Lecture II

Theoretical Perspective of Sociology

What is your conflict mode?

Fight  VS  Flight
Meaning of Perspective

If we search the meaning of perspective we will find various meaning. In general perspective is a particular attitude towards or way of regarding something; a point of view, stand point, or insight or outlook. Perspective has a Latin root meaning "look through" or "perceive," and all the meanings of perspective have something to do with looking. Your perspective is the way you see something. If you think that toys corrupt children's minds, then from your perspective a toy shop is an evil place. Our perception of space is dominated by our perspective. By seeing a glass partially filled with water we can say it is half empty or half full. It depends upon our perspective. So perspective is our stand point or our perception or our stances.

In the context of sociology there is not a single way of viewing or observing the society. Sociologists view society in a different way. In this writing I will try to explain especially three kinds of theoretical perspective of sociology: functionalist perspective, conflict perspective and interaction perspective of sociology.

**Functionalist perspective**

Some sociologist sees the social world as a stable and an ongoing unity. They are impressed with the endurance of the family, organized religion, and other social institutions. They define society as a system of interrelated parts that are interdependent. According to them society is just like the human body. Human body consists of numbers of parts like head; heart, limbs etc. and each part have their distinct functions to play in the life of the total organism. Similarly, the society has also its distinct parts like family, government, economy, religion, education etc. Functionalism addresses the society as a whole in terms of function of its constituent elements such as norms, customs, traditions, institutions etc. Social structures are stressed and placed at the center of analysis and social functions are deduced from these structures.

The functionalist perspective is based largely on the works of Herbert Spencer, Emile Durkheim, Talcott Parsons, and Robert Merton. According to functionalism, society is a system of
interconnected parts that work together in harmony to maintain a state of balance and social equilibrium for the whole. For example, each of the social institutions contributes important functions for society: Family provides a context for reproducing, nurturing, and socializing children; education offers a way to transmit a society’s skills, knowledge, and culture to its youth; politics provides a means of governing members of society; economics provides for the production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services; and religion provides moral guidance and an outlet for worship of a higher power. The functionalist perspective emphasizes the interconnectedness of society by focusing on how each part influences and is influenced by other parts. For example, the increase in single parent and dual-earner families has contributed to the number of children who are failing in school because parents have become less available to supervise their children’s homework. As a result of changes in technology, colleges are offering more technical programs, and many adults are returning to school to learn new skills that are required in the workplace. The increasing number of women in the workforce has contributed to the formulation of policies against sexual harassment and job discrimination.

Functionalism interprets each part of society in terms of how it contributes to the stability of the whole society. Society is more than the sum of its parts; rather, each part of society is functional for the stability of the whole society. The different parts are primarily the institutions of society, each of which is organized to fill different needs and each of which has particular consequences for the form and shape of society. The parts all depend on each other.

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

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

Functionalists believe that society is held together by social consensus, in which members of the society agree upon, and work together to achieve, what is best for society as a whole. Structural functionalism, or simply functionalism, is a framework for building theory that sees society as a complex system whose parts work together to promote solidarity and stability. This approach looks at society through a macro-level orientation, which is a broad focus on the social structures that shape society as a whole, and believes that society has evolved like organisms. This approach looks at both social structure and social functions. Functionalism addresses society as a
whole in terms of the function of its constituent elements; namely norms, customs, traditions, and institutions. A common analogy, popularized by Herbert Spencer, presents these parts of society as "organs" that work toward the proper functioning of the "body" as a whole. Each part affects the other parts of the system. In the most basic terms, it simply emphasizes "the effort to impute, as rigorously as possible, to each feature, custom, or practice, its effect on the functioning of a supposedly stable, cohesive system". For Talcott Parsons, "structural-functionalism" came to describe a particular stage in the methodological development of social science, rather than a specific school of thought. The structural functionalism approach is a macro sociological analysis, with a broad focus on social structures that shape society as a whole.

Functionalism emphasizes the consensus and order that exist in society, focusing on social stability and shared public values. From this perspective, disorganization in the system, such as deviant behavior, leads to change because societal components must adjust to achieve stability. When one part of the system is not working or is dysfunctional, it affects all other parts and creates social problems, which leads to social change.

Therefore, the sociological intent of Functionalism is found within the institutions and parts of society that operate as a system creating social balance and equilibrium. Functionalism is defined as the parts of society that are structured to maintain social equilibrium or balance. The parts all contribute to the “functional” operation of the system in general. If a part of society is not maintaining social homeostasis, it is referred to as dysfunctional. Furthermore, all other parts of society which are connected to this part are like-wise dysfunctional. For example, a dysfunctional school system is the outcome of dysfunctional family life. If the family does not support the goals of education, or does not understand the importance of education in our post-modern society, the children will on average not perform well in school.

The functionalist perspective achieved its greatest popularity among American sociologists in the 1940s and 1950s. While European functionalists originally focused on explaining the inner workings of social order, American functionalists focused on discovering the functions of human behavior. Among these American functionalist sociologists is Robert K. Merton, who divided human functions into two types: manifest functions, which are intentional and obvious and latent functions, which are unintentional and not obvious. The manifest function of attending a church or synagogue, for instance, is to worship as part of a religious community, but its latent function may be to help members learn to distinguish personal from institutional values. With common sense, manifest functions become easily apparent. Yet this is not necessarily the case for latent functions, which often demand a sociological approach to be revealed.

Functionalists use the terms functional and dysfunctional to describe the effects of social elements on society. Elements of society are functional if they contribute to social stability and dysfunctional if they disrupt social stability. Some aspects of society can be both functional and dysfunctional. For example, crime is dysfunctional in that it is associated with physical violence, loss of property, and fear. But according to Durkheim and other functionalists, crime is also
functional for society because it leads to heightened awareness of shared moral bonds and increased social cohesion.

Sociologists have identified **two types of functions**: manifest and latent (Merton 1968). **Manifest functions** are consequences that are intended and commonly recognized. **Latent functions** are consequences that are unintended and often hidden. For example, the manifest function of education is to transmit knowledge and skills to society’s youth. But public elementary schools also serve as babysitters for employed parents, and colleges offer a place for young adults to meet potential mates. The babysitting and mate-selection functions are not the intended or commonly recognized functions of education; hence they are latent functions.

In general social functions have 3 components: Manifest functions, latent functions and dysfunctions. The recognized and intended consequences of any social pattern are its manifest functions. E.g. manifest function of education include preparing for a career by getting good grades, graduation and finding good job etc.

Latent functions are the unrecognized and unintended consequences of any social pattern [objective consequences/functions] e.g. latent functions of education include meeting new people, participating in extracurricular activities, taking school trips or maybe finding a spouse. The concept of latent function extends the observer's attention BEYOND the question of whether or not the behavior attains its confirmed purpose. Sociological observers are less likely to examine the collateral/latent functions of the behavior. In the other hand social pattern's undesirable consequences for the operation of the society are considered dysfunction [failure to achieve manifest function] e.g. Dysfunction of education include not getting good grade, not getting a job etc. Functional analysts tend to focus on the **statics of social structure** and to neglect the study of structural change. Concept of dysfunction implies the concept of strain, stress and tension on the structural level of a social system.

**Limitation of Functionalist Perspective**

Functionalism has received criticism for neglecting the negative functions of an event such as divorce. Critics also claim that the perspective justifies the status quo and complacency on the part of society's members. Functionalism does not encourage people to take an active role in changing their social environment, even when such change may benefit them. Instead, functionalism sees active social change as undesirable because the various parts of society will compensate naturally for any problems that may arise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every society is relatively persistent (constant), stable structure of elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every society is a well-integrated structure of elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every element in a society has a function. (i.e. contributes to the maintenance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every function in the social structure is based on a consensus of values between members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
functionalism was criticized for being unable to account for social change/structural contradiction and conflicts (so often was called consensus theory). We need to note that Parson's theory came in the context of World War II and at that time equilibrium and social order was crucial rather than social change. Functionalism is teleological (that it attempts to describe social institutions solely through their EFFECTS and does not explain the CAUSE of those effects). Societies cannot have 'needs' as a human being does. Even if society does have needs, they need not be met. Functionalism contains no sense of agency, that individuals are seen as puppets, acting as their role demands them to do. Conflict theorists criticize functionalism as giving too much weight on consensus and neglecting independence and conflict. However, Merton introduced an explicit analysis of tension and conflict through his critique of functional unity. Jeffrey Alexander sees functionalism as a broad school rather than a specific method or system.

Conflict Perspective

The functionalist perspective views society as composed of different parts working together. In contrast, the conflict perspective views society as composed of different groups and interest competing for power and resources. The conflict perspective explains various aspects of our social world by looking at which groups have power and benefit from a particular social arrangement. For example, feminist theory argues that we live in a patriarchal society—a hierarchical system of organization controlled by men. Although there are many varieties of feminist theory, most would hold that feminism “demands that existing economic, political, and social structures be changed”.

Conflict occurs whenever disagreements exist in a social situation over issues or substance and/or emotional antagonism. It deals with the incompatible aspects of the society. According to this perspective change emerges from the crisis between human beings and their society. Human beings have capacity to think and act against situations that are not satisfactory to their existence. Means of conflict between two classes of people can bring change in society.

Conflict-Types

Substantive conflicts involve disagreements over such things as group goals, the allocation of resources, distribution of rewards, policies and procedures, and assignment of the roles.

Emotional conflicts result from feelings of anger, trust, dislike, fear and also from personality clashes.
**Functional conflict** contributes to the achievement of the goals of the group or the organization. Functional conflict should be nurtured, if not encouraged.

**Dysfunctional conflict** obstructs the organization from accomplishing its goals. Dysfunctional conflict should be reduced or removed.

**Different Views about Conflict**

**Traditional Views**: assumed that conflict is bad,

**The human relations views**: Conflict is accepted as natural occurrence in all groups and organization,

**The Integrationist View**: encourage conflict to keep the group alive, self-critical and creative

**Levels of Conflict**

If we study the conflict in different dimension we can find different level such as

- Intra-personal
- Inter-personal
- Intra-group
- Inter-group
- Intra-organization
- Inter-organization

**Society and Conflict**

Society is created from the ongoing conflict between key groups. According to some theorists, these groups are the main economic “classes” of society. These are made up of those who own the main wealth of society, and those who own little but their ability to labor. The main theorist representing this approach is Karl Marx (1818-1883). He saw society as being built out of the conflicting interests of the “owner class” and the “working class”. In his view, the resulting struggle between classes would lead to a classless society. Every Society is at every point subject to the processes of change. Change is everywhere. Every Element in a society contributes to its disintegration and change. Every Society is based on coercion of some members by others.

**Basic Sources of Conflict**

First, we want to consider what brings on social conflict in the first place. Most social conflict is based on the unequal distribution of scarce resources. Weber identified those resources for us as class, status, and power. Weber, as well as Simmel, also pointed out the importance of the *crosscutting influences* that originate with the different structures of inequality. For example, a
working class black person may not share the same political interests as a working class white person. The different status positions of these two people may cut across their similar class interests. Thus, what becomes important as a source of social conflict is the covariance of these three systems of stratification. If the public perceives that the same group controls access to all three resources, it is likely that the legitimacy of the system will be questioned because people perceive that their social mobility is hampered. The other general source of conflict comes from Marx. Marx’s concern was with a group’s sense of deprivation caused by class. This sense of deprivation is what leads a group to class consciousness and produces conflict and social change. Marx was primarily concerned with explaining the structural changes or processes that would bring the working class to this realization, such things as rising levels of education and worker concentration that are both structurally demanded by capitalism. Contemporary conflict theory has modified the idea of deprivation by noting that it is the shift from absolute to relative deprivation that is significant in producing this kind of critical awareness. Absolute deprivation refers to the condition of being destitute, living well below the poverty line where life is dictated by uncertainty over the essentials of life (food, shelter, and clothing). People in such a condition have neither the resources nor the willpower to become involved in conflict and social change. Relative deprivation, however, refers to a sense of being underprivileged relative to some other person or group. The basics of life aren’t in question here; it’s simply the sense that others are doing better and that we are losing out on something. These people and groups have the emotional and material resources to become involved in conflict and social change. But it isn’t relative deprivation itself that motivates people; it is the shift from absolute to relative deprivation that may spark a powder tub of insurgency. People who are upwardly mobile in this way have the available resources, and they may experience a sense of loss or deprivation if the economic structural changes can’t keep pace with their rising expectations.

**The Integrating Forces of Conflict**

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

**Assumptions of conflict perspective**

Conflict perspective feels conflict is an inevitable part of life. It looks at the role of competition in conflict. According to this perspective those who own the means of production use their resources to protect their interests. It wants to know “Who benefits?” from the system.

According to this perspective there are mainly two groups in the society which are described below.
Bourgeoisie—own the means of production (land, machinery, buildings and technology) and purchase labor

- Want to expand markets and increase profit
- Want cheapest labor and raw materials

Proletariat—workers, who own their labor, are treated like machines by owners, have low skills and are dependent

The origins of the conflict perspective can be traced to the classic works of Karl Marx. Marx suggested that all societies go through stages of economic development. As societies evolve from agricultural to industrial, concern over meeting survival needs is replaced by concern over making a profit, the hallmark of a capitalist system. Industrialization leads to the development of two classes of people: the bourgeoisie, or the owners of the means of production (e.g., factories, farms, businesses); and the proletariat, or the workers who earn wages. The division of society into two broad classes of people—the “haves” and the “have-nots”—are beneficial to the owners of the means of production. The workers, who may earn only subsistence wages, are denied access to the many resources available to the wealthy owners. According to Marx, the bourgeoisie use their power to control the institutions of society to their advantage. For example, Marx suggested that religion serves as an “opiate of the masses” in that it soothes the distress and suffering associated with the working-class lifestyle and focuses the workers’ attention on spirituality, God, and the afterlife rather than on such worldly concerns as living conditions. In essence, religion diverts the workers so that they concentrate on being rewarded in heaven for living a moral life rather than on questioning their exploitation.

In general, conflict theory seeks to scientifically explain the general outlines of conflict in society: how conflict starts and varies, and the effects it brings. The central concerns of conflict theory are the unequal distribution of scarce resources and power. What these resources are might be different for each theorist, but conflict theorists usually work with Weber’s three systems of stratification: class, status, and power. Conflict theorists generally see power as the central feature of society, rather than thinking of society as held together by collective agreement concerning a cohesive set of cultural standards, as functionalists do. Where power is located? Who uses it (and who doesn’t)? These are the fundamental questions to conflict theory. In this way of thinking about things, power isn’t necessarily bad: it is a primary factor that guides society and social relations

**Four Main Points in Conflict Sociology (additional reading materials)**

1. *The unequal distribution of each scarce resource produces potential conflict between those who control it and those who don’t.* Dahrendorf argues that there is one primary resource in society: power. Randall Collins, on the other hand, follows the basic outline that Weber gave us of the three different types of scarce resources: *economic resources*, which may be broadly understood as all material conditions; *power resources*, which are
best understood as social positions within control or organizational networks; and status or cultural resources, which Collins understands as control over the rituals that produce solidarity and group symbols. Notice that Collins expands and generalizes two of these resources. Both Marx and Weber saw economic resources in terms of class position; Collins, however, argues that economic resources ought to be seen as encompassing a much broader spectrum of issues—control over any material resources. These may come to us as a consequence of class, but they also may accumulate to a person working in an underground social movement through burglary or other illegal means.

2. Potential conflicts become actual conflicts to the degree that opposing groups become mobilized. There are at least two main areas of resource mobilization: The first area involves emotional, moral, and symbolic mobilization. The prime ingredient here is collective rituals. This is one of Collins’s main contributions to conflict theory. Groups don’t simply need material goods to wage a battle; there are also clear emotional and symbolic goods used in conflict. In general, the more a group is able to physically gather together, create boundaries for ritual practice, share a common focus of attention, and have a common emotional mood, the more group members will have a strong and explicit sense of group identity, have a worldview that polarizes the world into two camps (in-group and out-group), be able to perceive their beliefs as morally right and be charged up with the necessary emotional energy to make sacrifices for the group. The second main area for mobilization concerns the material resources for organizing. Material mobilization includes such things as communication and transportation technologies, material and monetary supplies to sustain the members while in conflict, weapons (if the conflict is military), and sheer numbers of people. While this area is pretty obvious, the ability to mobilize material resources is a key issue in geopolitical theory.

3. Conflict engenders subsequent conflict. In order to activate a potential conflict, parties must have some sense of moral rightness. Groups have a difficult time waging war simply on utilitarian grounds. They have to have some sense of moral superiority, some reason that extends beyond the control of oil or other material good. As a result, conflicts that are highly mobilized tend to have parties that engage in the ritualized exchange of atrocities. Collins calls this the negative face of social solidarity. This is a somewhat difficult subject to illustrate, because if you hold to or believe in one side in a conflict, its definition of atrocities or terrorism will seem morally right. The trick is to see and understand that there has never been a group that has entered into a conflict knowing or feeling that they are wrong. For instance, the people who flew the airplanes into the World Trade Center felt morally justified in doing so. We can think of many, many examples from around the world, such as the Croats and Serbs and the Irish Catholics and Protestants. And the history of the United States is filled with such illustrations. For example, there is still a debate concerning the reasons and justifiability of the use of nuclear weapons during WWII. Whatever side of the debate people takes, it is undeniable that retribution was and is part of the justification. As President Truman (1945a, 1945b) said, The Japanese began the war from the air at Pearl Harbor. They have been repaid many folds. And the end is not yet. With this bomb we have now added a new and revolutionary increase in destruction. . . . Having found the bomb we have used it. We have used it against those who attacked us without warning at Pearl Harbor, against those
who have starved and beaten and executed American prisoners of war, against those who have abandoned all pretense of obeying international laws of warfare. In addition to satiating righteous indignation and affirming social solidarity, ritualized retributions are used to garner support. We can see this clearly in the United States’ use of the attacks of September 11, Israel’s use of the holocaust, the antiabortionists’ conceptualization of abortion as murder, and the various civil rights groups’ use of past atrocities. Atrocities thus become a symbolic resource that can be used to sway public opinion and create coalitions.

4. Conflicts diminish as resources for mobilization are used up. Just as there are two main areas of conflict mobilization, there are two fronts where demobilization occurs. For intense conflicts, emotional resources tend to be important in the short run, but in the long run, material resources are the key factors. Many times the outcome of a war is determined by the relative balance of resources. Randall Collins gives us two corollaries. The first is that milder or sporadic forms of conflict tend to go on for longer periods of time than more intense ones. Fewer resources are used and they are more easily renewed. This is one reason why terrorism and guerilla warfare tend to go on almost indefinitely. Civil rights and relatively peaceful political movements can be carried out for extended periods as well. The second corollary Collins gives us is that relatively mild forms of conflict tend to de escalate due to the bureaucratization of conflict. Bureaucracies are quite good at co-optation. To co-opt means to take something in and make it one’s own or make it part of the group, which on the surface might sound like a good thing. But because bureaucracies are value and emotion free, there is a tendency to downplay differences and render them impotent. For example, one of the things that our society has done with race and gender movements is to give them official status in the university. One can now get a degree in race or gender relations. Inequality is something we now study, rather than it being the focus of social movements. In this sense, these movements have been co-opted. “This is one of the unwelcome lessons of the sociology of conflict. The result of conflict is never the utopia envisioned in the moments of intense ideological mobilization; there are hard-won gains, usually embedded in an expanded bureaucratic shell” (Collins, 1993a, p. 296). The second front where conflicts may be lost is de-escalation of ritual solidarity. A conflict group must periodically gather to renew or create the emotional energy necessary to sustain a fight. One of the interesting things this implies is that the intensity of conflicts will vary by focus of attention. Conflict that is multi-focused will tend not to be able to generate high levels of emotional energy.

Conflict Perspective in Modern Sociology

Not only focusing on class struggle as Marx did, but on the overall power structure in society, such as conflicts between different groups of interests like

– Producers and consumers, employers and employed, Muslims and Christians, teachers and students, parents and kids, personality and culture etc.
Way of Resolving Conflict

Following “pictures” and “quotes” clearly show the way of resolving conflict in the society.

What is your conflict mode?

Fight  VS  Flight

I win  You lose
I lose  You win
I win  You win
I lose  You lose

“Honest disagreement is often a good sign of progress.”
- Gandhi

“Let us never negotiate out of fear but let us never fear to negotiate.”
- John F. Kennedy

“Jaw-jaw is better than war-war.”
- Harold Macmillan

Some limitations of Conflict perspective
- presumes the working class do not rebel against the norms and values set by the ruling class
- doesn't explain how the individual is affected
- presumes that the working class do not realize their subordination
- presumes that everything only benefits the ruling class
- doesn't explain how the individual is affected
- very deterministic
- Overemphasizes the tensions and divisions between the top and bottom of society
- Ignores real contributions of industrialization
- Owners do not always ignore workers
- Watchdog and grass route groups are created to watch the actions of the bourgeoisie

**Interactionist Perspective**

Both the functionalist and the conflict perspectives are concerned with how broad aspects of society, such as institutions and large social groups, influence the social world. This level of sociological analysis is called **macro sociology**: It looks at the big picture of society and suggests how social problems are affected at the institutional level. **Micro sociology**, another level of sociological analysis, is concerned with the social psychological dynamics of individuals interacting in small groups. Symbolic interactionism reflects the micro-sociological perspective, and was largely influenced by the work of early sociologists and philosophers, such as George Simmel, Charles Cooley, George Herbert Mead, and Erving Goffman. Symbolic interactionism emphasizes that human behavior is influenced by definitions and meanings that are created and maintained through symbolic interaction with others.

Sociologist W.I. Thomas (1966) emphasized the importance of definitions and meanings in social behavior and its consequences. He suggested that humans respond to their definition of a situation rather than to the objective situation itself. Hence Thomas noted that situations that we define as real become real in their consequences. Symbolic interactionism also suggests that our identity or sense of self is shaped by social interaction. We develop our self-concept by observing how others interact with us and label us. By observing how others view us, we see a reflection ourselves that Cooley calls the “looking glass self.”

This perspective in sociology was initially influenced by Max Weber. There is crucial role of George Herbert Mead, leader in the Chicago School of sociology for development of the concept of symbolic interactionism. He emphasized the subjective meaning of human behavior, the social process, and pragmatism.

**Symbolic Interactionism**

Symbolic interactionism is the process of interaction in the formation of meanings for individuals. *Symbolic Interactionism* examines people’s day-to-day interactions and their behavior in groups; this is called micro level analysis. Examples of small groups: Micro level small group - two friends, a family etc. and micro level analysis – focuses on
small groups rather than large-scale social structures. This perspective is based upon the assumption that society is the sum of the interactions of individuals and groups. It is a study of human group life and conduct. Symbolic interaction occurs when people communicate through the use of symbols. Symbol is the anything that meaningfully represents something else. For example: signs, gestures, written language and shared values (e.g. saluting a nation’s flag may be a sign of nationalism or loyalty, whereas burning that same flag may show disrespect).

Symbolic interactionism, which focuses on how people interpret and define their social reality and the meanings they attach to it in the process of interacting with one another via language. Integrationists seek to explain both micro and macro level human behavior. The interactionism sees humans as active, creative participants who construct their social world, not as passive objects of socialization. Symbolic integrationists direct their attention at the nature of interaction and dynamic activities of the people. This perspective asks the questions “How do individuals experience one another?” “How do they interpret the meaning of these interactions?” and “How do people construct a sense of self and the society as a whole?” It is Micro sociology.

**Limitation of interaction perspective**

1. Interactionist perspectives have been criticized for their over-emphasis upon "the individual" as the object of sociological study.

2. There is little attempt to explain how the social relationships that we create (especially when we live in very large, very complex, social groups) "reflect back" upon our behavior to apparently force us into behaving in ways that give us little real choice.

3. The perspective concentrates too much on the small-scale, relatively trivial (small), aspects of social life.

4. Interactionist sociology does not adequately address (or explain) questions of social order and social change. The concepts used by Interactionists are not adequate enough to explain, for example, why societies change.

5. Inattention to the functions of institutions or structural forces and what structures we are trying to make sense of and adapt to.
Some Assignment Questions

1. What do you meant by perspective? Explain it with a suitable example.
2. What is functionalist perspective? Explain its assumption and limitation.
5. Write about the critiques of the conflict perspective.
6. What is interaction perspective? Explain the meaning and characteristic of the symbolic interactionism. List down the limitation of interaction perspective.
7. Compare functionalist, conflict and interaction perspectives by constructing matrix.
8. What is the role of sociology to promote the business management? explain
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