

Article History

Received: 09 – 08 – 2024

Revised: DD – MM – YYYY

Accepted: 26 – 09 – 2024

Sociology in India: Perspectives and Imperatives

B K Nagla

Abstract: *No intellectual discipline develops overnight. This statement is largely applicable to the evolution of Indian sociology. Sociology as a discipline emerged as the contributions made by social thinkers, philosophers, and administrators who worked to understand Indian society. Sociology emerged in the West and therefore the sociological approaches of the West expanded to other parts of the globe. However, many Indian scholars began to realize that various social aspects are peculiar to Indian society and need to be studied from an Indian perspective as against the Western approaches that had been universally applied everywhere. This leads to the emergence of Indian sociology. The present paper explores the historical emergence and Hundred Years of Sociology in India which would envisage trajectories for the future of sociology in India.*

Keywords: Sociology, Modernity, Secularisation, Indigenization, Westernization

Context

Sociology can be defined as the study of societies and their development in terms of their political decisions, ethics, economic development, religion, and laws. Famous French Philosopher Auguste Comte coined the term “Sociology” in the year 1839. Hence, the etymological meaning of the term sociology is the science of society

or the study of society. Society is a web of social relationships i.e., human interactions and interrelations. Sociology is a science of values, Institutions & processes. Sociology did not find its importance as a discipline until the 20th century. Still, its many ways of perspectives, approaches and areas of study evolved from centuries of work by historians and philosophers such as Plato, who reflected on the “ideal society. Although the first identifiable sociological study was made by Ibn Khaldun in the 14th century who is best known for his multivolume history of the world, the *Kitab al- Iber*, is understood as a foundation of sociology because its analysis of society’s Arabic concept of *asabiyyah*, or usually translated today is *social solidarity*.

In the end of the 18th century, the emergence of sociology occurred because of two major events in Western Europe:

- (i) The first event was the French Revolution (1789-1799) – A period known as the Enlightenment (Which lasted for 10 years). It was a modern and ideological revolution.
- (ii) The second major event was the Industrial Revolution (1765-1850). This transformed the traditional form of production to modern technology in every field like trade, commerce, communication etc.

With the effect of the above two events, is identified social change known as “modernity” which included the effects of industrialization and the growth of capitalism, and the less tangible (but no less significant) effects of secularization and rationality. Modern society is the product of the Age of Reason: the application of rational thinking and scientific discoveries. In keeping with this idea, the pioneers of sociology such as French philosopher Henri de Saint-Simon and his protégé Auguste Comte provide facts to support theories. Like Comte, Marx too, insisted on approaching the subject scientifically, and Durkheim was perhaps the first to gain acceptance for sociology as a social science in the academic world. Weber’s focus was on the effects on individuals of rationalization secularization.

By the mid-20th century, sociologists had shifted from a macro view of society to a micro view of individual experience. The study of the “power elite” by Charles Wright Mills, Michel Foucault’s analysis of

power relations, and Judith Butler's study of gender and sexuality are examples of qualitative analysis in sociology. For this, Harold Garfinkel has given a complete change of sociological method i.e., ethnomethodology to examine the everyday actions of ordinary people. By the end of the century, a balance had been found between the objective study of society as a whole and the interpretive study of individual experience. Therefore, sociologists are applying various methods to study society in an increasingly globalized late-modern world. Given Western modernity, we would like to analyze the development paths of sociology in India which has quite an influence on Western sociology in the beginning of research and teaching in academic institutions.

I. Development of Sociology in India

Sociology as a discipline is a product of Western intellectual discourse. However, writing about society can be traced back to the Ancient Indian Mythological, religious, and spiritual texts such as the Veda, Upanishads, Puranas, and Smritis, writings of Kautilya. All these writings are replete with insights concerning social order and stability, human interrelationship, and social governance. In this context, the growth of sociology and anthropology passed through three phases such as:

First Phase: (1773–1900) Period of Renaissance: This period was reforming and modernizing society in which Vivekanand, Sri-Aurobindo, and Rabindra Nath Tagore played a crucial role in removing the evils of society. In the colonial context, sociology became for many intellectuals an ideology of revolutionary social and political movement for emancipation from foreign rule. In the Indian case, this is illustrated by the publication of a journal *Indian Sociologist* by Shyamji Krishna Verma (1857-1930), a non-resident Indian political and social revolutionary in Britain in 1905 (See J.P. Chaturvedi).

Second Phase: (1901-1950) Pre-Independence Period: Dadabhai Naoroji, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, M.G. Ranade. This period was related to the freedom movement and had a significant impact on colonial

higher education. Beginning in the 20th century made an appearance in Bombay, Calcutta and Lucknow University, due to the contributions of B. N. Seal, G. S. Ghurye, B. K. Sarkar, Radhakamal Mukherjee, D. P. Mukerji and K. P. Chattopadhyay. However, their intellectual interests, methods of data collection, and interpretations of the Indian social system and social institutions were strongly influenced by the ethnographic works produced by scholar-administrators throughout the colonial period. Studies on caste, family, marriage and kinship, social stratification, tribal communities, and rural and urban society figured prominently in this period.

Third Phase (1950–till date) is concerned with the development of sociology in post-independence. The phase of expansion of sociology began in 1952, with several factors accounting for its growth. The policymakers of Independent India pursued objectives of economic regeneration and social development, they recognized the role of social sciences in attaining and objectives of national reconstruction and development.

Currently, the above divisions are little modified in three different phases of the development of sociology though the above phases are equally important in context to the historicity of the development of sociology in India particularly the Indological research of our society. These phases based on formal teaching and research of sociology in India since 1919 which are as follows:

1. First phase, Colonial Period (1919-1947) surveys and studies on Indian villages, religions and castes were done during this period. The impact of British patterns or historical research methods were the two skills anthropological ethnographic method and field studies.
2. Second phase (1947-2000) contact with the USA involved a strong empirical positivistic orientation focused on studies on development, modernization, and democracy
3. Third phase (2000 till now) major challenges of post-modernism emphasize the study of globalization, liberalization, privatization, nation-building, and social identities and focus on pertinent issues of terrorism and the threat of climate change.

Sociology emerged in the West and therefore the sociological approaches of the West expanded to other parts of the globe. However, many Indian scholars began to realize that various social aspects are peculiar to Indian society and need to be studied through the Indian perspective as against the Western approaches that had been universally applied to India and elsewhere. This leads to the emergence of Indian sociology.

The reviewers of Indian sociology generally trace its origin to the works of several British civil servants, missionaries, and Western scholars during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Srinivas and Panini:1973; Mukherjee 1979; Rao 1978; Lele:1981; Dhanagare 1985; Singh:1986; Oommen and Mukherjee (eds.):1986; Nagla:2008; Patel:2016; Srivastava et al., 2019 etc.). The writings of these scholars reflect the general picture of the origin of sociology in India but none of these writings reflect the comprehensive analysis of the development of sociology in India.

Sociology in India is now a century-old discipline. In this context, we would like to analyze the development of the last 100 years' journey of sociology in India. During the colonial period, British administrators wanted to understand the customs, manners, and institutions of the people of India to ensure the smooth running of their administration. Christian missionaries were interested in learning local languages, folklore, and culture to conduct their activities. The origin, development, and functioning of the various customs and traditions, the Hindu systems of caste and joint family, and the economy and polity of the village/tribal community were some of the prominent themes of study by the British administrators and missionaries as well as other British, European, and Indian intellectuals. Subsequently, in 1774, William Jones founded the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, to study nature & man in India. The first All India census was conducted in 1817 to capture societal and cultural norms before changing and help in controlling epidemics, famine etc. Several ethnographic surveys, monographs, census documents, and gazetteers produced during this period constitute a wealth of information that is of interest to sociologists even today such as

ethnographic works written by J H Hutton, Edwards Thurston, Riskey and others. There were also writings of Sir Henry Maine and Baden Powell on the village community in India. In India, the religions did not place a bar on freethinking. The stimulus to creative work in Indian social science came from interaction with the West. Further, the available studies of Indian society and culture became an important source for testing various theories by scholars such as Marx and Engels, Maine, and Weber.

The emergence and development of sociology and anthropology were influenced by the growth of the ideology of nationalism in India under British rule. Hence, the nationalist movement was itself a product of the impact of the West especially colonial rule in India. The repercussion of this impact was felt widely due to several reasons such as improvement in communication, transport facilities, printing press etc. Modern law and Western education generated a new self-awareness among Indian people. The awareness of people along the lines of religion, sects, caste, tribes etc. became more heightened on the one hand while a wider level of a new sense of unity emerged on the other. All these social changes gave rise to new problems.

Before 1900, sociology developed as a tool for British administrators to understand Indian society and culture. Although the first universities in India were established in 1857 in Bombay, Calcutta and Madras, formal teaching of sociology began only in the second decade of the twentieth century—at the University of Bombay in 1914 at the undergraduate level and 1919 at the post-graduate level, Calcutta University in 1917, Lucknow University in 1921, Mysore University in 1928, Osmania University, Hyderabad in 1928 and Poona University in 1928. There was no separate department of sociology; it was joined with the department of economics (Bombay and Lucknow), economics and political science (Calcutta), anthropology (Poona), or philosophy (Mysore). Almost all the pioneers in sociology in the first half of the twentieth century were trained in disciplines other than sociology. Only a limited number of courses in sociology, as fashioned by teachers according to their interest, were taught, e.g., in the Department of Economics and Sociology at Lucknow

University. After Independence, sociology started in many more universities mainly Vadodara (1951), Agra (1955), Delhi (1959), Chandigarh (1960), Jaipur (1961), Meerut (1966), JNU (1971) etc.

It is very important to mention here the major professional body of sociologists in India i.e., the Indian Sociological Society which was established in 1951 in Bombay with the initiative of Govind Sadashiv Ghurye at the University of Bombay (now University of Mumbai). The Society started the journal *Sociological Bulletin* in 1952 and during the first decade or so of their existence, both the Society and its journal were nurtured in the Department by the meticulous efforts of Ghurye. In 2022, both the Indian Sociological Society (ISS) and the *Sociological Bulletin* have completed seventy years of their existence. In 2014, ISS started its Hindi Journal, *Bhartiya Samajshastra Sameeksha*.

Two journals of sociology—*The Indian Journal of Sociology*, started in 1921 by Alban G. Widgery (a British professor at Baroda College), and *The Indian Sociological Review*, started in 1934 with R. K. Mukherjee as its editor—were short-lived. There are now only a few all-India journals of sociology: *Sociological Bulletin* (a biannual journal of the Indian Sociological Society since 1952), *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (edited by two French scholars, Louis Dumont and D. F. Pocock, from its inception in 1957 to 1963, when its editorship was passed on to Indian sociologists), and *Social Change* (published by the Council for Social Development since 1971). Occasionally, articles with sociological content and relevance are published in other journals, such as *Economic and Political Weekly* and journals published by some universities and regional associations. Several sociological articles are published in the journals of some institutions and university departments with a focus on interdisciplinary training and research. For example, since the beginning of the 1980s, the National Institute of Rural Development in Hyderabad has published a quarterly (*Journal of Rural Development*), and the National Institute of Urban Affairs in New Delhi has published a biannual journal (*Urban India*). Also, the Center

for Women's Development Studies in New Delhi publishes a biannual journal called the *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*.

Initially, no rigid distinction was made between social anthropology and sociology, but they separated as teaching disciplines in the 1950s. In the field of research, however, the distinction between social anthropology and sociology continues to be blurred. Ghurye, Srinivas, S. C. Dube, and André Beteille, among others, have argued that sociologists in the Indian context cannot afford to make any artificial distinction between the study of tribal and folk society on the one hand and advanced sections of the population on the other; nor can they confine themselves to any single set of techniques. Yogesh Atal (1985) points out that this is true of several countries in Asia and the Pacific; social anthropologists have extended the scope of their investigation to micro-communities in rural as well as urban settings in their own country, and sociologists have found the anthropological method of fieldwork and participant observation useful in their research. Even the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR) treats both these disciplines together in its two surveys of research, the first covering the period from 1959 to 1969 (ICSSR 1972–1974) and the other from 1969 to 1979 (ICSSR 1985–1986); the same approach continues for the third survey for the period 1979 to 1987 and in the later surveys edited by Yogesh Atal (2009), and Yogendra Singh (2014). In the first volume of ICSSR trend reports (1959-1969), T. N. Madan analyzed the methodology of social anthropology in India. He views that holism, functionalism and empiricism go together as a method of social anthropology. The functionalists advocate the holistic study of society through fieldwork. *Functionalism*, as a method of study in social anthropology, has come as a revolt against the historical method. Increasingly, the evolutionary historicism came into disrepute owing to the emergence of empiricism. *Empiricism* is experience. When the social anthropologists took to holistic studies through empiricism, functionalism came to be known as a new idiom of methodology. Similarly, the second and third survey was done, and

the trend report was prepared to analyze the subject areas of sociology and social anthropology for the respective block of ten years.

These volumes on Research Surveys and Explorations: Indian Sociology, (ICSSR) highlight the history of Indian sociology, its theories, knowledge, science, society, caste, community, power, governance, and urban studies and discuss key concepts of development, education, justice and equality, sociology of law, sociology of health and medicine and also Dalit studies, gender, sociology of tribes, communication research in India, globalization and culture, and justice and equality.

Sociology and anthropology were also developing in Indian universities. In the Indian context, it is not possible to distinguish between anthropology and sociology except in terms of methodology. Sociology has studied urban-industrial groups while anthropology focused on tribes, castes, and communities. In the Indian academic studies, we find that tribe, caste, and region have been linked with each other in a variety of ways. Both sociology and anthropology in India are mainly based on empirical data. They deal with aggregates of people in several locales, villages, towns, and cities.

Talcott Parsons and R. K. Merton are also taught along with B. Malinowski, and Radcliffe Brown. American, British, German, French and thinkers of other countries are taught along with three classical thinkers mainly Marx, Durkheim and Weber. Their sociological thinking influenced India. B. D. Gupta observes that the story of Indian Sociology has not been properly told. Late arrivals of sociology in India are wrongly attributed to the philosophical and religious orientation of Indian intellectuals (Gupta:1972). Max Muller, Emile Senart, Bougle, Max Weber, P. A. Sorokin, and E. Shils etc. all condemned Indian Sociology for not studying material interests. There remain a handful of scholars in the universities who have been carrying on with their work despite indifference, contempt, and opposition. Fortunately, they have been influenced by the classical Sociologists of Europe and America, and by two of the encyclopedic minds of India in this century, Dr. B. N. Seal and Dr. Patrick Geddes.

B N Seal a professor of Philosophy at Calcutta University was one of the first scholars to draw the attention of the university towards sociology. He was actively involved in refuting the unilinear evolutionary doctrines, which believed that like an organism society has evolved from a simple primitive stage to a more complex industrial stage. Indian society like several others in its various aspects represented the lower rungs of a ladder.

The 20th-century European civilization represented the highest point of this ladder. This was an ethnocentric belief of European scholars who believed that their society was the best and most evolved while the rest of the world was in various stages of evolution. Seal rejected this view and wrote and lectured extensively in defence of Indian culture throughout his Comparative Sociology. He was responsible for introducing sociology at Calcutta University and later Mysore University.

In Bombay Patrick Geddes was responsible for the introduction of sociology. He opened a department in 1919 that was a landmark in the development of sociology in India. Le Play an eminent sociologist influenced Geddes. Geddes was interested in human geography and town planning with a specific interest in the problems of urban deterioration. He studied the town planning of such cities as Calcutta, Indore etc. that are of great value. G.S Ghurye and Radhakamal Mukherjee show the influence of Geddes in their sociological writings representing Bombay and Lucknow School of Indian sociology.

At Lucknow University, to begin with, for nearly three decades, economics and sociology constituted the same department. This was also the case at Bombay University. Chairs in sociology in 1917 were also set up in Calcutta, Madras and Mysore along with Bombay. At Bombay, though Patrick Geddes initially occupied the chair in sociology, G. S. Ghurye was appointed as Reader in 1923, and promoted to professor in 1934. Ghurye thought of the anthropological approach to sociology as the most appropriate.

Besides Bombay and Lucknow, sociology gained currency in the 1960s at Pune, Baroda, Delhi (Delhi University and later on at JNU),

Jaipur, Chandigarh, etc. The main focus was at the Delhi School of Economics, where Srinivasan sociology became known in India and outside. After more than a decade, sociology at JNU emerged as a far more liberal discipline with a semblance of Western and Indian perspectives and concepts under the leadership of Yogendra Singh. His book *Modernization of Indian Tradition* (1973) has made a great impact on Indian sociology in particular, and social sciences in general.

II. Theoretical Orientations in Indian Sociology

We would like to refer here the two scholars of the early phase of Indian sociology that was clearly led by G. S. Ghurye on the one hand (particularistic orientation), and Radhakamal Mukherjee on the other (universalistic orientation). Though, G.S. Ghurye had no clear theoretical perspective and methodological orientation, but he was influenced by British diffusionism due to his association with Rivers. Ghurye's early studies were of Indological in nature. According to (G.S. Ghurye), ordinarily speaking Indological approach means the study of Indian society from an Indian perspective collecting data of Indian art, architecture, language, culture, religious texts, folklore, legends, and myths. Indological studies also simultaneously contributed to as well as received stimulus from the efforts made by British scholars and officials to develop an in-depth knowledge of Indian society and culture.

Radhakamal Mukerjee talks of universal categories and concepts. According to him, sociology could be a universal social science, and it should be related to natural and other social sciences (Y. Singh:1967:13-37). Mukerjee finds both the Western liberal democratic pattern and the Marxist models are inadequate. He integrates the social science model at a meta-scientific and meta-anthropological level. It is a "human general theory of relativity", that resolves the conflict between the philosophy of science and the philosophy of values. Mukerjee's explanations are based on deductive reasoning, hence exogenous and speculative. Taking the ideas of Ghurye and Mukherjee, we would like to discuss the theoretical perspective and methodological orientation of Indian sociology.

Indian sociology, as an emergent distinctive discipline during colonial and post-colonial phases, has been significantly influenced and patterned on the Western paradigm. Almost all sociologists in India have taken up studies on the theoretical paradigm of Durkheim, Weber, Marx, and Parsons. Besides the Western paradigms, according to Singh (1979), Indian sociologists have adopted four theoretic orientations which cover a period of a quarter century of sociology in India from 1952 to 1977. The four periods correspond with four theoretic developments in Indian sociology. These theoretic orientations are:

Yogendra Singh (1979, pp. 291–314), in his analysis of Indian sociology from 1952 to 1977, mentions four periods of its trajectory: (a) 1952–1960 (philosophical), (b) 1960–1965 (culturological), (c) 1965–970 (structural) and (d) 1970–1977 (dialectical-historical) (Nagla: 2008). This shows that Indian sociologists use conceptual schemes rather than constructing meta-theories or general theories, though there are some exceptions of those who have been guided by the theories of Marx, Weber, Durkheim, Parsons, and ideas of Habermas, Foucault, Derrida, etc. Singh pleads for a synthesis of structural and cultural dimensions in the making of Indian sociology. In general, there is a good deal of theorizing about Indian sociology, but there is hardly any theorization of one's ideas and research. Singh's typology of four major theoretic orientations is significant and logically coherent (Singhi:1993).

This shows that Indian sociologists use conceptual schemes rather than constructing meta-theories or general theories, though there are some exceptions of those who have been guided by Western theories. Singh pleads for a synthesis of structural and cultural dimensions in the making of Indian sociology. In general, there is a good deal of theorizing about Indian sociology, but there is hardly any theorization of one's ideas and research.

Ramkrishna Mukherjee (1970, pp. 1159–1170) has taken a methodological view regarding the study of Indian society. Mukherjee considers his perspective as 'contemporary' as well as 'diagnostic'. Mukherjee suggests the use of both Marxian and Weberian concepts

of social dynamics. He also talks of indicators in terms of the null hypotheses and the alternative hypotheses, in a well-formulated research design. Finally, while examining the role of 'ideology' and deductive-positivistic orientation, Mukherjee (1974, pp. 169–192) appreciates a dialectical ethos with an inductive-inferential orientation (Sharma:2019:7-24)).

Mukherjee (1979a, 1979b) undertook a comprehensive review of Indian sociology, citing 712 references, covering the profession from 1920 to 1970. A fivefold classification of sociologists is given by Mukherjee, which includes: (a) pioneers (1920–1940s), (b) modernizers (1950s), (c) insiders (1960s), (d) pacemakers (1970s) and (e) non-conformists (1970s). Yogendra Singh (1986), like Ramkrishna Mukherjee, has undertaken a comprehensive analysis of Indian sociology, based on nearly 700 writings, explaining its 'social conditioning'. There is a clear shift in Indian sociology from the decades of the 1950s, 1960s and the early 1970s. The 1970s and the 1980s reflect a fivefold typology: structuralism, ethno-sociology, structural-historicism, Marxism and dimensional or systemic approaches.

There are a great deal of pluralism means enrichment as 'multidimensional in Indian sociology. Varied Orientations and methods have widened the horizons of the discipline of sociology. Variants of functionalism and Marxism, structuralism, symbolic interactionism, critical sociology, phenomenology, ethnomethodology, etc., are taught in our universities and colleges, and some scholars have made efforts to find out their relevance to studying Indian society. However, we have mainly used variants of Marxism, functionalism and, to some extent, structuralism. A change or a paradigm shift in the discipline is a sign of its enrichment as 'multidimensional sociology' (Sharma: 2019:20-21).

We may reveal from the above description that like most other social sciences in India, sociology is very much influenced by Western philosophical and social scientific traditions. However, some scholars have challenged the borrowed theoretical and methodological assumptions. Now, we briefly describe the different perspectives of

sociology that are employed in the studies of Indian culture and society. In recent times five main trends of thought can be distinguished about Indian sociology:

I. *Colonialist View*: Let us now look at the colonialist view of Indian society. The aim of the British colonial interest in studying the traditional Indian society proved useful in laying the foundation for further studies of Indian society. The emphasis of the studies was on how to govern India better. After the arrival of the British, knowledge of Indian society began to develop very rapidly from 1760 onwards. They needed to study Indian languages to understand India better. The view of the British Colonialists can be subdivided into a) Missionaries. It was N. B. Halhed who presented the first compilation of Hindu Dharamshastra (1776) William Jones, and Colebrook were other scholars who did notable work on India) and b) Administrative view, from H.H. Risley under whom the first census of India (1872) took place to J.H. Hutton, who was the last census commissioner. The collected census data helped later scholars like Morgan, McLennon, Lubbock, Tylor, Starcke and Frazer.

II. *Social Anthropology* developed more vigorously than Sociology before 1947. The *anthropological field studies* in various institutions have led to the pulling down of book-views and revision of some earlier misapprehensions. It has been a major intellectual influence in the expansion of Sociology, Indigenization (for example Indianization using the Indological approach), contextualization, and traditionalist and nativist Indian sociologists using book view and field view. These have been used interchangeably in the research which is done in India. The Indological writings dealing with Indian philosophy, art, and culture are reflected in the works of Indian scholars like A.K. Coomaraswamy, Radhakamal Mukherjee, D.P. Mukerji, G.S. Ghurye, Louis Dumont and others.

III. *Philosophical Perspective*: A group of sociologists at the University of Lucknow influenced by the work of D P Mukerjee and other scholars of Lucknow University took an interest in logical and methodological problems. They are very much critical of sociological positivism and scientism. They attempted to develop a sociological

theory which would be rooted in India's social history and closely related to traditional social thought.

IV. Influence of Western Sociology: Indian sociology is directly attributable to the influence of recent Western sociology, particularly American Sociology which involves quantitative methods and scientific procedures involving the formulation and testing of hypotheses. The structural and functionalist traditions (followed by M. N. Srinivas, G.S. Ghurye etc.) and Marxist tradition in analyzing the village and tribal communities had the potential to discover society without compromising their tradition of methodological philosophy. R.P. Dutt and A.R. Desai analyzed Marxism as a movement which was mostly dominated by the bourgeoisie. Although various classes, including the peasantry and the working classes, participated in it, its basic character remained bourgeois.

V. Universalistic Perspective: Who wanted to focus on the general and the present, they tend to be historical. Among them, some are Radical sociological significance (e.g., Srinivas's concept of Westernization and the concept of cultural modernization given by Y. Singh) including feminists who call for a selective rejection of the outside influence. Neera Desai, C. Parvathamma, Ratna Naidu, Gita Chadha etc. have done a study from the feministic perspective to understand the women's oppression in India. Besides these, Grounded theory has become a recent trend as a fashion as viewed by Glaser BG and Strauss, A. (1967) (see Priya :2016: 50-68). To build middle-range theories, grounded theory is rooted in the theoretical perspective of symbolic interactionism and entails an interpretive understanding of actions and interactions within the social phenomenon under investigation.

Although all these trends of thought have developed independently, they have not been exclusive. Nor do the advocates of one thought inhibit research in other conceptual frameworks. The above approaches are used as Indian values are different from Western values i.e., mostly followed by Indians to regulate their everyday social life. Ethno-sociology should be evolved as a methodology to study India and for that, a sociologist must use people's language to

understand their symbols, and cultural meanings associated with their activities to gain an understanding of Indian society without any value bias.

Since Independence, the Indian democratic government started an economic development programme through centralized planning followed by welfare schemes such as banning the practice of untouchability and the introduction of measures for protective discrimination in favour of the untouchables, tribals, and other socially and educationally backward classes, involving social sciences including sociology and social anthropology that a widespread need was felt for sociological research. Apart from the older division of sociology into rural, urban and industrial sociology, new areas have rapidly established themselves, viz. political sociology, sociology of kinship, sociology of professions, developmental sociology and women's studies, to name a few.

The pre-independence sociological categories were substituted in the 1950s and the 1970s by the categories of caste, kinship, family, village, agriculture land, labour and religion were extremely committed to the British idea of empiricism. Later, the categories of 'class' and 'power' were added. The Indological approach was humbled by way of holistic-monographic studies with implicit functionalist ethos in the 1950s and the 1960s. The Srinivasan cultural sociology/anthropology was challenged by macro-categories, such as structure, change, development, modernization, legislation, movements, etc. Further, even these categories were questioned by reincarnation of 'culture' in the understanding of the 'social'. The ideas of 'honour', 'dignity', 'identity', 'mobilization', etc., received a lot of significance. Along with these conceptual and cognitive advances, the studies of weaker sections, poor, Dalits, women, and marginalized groups surfaced challenging the persisting studies in the discipline of sociology in India (Sharma:2019).

Since Independence, with the rapid development of the teaching of sociology in Indian Universities and colleges, there has been a concomitant increase in the number of research on different aspects of sociology, resulting in doctoral dissertations and in the publication of

many volumes and articles in various professional journals. Several previous surveys of the development of sociology in India present the process in different phases and trends, notably those by Becker and Barnes (1961), Saran (1958), Bottomore (1962), Clinard and Elder (1965), Vidyarthi (1972), and the Indian Council of Social Sciences research (1972). Despite these attempts, little attention has so far been paid in the direction of proper research taking steps of method of data collection, techniques, degree of quantity and quality, arial unit of study, and theoretical orientations in specific substantive areas of sociology.

Usually, it is seen that while at the university department level, there are facilities of doing research which does not exist at the college level. Even at the department level there is no system of sabbatical leave where the teacher can take time off for research. Field work is an essential aspect of research in sociology and unless a teacher has a year or nine months off, he cannot conduct research. The ICSSR and the UGC have suitable schemes for providing these facilities. There is thus now no dearth of money to do research. The problem is to control spurious research. The ICSSR, which is the main agency for promoting research in sociology and social anthropology, has laid down priorities in keeping with social goals. It is necessary to initiate research to teach new courses as research and teaching are intimately related in the development of the discipline.

Research in sociology has got a considerable boost since Independence. Several studies conducted by sociologists were financed, sponsored and supported by several agencies. There was another welcome trend in the introduction of the courses on methods of social research as part of the MA syllabus. In fact, this was also emphasized by the UGC Review committee on Sociology (1960). Significant sophistication in research methodology is an urgent desideratum for present assessment of the rapidly changing and complex social organization to which we belong. In the field of doctoral research, the progress in sociology has been remarkable. In spite of the fact that almost till the middle of the fifties, a much smaller

number of recognized supervisors were available for the guidance of the doctoral research students in the departments of the universities.

There has been a realization that diverse research methods were complimentary rather than conflicting. The early seventies saw a bitter debate between the surveyors and participant observers. But both realized that the two could be complementary. There has been more research using statistical surveys methods. There were a number of training courses in quantitative methods including computer programming. Besides quantitative techniques, other techniques such as historical analysis, case studies and participants observation are also increasingly used by sociologists and social anthropologists depending on the nature of the problem of investigation and its aim.

III. Trajectories for the Future of Sociology

Indian sociology today is more committed to the study of social protests, women's issues, problems of Indian farmers, Cosmopolitization, and Globalization and getting away from the study of caste, kinship, and family which were centrality to the study of Indian sociology from 1950 - 1980. Nonetheless, religion and caste issues remain crucial factors for the study of Indian society. This departure advocates an impact on Indian sociology losing its Indianness and merging into cosmic sociological tradition as put forward by Venugopal (1998) which reflects the major Challenge of post-modernism and liberalization, privatization and globalization of the knowledge society. A major challenge that globalization has posed refers to the social inequalities in India. But globalization is also a comprehensive and composite concept and a process of change. It has paved the way for an understanding of complex linkages, interdependence and integration among countries and people.

Michael Burawoy (2007:339–354) observes that marketisation is destroying the very grounds upon which sociology grows. Sociology as a discipline is more for upholding civil society, and for keeping distance from the state and market (Sharma:2019:17). In fact, to engage with the 'public', Nagla (2022) and Hetukar Jha (2005:396–411) emphasizes the need for 'regional orientation' in sociology. The

current situation needs a humanistic perspective to answer sociology for what and sociology for whom in future. The answer lies in public sociology and practicing sociology which is viewed by Burawoy (2021) and Dhanagare (2007). Sociology, as we know, reaches all spheres of life in a manner that no other social science does. As such, studies and research in Indian sociology would remain concerned with India's pluralism.

References:

Atal, Yogesh (1985). *Sociology and Social Anthropology in Asia and the Pacific*, Wiley Eastern.

Burawoy, M. (2007). 'The Future of Sociology', *Sociological Bulletin*, 56(3), 339–354.

_____ (2021). *Public sociology: Between Utopia and Anti-utopia*, Polity Press.

Dhanagare, D. N. (1985). *India*. In *Sociology and Social Anthropology in Asia and Pacific*, UNESCO, New Delhi: Wiley Eastern.

_____ (2007). 'Practicing Sociology Through History'. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 42(33–34), 3414–3421, 3502–3508.

Gupta, B. D. (1972). *Sociology in India*. Calcutta: Centre for Sociological Research.

Hull et al. (1982). *All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave*, New York: Feminist Press.

Jha, H. (2005). 'Indian Sociology in Crisis: The Need for Regional Orientation', *Sociological Bulletin*, 54(3), 396–411.

Lele, Jayant (1981). 'Indian Sociology and Sociology in India: Some Reflections on Their Beginning', *Sociological Bulletin*, 30(1), 39-53.

Millett, Kate (1977). *Sexual politics*, New York: Doubleday.

Mukerji, D. P. (1952). 'Sociology in Independent India', *Sociological Bulletin*, Volume:1(1)13-27.

Mukherjee, Ramkrishna (1970). 'Study of Social Change and Social Development in the Developing Societies.' *Economic & Political Weekly*, 5(29–31), 1159–1170.

_____. (1974). 'The Sociologist and the Social Reality.' *Sociological Bulletin*, 23(2), 169–92.

_____. (1979a). *What will it be?* New Delhi: Macmillan.

_____. (1979b). *Sociology of Indian Sociology*. Bombay: Allied Publications.

Nagla, B.K. (2008). *Indian Sociological Thought*, Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

_____ (2022). *Sociology and Sociologists in India*, Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

Oommen, T. K. and P. N. Mukherjee (eds.) (1986). *Indian Sociology: Reflections and Introspection*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan.

Patel, Sujata (ed.) (2016). *Doing Sociology in India: Genealogies, locations, and Practices*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Rao, M. S. A. (1978). 'Introduction. In Report on the Status of Teaching of Sociology and Social Anthropology,' Part I: Recommendations, University Grants Commissions.

Sharma, K. L. (2019). 'Indian Sociology at the Threshold of the 21st Century: Some Observations,' *Sociological Bulletin*, 68 (1) 7-24.

Sharma, S. (1985). *Sociology in India: A perspective from sociology of knowledge*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

Singh, Y. (1967). 'The Scope and Method of Sociology in India and Sociology for India: The Emerging Perspective.' In T. K. N. Unnithan, Yogendra Singh, Narendra Singhi, & Indra Deva (Eds.), *Sociology for India* (pp. 19–37). Delhi: Prentice Hall.

_____ (1979). 'Ideology, Theory and Methods in Indian Sociology' In Rokkan, S. (Ed.), *Quarter century of International Social Science: Papers and reports on development* (pp. 1952-1977). New Delhi: Concept.

———. (1986). Indian sociology: Social conditioning and emerging concerns. New Delhi: Vistar Publications.

Singhi, N. K. (1993). Theory and Method in Indian Sociology, Jaipur: Rawat Publications

Srinivas, M. N.; Rao, M.S.A.; Shah, A.M. (eds.) (1974). Survey of Research in Sociology and Social Anthropology, Bombay: Popular Prakashan.

Srinivas, M. N. and M. N. Panini (1973). 'The Development of Sociology and Social Anthropology in India,' Sociological Bulletin, 22(2): 179-215.

Srivastava et al., (2019). Critical Themes in Indian Sociology, Sage publications.

Venugopal, C. N. (1998). Religion and Indian Society: A Sociological Perspective. Delhi: Gyan Pub. House.

B K Nagla is the former Professor of Sociology at M.D. University, Rohtak. He has researched at Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi and has taught at M.S University, Baroda and the National Institute of Criminology and Forensic Science, New Delhi. Post-retirement, he continued his academic journey as a Professor on Babu Jagjivan Ram Chair at Banaras Hindu University. For his significant contributions to sociology and criminology, he received the **ISC-Fellow Award** and **ISS-Lifetime Achievement Award**. He was also the editor of ISS Hindi Journal *Bhartiya Samajshastra Sameeksha*.

Email: bnagla@yahoo.com

Article History

Received: 05 – 10 – 2024

Revised: 13 – 10 – 2024

Accepted: 15 – 10 – 2024

Development of Indian Sociology in Bombay (Mumbai): Issues and Concerns

P.G. Jogdand

Abstract: *The department of sociology, University of Mumbai is one of the earliest centres of teaching and learning in India. The contribution of the eminent sociologists like Geddes, Ghurye, Desai and others is noteworthy. Indology, fieldwork and Marxist approaches remained dominant in teaching and research since its inception. Subsequently, sociologists engaged with classical texts - textual and field views, theoretical & philosophical anthropology and phenomenology. The historical context of social research remained significant for the study of Indian society. The founding fathers had a deep engagement with diverse issues and concerns. Caste, family, marriage, kinship, religion were dominant issues and concerns of the sociologists (known as Bombay School). It is argued that the department had two separate legacies - Ghurye and Desai. Later Ghurye's students and followers practiced and popularized diverse sociological orientations. Subsequent research interest was sustained in the areas of caste, tribe, and village by using ethnography and field work traditions. However, this department remained silent on the contributions of Dr Ambedkar, Dalit movements and similar issues. A bottom-up perspective has now emerged and widely debated and discussed all over India.*