

Content

1.1 What is Sociology?

1.2 What is Education?

1.3 Sociology of Education

1.4 Historical Roots and Theoretical Perspectives

1.4.1 Political Arithmetic

1.4.2 Structural functionalism

1.4.3 Socialization

1.4.4 Filling roles in society

1.4.5 Education and social reproduction

1.4.6 Bourdieu and cultural capital:

1.5 Scope of Sociology of Education

1.6 Difference between Educational Sociology and Sociology of Education

1.7 Functions of Education in Society

1.7.1 Assimilation and transmission of culture/traditions

1.7.2 Development of new social patterns

1.7.3. Activation of constructive and creative forces

1.7.4 Need to Study Sociology of Education

1.8 Education and Development:

1.8.1 Disregard of Education

1.8.2 Investment in Man

1.8.3 Rejection of the Panacea

1.8.4 Education as Barrier to Development

1.9. Let us Sum Up

1.10. Keywords

1.11. Check your progress

1.12. References

1.2 What is Sociology?

Sociology primarily concerns itself with social relationships. A network of social relationships is called the society. The society is the sole concern of sociology. Though, there are other aspects of the social science that focuses on some other aspects of the society, the central concern of sociology is the social relationships of mankind. Sociology also uses scientific method in its study. Science is an accumulated body of systemized knowledge and widely accepted processes dedicated to the discovery of generalizations and theories for refining and building on the existing knowledge. The scientific method which is universal (though now objected to by some scientists) consists of formulating a problem to be investigated, formulating some hypotheses and conducting a research which must be public, systematic and replicable.

Sociology is therefore a scientific study of human behaviour in groups, having for its aim the discovery of regularities and order in such behaviour and expressing these discoveries as theoretical propositions or generalizations that describe a wide variety of patterns of behaviour. Members of a group interact with one another at the individual level. The patterns of behaviour are the sum of the activities of one member on another in the group. Thus, sociology is also seen as the study of the formation and transformation of groups and the relationship of groups and group members with one another, noting that where there are groups there are tendencies for participation, cohesion and conflict. Sociology also involves the study of human groups and how they operate through established institutions and institutionalized patterns of behaviors which are more or less adapted to the specific functions of society assigned to each institution.

1.2 What is Education?

To the sociologist, education takes place in the society and is a social thing. Durkheim (1950) argued that:

“It is society as a whole and each particular social milieu that determine the ideal that education realizes. Society can survive only if there exists among its members a sufficient degree of homogeneity; education perpetuates and reinforces this homogeneity by fixing in the child from the beginning, the essential similarities that collective life demands. But on the other hand,

without certain diversity all cooperation would be impossible; education assumes the persistence of this necessary diversity by being itself diversified and specialized”

Durkheim thus views education as a means of organizing the individual self and the social self, the I and the We into a disciplined, stable and meaningful unity. The internalization of values and discipline represents the child’s initiation into the society. This is why it is very significant to study and analyze education using sociological approaches.

Swift (1969) noted that:

- 1. Education is everything which comprises the way of life of a society or group of people is learned. Nothing of it is biologically inherited.*
- 2. The human infant is incredibly receptive to experience. That is, he is capable of developing a wide range of beliefs about the world around him, skills in manipulating it and values as to how he should manipulate it.*
- 3. The infant is totally dependent from birth and for a very long period thereafter upon other people i.e. he is incapable of developing human personality without a very great deal of accidental or intended help from other people*

He therefore, defined education as “the process by which the individual acquires the many physical, moral social capacities demanded of him by the group into which he is born and within which he must function.” This process has been described by sociologists as Socialization. Education has a broader meaning than socialization. It is all that goes on in the society which involves teaching and learning whether intended or unintended to make the child a functional member of that society. The role of sociology in education is to establish the sociological standpoint and show its appreciation to education. Manheinn (1940) stated that:

“Sociologists do not regard education solely as a means of realizing abstract ideals of culture, such as humanism or technical specialization, but as part of the process of influencing men and women. Education can only be understood when we know for what society and for what social position the pupils are being educated.”

Education has often been very much so seen as a fundamentally optimistic human endeavour characterized by aspirations for progress and betterment.¹ It is understood by many to be a means of overcoming handicaps, achieving greater equality, and acquiring wealth and social status.

Education is perceived as a place where children can develop according to their unique needs and potential. It is also perceived as one of the best means of achieving greater social equality. Many would say that the purpose of education should be to develop every individual to their full potential, and give them a chance to achieve as much in life as their natural abilities allow (meritocracy). Few would argue that any education system accomplishes this goal perfectly. Some take a particularly negative view, arguing that the education system is designed with the intention of causing the social reproduction of inequality.

Education does not operate in a vacuum. To have a better society, we should analyze the society to show its strengths and weakness and plan the educational programmes to these effects. The educational system of many countries must reflect the philosophy of that society. It should be based on the needs, demands and aspirations of the society for it to function properly. It should be related to the level of culture, industrial development, and rate of urbanization, political organization, religious climate, family structures, and stratification. It should not only fulfill the individual's and society's needs but their future aspirations.

1.3 Sociology of Education:

Briefly, sociology of education is defined as a study of the relations between education and society. It is an investigation of the sociological processes involved in an educational institution. To Ottaway (1962), it is a social study and in so far as its method is scientific, it is a branch of social science. It is concerned with educational aims, methods, institutions, administration and curricula in relation to the economic, political, religious, social and cultural forces of the society in which they function. As far as the education of the individual is concerned, sociology of education highlights on the influence of social life and social relationships on the development of personality. Thus, sociology of education emphasizes sociological aspects of educational phenomena and institutions. The problems encountered are regarded as essentially problems of sociology and not problems of educational practice.

Sociology of Education, therefore, may be explained as the scientific analysis of the social processes and social patterns involved in the educational system. Brookover and Gottlieb consider that "this assumes education is a combination of social acts and that sociology is an analysis of human interaction." Educational process goes on in a formal as well as in informal

situations. Sociological study of the human interaction in education may comprise both situations and might guide to the development of scientific generalizations of human relations in the educational system. The sociology of education is the study of how public institutions and individual experiences influence education and its outcomes. It is most concerned with the public schooling systems of modern industrial societies, including the growth of higher, further, adult, and continuing education. It is a philosophical as well as a sociological concept, indicating ideologies, curricula, and pedagogical techniques of the inculcation and management of knowledge and the social reproduction of personalities and cultures. It is concerned with the relationships, activities and reactions of the teachers and students in the classroom and highlights the sociological problems in the realm of education.

1.4 Historical Roots and Theoretical Perspectives:

Systematic sociology of education began with the work of Émile Durkheim (1858-1917) on moral education as a basis for organic solidarity, and with studies by Max Weber (1864-1920) on the Chinese literati as an instrument of political control. After World War II, however, the subject received renewed interest around the world: from technological functionalism in the US, egalitarian reform of opportunity in Europe, and human-capital theory in economics. These all implied that, with industrialization, the need for a technologically skilled labour force undermines class distinctions and other ascriptive systems of stratification, and that education promotes social mobility. However, statistical and field research across numerous societies showed a persistent link between an individual's social class and achievement, and suggested that education could only achieve limited social mobility. Sociological studies showed how schooling patterns reflected, rather than challenged, class stratification and racial and sexual discrimination. After the general collapse of functionalism from the late 1960s onwards, the idea of education as an unmitigated good was even more profoundly challenged. Neo-Marxists argued that school education simply produced a docile labour force essential to late-capitalist class relations

The sociology of education contains a number of theories. Some of the main theories are presented below.

1.4.1 Political Arithmetic

The Political Arithmetic tradition within the sociology of education began with Hogben (1938) and denotes a tradition of politically critical quantitative research dealing with social inequalities, especially those generated by social stratification. Important works in this tradition have been. All of these works were concerned with the way in which school structures were implicated in social class inequalities in Britain. More recent work in this tradition has broadened its focus to include gender, ethnic differentials and international differences. While researchers in this tradition have engaged with sociological theories such as Rational Choice Theory and Cultural Reproduction Theory, the political arithmetic tradition has tended to remain rather skeptical of 'grand theory' and very much concerned with empirical evidence and social policy. The political arithmetic tradition was attacked by the 'New Sociology of Education' of the 1970s which rejected quantitative research methods. This heralded a period of methodological division within the sociology of education. However, the political arithmetic tradition, while rooted in quantitative methods, has increasingly engaged with mixed methods approaches.

1.4.2 Structural functionalism

Structural functionalists believe that society leans towards social equilibrium and social order. They see society like a human body, in which institutions such as education are like important organs that keep the society/body healthy and well. Structural functionalist believe that role of educational institutions is to incorporate common consensus among the new member (children) of the society. According to Durkheim in educational institutions the behaviour is regulated to accept the general moral values through curriculum and hidden curriculum. Educational institutions also sort out learners for future market. It plays the role of grading learners out come to fit them to different future jobs. High achievers will be trained for higher jobs and low achievers will be fitted in less important jobs. The behaviour of member of society is regulated in such a way that they accept their roles in society according to their social status. Thus structural functionalism opposes social mobility.

1.4.3 Socialization

Social health means the same as social order, and is guaranteed when nearly everyone accepts the general moral values of their society. Hence structural functionalists believe the aim of key institutions, such as education, is to socialize children and teenagers. Socialization is the process by which the new generation learns the knowledge, attitudes and values that they will need as productive citizens. Although this aim is stated in the formal curriculum, it is mainly achieved

through the hidden curriculum, a subtler, but nonetheless powerful, indoctrination of the norms and values of the wider society. Students learn these values because their behavior at school is regulated until they gradually internalize and accept them.

1.4.4 Filling roles in society

Education must also perform another function: As various jobs become vacant, they must be filled with the appropriate people. Therefore the other purpose of education is to sort and rank individuals for placement in the labor market. Those with high achievement will be trained for the most important jobs and in reward, be given the highest incomes. Those who achieve the least, will be given the least demanding (intellectually at any rate, if not physically) jobs, and hence the least income.

According to Sennet and Cobb however, “to believe that ability alone decides who is rewarded is to be deceived”. Meighan agrees, stating that large numbers of capable students from working-class backgrounds fail to achieve satisfactory standards in school and therefore fail to obtain the status they deserve. Jacob believes this is because the middle class cultural experiences that are provided at school may be contrary to the experiences working-class children receive at home. In other words, working class children are not adequately prepared to cope at school. They are therefore “cooled out” from school with the least qualifications, hence they get the least desirable jobs, and so remain working class. Sargent confirms this cycle, arguing that schooling supports continuity, which in turn supports social order. Talcott Parsons believed that this process, whereby some students were identified and labelled educational failures, “was a necessary activity which one part of the social system, education, performed for the whole”. Yet the structural functionalist perspective maintains that this social order, this continuity, is what most people desire.

1.4.5 Education and social reproduction

The perspective of conflict theory, contrary to the structural functionalist perspective, believes that society is full of vying social groups with different aspirations, different access to life chances and gain different social rewards. Relations in society, in this view, are mainly based on exploitation, oppression, domination and subordination. Many teachers assume that students will have particular middle class experiences at home, and for some children this assumption isn't necessarily true. Some children are expected to help their parents after school and carry considerable domestic responsibilities in their often single-parent home. The demand of this

domestic labour often makes it difficult for them to find time to do all their homework and thus affects their academic performance.

Where teachers have softened the formality of regular study and integrated student's preferred working methods into the curriculum, they noted that particular students displayed strengths they had not been aware of before. However few teachers deviate from the traditional curriculum, and the curriculum conveys what constitutes knowledge as determined by the state - and those in power. This knowledge isn't very meaningful to many of the students, who see it as pointless. Wilson & Wyn state that the students realise there is little or no direct link between the subjects they are doing and their perceived future in the labour market. Anti-school values displayed by these children are often derived from their consciousness of their real interests. Sargent believes that for working class students, striving to succeed and absorbing the school's middle class values, is accepting their inferior social position as much as if they were determined to fail. Fitzgerald states that "irrespective of their academic ability or desire to learn, students from poor families have relatively little chance of securing success" On the other hand, for middle and especially upper-class children, maintaining their superior position in society requires little effort. The federal government subsidises 'independent' private schools enabling the rich to obtain 'good education' by paying for it. With this 'good education', rich children perform better, achieve higher and obtain greater rewards. In this way, the continuation of privilege and wealth for the elite is made possible *in continuum*.

Conflict theorists believe this social reproduction continues to occur because the whole education system is overlain with ideology provided by the dominant group. In effect, they perpetuate the myth that education is available to all to provide a means of achieving wealth and status. Anyone who fails to achieve this goal, according to the myth, has only themselves to blame. Wright agrees, stating that "the effect of the myth is to...stop them from seeing that their personal troubles are part of major social issues". The duplicity is so successful that many parents endure appalling jobs for many years, believing that this sacrifice will enable their children to have opportunities in life that they did not have themselves. These people who are poor and disadvantaged are victims of a societal confidence trick. They have been encouraged to believe that a major goal of schooling is to strengthen equality while, in reality, schools reflect society's intention to maintain the previous unequal distribution of status and power.

However, this perspective has been criticized as deterministic and pessimistic. It should be recognized however that it is a model, an aspect of reality which is an important part of the picture.

1.4.6 Bourdieu and cultural capital: This theory of social reproduction has been significantly theorized by Pierre Bourdieu. However, Bourdieu as a social theorist has always been concerned with the dichotomy between the objective and subjective, or to put it another way, between structure and agency. Bourdieu has therefore built his theoretical framework around the important concepts of habitus, field and cultural capital. These concepts are based on the idea that objective structures determine individuals' chances, through the mechanism of the habitus, where individuals internalize these structures. However, the habitus is also formed by, for example, an individual's position in various fields, their family and their everyday experiences. Therefore one's class position does not determine one's life chances, although it does play an important part, alongside other factors.

Bourdieu used the idea of cultural capital to explore the differences in outcomes for students from different classes in the French educational system. He explored the tension between the conservative reproduction and the innovative production of knowledge and experience. He found that this tension is intensified by considerations of which particular cultural past and present is to be conserved and reproduced in schools. Bourdieu argues that it is the culture of the dominant groups, and therefore their cultural capital, which is embodied in schools, and that this leads to social reproduction.

The cultural capital of the dominant group, in the form of practices and relation to culture, is assumed by the school to be the natural and only proper type of cultural capital and is therefore legitimated. It demands “uniformly of all its students that they should have what it does not give” [Bourdieu]. This legitimate cultural capital allows students who possess it to gain educational capital in the form of qualifications. Those lower-class students are therefore disadvantaged. To gain qualifications they must acquire legitimate cultural capital, by exchanging their own (usually working-class) cultural capital. This exchange is not a straight forward one, due to the class ethos of the lower-class students. Class ethos is described as the particular dispositions towards, and subjective expectations of, school and culture. It is in part determined by the objective chances of that class. This means that not only do children find success harder in school due to the fact that they must learn a new way of ‘being’, or relating to the world, and especially, a new way of relating to and using language, but they must also act against their instincts and expectations. The

subjective expectations influenced by the objective structures found in the school, perpetuate social reproduction by encouraging less-privileged students to eliminate themselves from the system, so that fewer and fewer are to be found as one journeys through the levels of the system. The process of social reproduction is neither perfect nor complete, but still, only a small number of less-privileged students achieve success. For the majority of these students who do succeed at school, they have had to internalize the values of the dominant classes and use them as their own, to the detriment of their original habitus and cultural values.

Therefore, Bourdieu's viewpoint discloses how objective structures play an imperative function in determining individual attainment in school, but allows for the exercise of an individual's agency to conquer these blockades, although this option is not without its penalties.

1.5 Scope of Sociology of Education:

The scope of sociology of education is vast.

- It is concerned with such general concepts such as society itself, culture, community, class, environment, socialization, internalization, accommodation, assimilation, cultural lag, subculture, status, role and so forth.
- It is further involved in cases of education and social class, state, social force, cultural change, various problems of role structure, role analysis in relation to the total social system and the micro society of the school such as authority, selection, and the organization of learning, streaming, curriculum and so forth.
- It deals with analysis of educational situations in various geographical and ethnological contexts. For e.g. educational situations in rural, urban and tribal areas, in different parts of the country/world, with the background of different races, cultures etc.
- It helps us to understand the effectiveness of different educational methods in teaching students with different kinds of intelligences.
- It studies the effect of economy upon the type of education provided to the students, for e.g. education provided in IB, ICSE, SSC, Municipal schools
- It helps us to understand the effect of various social agencies like family, school on the students.
- It studies the relationship between social class, culture, language, parental education, occupation and the achievement of the students
- It studies the role and structure of school, peer group on the personality of the students

- It provides an understanding of the problems such as racism, communalism, gender discrimination etc.

1.6 Difference between Educational Sociology and Sociology of Education

The premise of sociology of education is different from the concept of educational sociology which is seen as the application of general principles and findings of sociology to the administration and/or processes of education. These approach efforts to pertain principles of sociology to the institutions of education as a separate societal unit. The challenges of educational sociology are derived from the field of education. The content of the sociology of education therefore included such general concepts as the society itself, accommodation, assimilation, cultural lag, sub culture, status etc. Such other considerations as the effect of the polity and economy on education, the social forces and determinants that effect educational and cultural change; the social institutions involved in the educational process – the family, the school and the church; various problems of role structure and role analysis in relation to the total social system and the micro-society of the school; the school viewed as a formal organisation, involving such problems as authority, selection, the organization of learning and streaming; the relationship between social class, culture and language, and between education and occupation; and problems of democratization and elitism, all fall within the purview of sociology of education. In doing the above, the sociologists often utilize any one of Historical correlation or the functionalist approaches. These are demonstrated in the particular perspective used for the study of a given problem.

Educational sociology is a branch of discipline of sociology which studies the problems of relationship between society and education. It evolved as a discipline designed to prepare educators for their future tasks. It uses the results of sociological researches in planning educational activities and in developing effective methods of realizing these plans. The main aim of educational sociology was to study social interaction. Francis Brown considered that, “All education proceeds by the participation of the individual in the social consciousness of the race”. He defined educational sociology as that discipline which applied the general principles and findings of sociology to the process of education. Educational sociology is by definition a discipline which studies education sociologically, with the premise that it recognizes education as a social fact, a process and an institution, having a social function and being determined socially.

It is the application of sociological principles and methods to the solution of problems in an educational system.

Educational Sociology threw light on the importance of the interactions of different elements of the society with an individual. It emphasized the progress of the society through the medium of education. The problems of schooling and instructions were looked upon as problems of the society. The educational sociology tried to answer the questions -- as to what type of education should be given? What should be the curriculum? Why children become delinquent? It threw light on those institutions and organizations and on those social interactions that were important in educational process. It used educational interactions that helped in the development of the personality of the individual so that he becomes a better social being. It was realized that though educational sociology made everyone realize the social nature of education, formulated ideals by which educational planning was guided, used the theoretical knowledge gathered by researches conducted by either sociologists or educational sociologists, there appeared to be confusion as to what the proper dimensions of educational sociology should be. There were differences of opinion regarding what types of researches are to be classified under the head of educational sociology. This led to the thinking that there should be a separate branch of knowledge which can be designated as sociology of education. Soon educational sociology became a historical phenomenon. In 1963, the Journal of Educational Sociology became the Journal of Sociology of Education. Sociology of Education may be defined as the scientific analysis of the social processes and social patterns involved in the educational system.

1.7 Functions of Education in Society

Acquisition of knowledge and development of the personality of an individual is no longer presumed to be the main function of education. Functions are assumed to occur without directed effort. From the sociological point of view, education has the following functions:

1.7.3 Assimilation and transmission of culture/traditions:

This needs to be done consciously and selectively because traditions need to be selected for transmission as well as omission depending on their value and desirability in today's democratic set-up. For example, one needs to propagate the idea of 'Sarva Dharma

Samabhav' meaning 'all Dharmas (truths) are equal to or harmonious with each other'. In recent times this statement has been taken as meaning "all religions are the same" - that all religions are merely different paths to God or the same spiritual goal. It emphasizes moral responsibilities in society that people should have towards each other. At the same time education should encourage people to do away with the custom of child marriage, untouchability etc. Education should help in

- Acquisition/clarification of personal values
- Self-realization/self-reflection: awareness of one's abilities and goals
- Self-esteem/self-efficacy
- Thinking creatively
- Cultural appreciation: art, music, humanities
- Developing a sense of well-being: mental and physical health
- Acquisition/clarification of values related to the physical environment
- Respect: giving and receiving recognition as human beings
- Capacity/ability to live a fulfilling life

1.7.4 Development of new social patterns:

Today the world is changing very fast due to development of technology and communication. So along with preservation of traditional values, new values, social patterns need to be developed where:

- Citizens rooted in their own cultures and yet open to other cultures are produced.
- Global outlook is fostered.
- Knowledge is advanced in such a way that economic development goes hand in hand with responsible management of the physical and human environment.
- Citizens who understand their social responsibilities are produced.
- Citizens who can evaluate information and predict future outcomes are developed – in short who can take part in decision-making
- Who have the capacity/ability to seek out alternative solutions and evaluate them are trained – those who are trained in problem solving

1.7.5 Activation of constructive and creative forces: Education should help to build up a qualified and creative workforce that can adapt to new technologies and take part in the 'intelligence revolution' that is the driving force of our economies.

- It should Ensure capacity/ability to earn a living: career education Develop mental and physical skills: motor, thinking, communication, social, aesthetic
- Produce citizens who can adapt, adjust according to social environment,
- Produce citizens who can contribute towards the progress of society,
- Produce citizens who will live democratically,
- Create individuals who will make proper use of leisure time,
- Train individuals to adapt to change or prepare for change, better still initiate change in the society,
- Develop individuals who are open to others and mutual understanding and the values of peace,
- Promote knowledge of moral practices and ethical standards acceptable by society/culture
- Develop capacity/ability to recognize and evaluate different points of view
- Develop understanding of human relations and motivations

1.7.4 Need to Study Sociology of Education:

Every society has its own changing socio – cultural needs and requires an education to meet these needs. Today’s needs are conservation of resources, environmental protection, global citizenship etc. Therefore education caters towards meeting of these different needs. Since the needs of the society change education also changes. Hence there is need for studying sociology of education.

It helps in understanding:

- Work of School and Teachers and its relation to society, social progress and development
- Effect of Social Elements on the working of school and society
- Effect of Social Elements on the life of individuals
- Construction of Curriculum in relation to the cultural and economic needs of the society
- Democratic ideologies present in different countries
- Need for understanding and promoting international culture
- Development of Society through the formulation of various rules and regulations and understanding of culture and traditions
- Need for Promotion of Social Adjustment
- The effect of social groups, their interrelation and dynamics on individuals

1.8 Education and Development:

Granted that education has an assured value of its own, it must be still asked what role it could be assigned in national development. Educational systems are costly and must be weighed against other possible development projects in drawing up a list of priorities for developing countries. It is necessary, therefore, to set up clearly the relationship between education and development.

During the past two decades there have been at least four major shifts in the way this relationship has been perceived by development theorists and economists. An understanding of these shifts is vital if anyone wishes to understand the alterations in development policy all through the Third World in the last twenty years and, more particularly, the educational decisions that were made. It should be noted that there was an era when development was generally identified with economic development. This is borne out by the fact that the most common indices of "development" during the 1960s and before were:

1. Growth of Gross National Product,
2. Technological advance and rate of industrialization,
3. Improved living standards.

Present-day philosophy, however, is less willing to regard development as only a condensed form of economic development. The meaning of development has been widening to hold more than merely economic growth. While this may be an enhancement of a term, the task of defining a changing relationship is none the easier when the meaning of one of the terms of the relationship is itself shifting.

1.8.1 Disregard of Education: In the post-War years, education was generally neglected as a factor in the economic development of what later came to be called the Third World countries. While education was always regarded as humanizing and popular for all people, it was seen as something of a luxury for those countries struggling to produce enough to feed their populations. The real imperative for these countries was an augment in productivity, and this meant modernization of productive methods-factories, utilization of resources, and so forth. The principal means of achieving this was the formation of sufficient capital in the country to permit industrialization and development of the infrastructure. Accumulation of savings from within the country, or adequate inflow of foreign aid from abroad, was the prerequisites for economic

development. Several studies (the most popular of which was Rostow's *The Stages of Economic Growth*) supposed to demonstrate the close correlation between capital formation and economic growth in the industrialized nations of the West. This was assumed to hold equally true for non-industrialized, more traditional countries elsewhere.

1.8.2 Investment in Man: During the early 1960s an amazing turnaround of development theory took place. More rigorous studies of economic growth revealed that only a part of it could be explained by the amount of capital investment. Other factors seemed to be at least as important in development. One correlation that loomed large in the studies by economists at this time was that between the level of education and economic growth. Some found a close relationship between elementary education and Gross National Product; others maintained that higher education was the decisive factor; still others argued that general literacy was the important element. Assuming that the level of education bore a causal relationship to economic growth, economists tended to see "investment in human resources" as the essential condition for economic development. This meant, in practice, that foreign aid to developing countries was to be allocated primarily for hospitals and schools rather than for factories.

The explanation for this reversal of development theory went thus: No economic development can take place in a society until the people embrace values favorable to modernization and progress and until they are trained in the basic skills needed in a transitional society. The "crust of custom" needed to be broken before change could occur. Traditional attitudes which discouraged development had to be properly shaken, and there was no better way to do this than to sharpen the material appetites of the people. This would lead them in time to turn to Western patterns of production and use of resources. For other theorists, the primary place of education in development was more a matter of recognizing the value of capital investment in human beings. Gunnar Myrdal, whose *Asian Drama* reflects in great part the thinking of this period, quotes a representative statement: "Countries are underdeveloped because most of their people are underdeveloped, having had no opportunity of expanding their potential capital in the service of society."

The thinking on economic development had undergone this shift: the cause of economic growth was seen as the "capacity to create wealth rather than the creation of wealth itself." Thus, every graduate of a school in a developing country was regarded as a valuable resource capable of making a significant contribution to economic development. In time, the investment in his education would be returned to the country many times over.

1.8.3 Rejection of the Panacea

By the late 1960s it had become clear that investment in education and health did not in itself assure development any more than capital formation did. Education, which had once been abandoned in development, had thereafter been given the leading place in aid programs to developing countries. Neither approach proved a impressive success. Critics soon warned of taking education out of the context of the multiple and complex forces at work in a society and assigning it too great an importance in development. They cautioned that something more than insecticides, tractors, and education were needed for increasing agricultural productivity. Other sorts of institutional reforms—for example, land reform programs—were recognized as a necessary ingredient of development. If education was a prerequisite for economic growth, it was by no means the only one and perhaps not even the most important.

Critics of the "Investment in Man" theory of development pointed out that education could hinder rather than promote economic growth. A case study of Kerala, one of the states of India, showed how educational expansion could lead to political instability, social unrest, and retardation of economic growth in certain circumstances. The older idea governing educational acceleration in developing countries—"There can never be too much of a good thing."—was now under fire from many quarters. In its place came the idea of "controlled education" for developing countries. Educational expansion must take place within the limits imposed by capital formation in the country. It must not outpace the ability of the economy to absorb its products. This led to another question being raised. If education could actually set back economic development, when allowed to run wild, might not it also retard social development in certain instances? A balance was required between the educational thrust and the development of other institutions in the Third World. Otherwise, education might well be counterproductive in terms of over-all development. Education, therefore, was no longer seen as an unqualified good.

1.8.4 Education as Barrier to Development

By the beginning of this decade a small but growing number of social critics were heard to proclaim that formal education was not a mixed blessing at all for Third World countries; it was a real obstacle to development. For Ivan Illich, Paulo Freire and others who were at the vanguard of this movement, "development" had acquired a new definition. The measure of development was no longer an increased productivity and more dollars. National and individual wealth was now seen as secondary to a sense of power-the ability to make real choices and shape one's own future. A certain level of national affluence is the condition for achieving this power, provided it does not lead to domination by the wealthy world powers. Just as development means freedom from national impotence, it also implies liberation from powerlessness for all social groups within the country. The elimination of social inequality takes on special prominence in this concept of development. And here is where formal education, as embodied in the Western school, comes under severe attack. By sorting people out into categories of its own making (PhDs, ABs, high school graduates, dropouts), it leads to class stratification and actually promotes social inequality. Formal education systems, the critics charge, produce a sense of dependence and helplessness among those whom they purport to help. People learn to mistrust their own power to engage in meaningful learning outside of a school. The Western school, Illich maintains, is as much the product of an industrialized society-and therefore just as inappropriate to many developing countries-as the skyscraper and the fast express train. His quarrel is not with education as such, but with the costly types of formal education that devour a large chunk of the national budget for the benefit of elite representing only a tiny fraction of the national population. Others contend that the supposed economic gains from education are largely illusory. The consumption of the educated eventually outstrips their productivity, education being not the least expensive of the commodities they learn to consume. The result is a society outdoing itself to keep up with educational demands. In the last analysis, the system of formal education transplanted in developing countries from foreign shores is self-defeating as a means of achieving development.

It would be hard to conceive of a greater fluctuation in theories than that which has taken place within the past twenty years. Education, which was at first ignored as a force in development, then became the magic key to attaining economic growth. Not long afterwards it was

demystified, although still accorded an important place in national development. Now, as the disenchantment with the results of development during the 1960s grows, education (or at least the formal education with which we are most familiar) is, in the eyes of some, a real obstacle to a more broadly defined development. One of the purposes of studying history is to assist us in relativizing the dogmas of a particular age so that we can discern what is of lasting value. This is particularly important for us as we attempt to focus on the meaning of education in overall development. Our schools in Micronesia were built on the limited theoretical foundations of the early 1960s, and they are being attacked from other limited premises that we work from today. It is impossible for educators to ignore the critical question of the relationship between education and overall development, and unwise for us to see only a little bit of the question. Perhaps this survey will help us gain a larger perspective.

1.9. Let us Sum Up:

- The sociology of education is the study of how public institutions and individual experiences affect education and its outcomes. It is mostly concerned with the public schooling systems of modern industrial societies, including the expansion of higher, further, adult, and continuing education.
- The scope of sociology of education is vast. It is concerned with such general concepts such as society itself, culture, community, class, environment, socialization, internalization, accommodation, assimilation, cultural lag, subculture, status, role and so forth.
- Every society has its own changing socio – cultural needs and requires an education to meet these needs. Today’s needs are conservation of resources, environmental protection, global citizenship etc. Therefore education caters towards meeting of these different needs. Since the needs of the society change education also changes
- The premise of sociology of education is different from the concept of educational sociology which is seen as the application of general principles and findings of sociology to the administration and/or processes of education.

1.10. Keywords: Education, Sociology, Development. Socialization, Cultural Capital, Social Reproduction