Chapter 2

Understanding Education and Development
Understanding Education

In this chapter we will try to understand the twin concepts of education and development which have used extensively in this study. To begin with we will look at the theories and views given by classical sociological thinkers and American sociologists. More we will also understand the views of Indian social reformers.

Educational system is considered as a response to the type of socio-cultural system the society develops and perpetuate. The Post-World War period has seen dramatic development in education in all most all the countries of the world. Development of education had been an important item on the agenda of both the developed and the developing countries. Literacy an important component of education is an essential tool of self-defense in a society where social interactions include written media. The value of education as a tool of social affirmation appears to be well seized by people. In fact, a common finding of village studies and household surveys is that education is widely perceived by members of socially or economically disadvantaged groups as the most promising means of upward mobility for their children (Tilak 2003:3). Not only that the role that education plays in the empowerment of people is also well understood by many social leaders world over.

The concept of education is viewed in a generalized manner and considered as synonymous with the process of learning, socialization, transmission of values or cultural heritage of society. Education is characterized by two aspects formal and informal. The formal education is an important agent of occupational training, social change and modernization. It uses the class room in an organized and systematic manner to promote values and skills required by the society in general and its sub-systems, social groups and
strata in particular. Further formal education is limited to teaching and related activities
taking place under the auspices of schools, colleges and universities. This formal
education is an important source for providing service to society and state and has high
social, economic and political potential.

Theories of Education by classical and American Sociologists

Herbert Spencer’s View on Education

To begin with Spencer defines education and its types. According to Spencer (1861)
“education must conform to the natural process of mental evolution-that there is a certain
sequence in which the faculties spontaneously develop, and certain kind of knowledge
which each requires during its development and supply this knowledge”. Spencer gives
three different types of education i.e. intellectual, moral and physical education. For him
“in intellectual education the process of self development should be encouraged to the
uttermost. Children should be led to make their own investigation, and draw their own
inferences. They should be told as little as possible. Humanity has progressed solely by
self instruction; and that to achieve the best results, each mind must progress somewhat
after the same fashion, is continually proved by the marked success of self made man”
(ibid:62). He says moral education teaches the child the rational knowledge of right and
wrong conduct, which results from personal experience of their good and bad
consequences. Further, that the child suffering the painful effects of its own wrong
actions, must recognizes more or less clearly the justice of the penalties. For Spencer,
physical education of children in various ways include feeding, clothing, exercising and
mental application.
Describing intellectual education Spencer views that the development of the mind, as all other development, is an advance form the indefinite of the definite. In common with the rest of the organism, the brain reaches its finished structure only at maturity; an in proportion as its structure is unfinished, its actions are wanting in precision (ibid:59). Education of the child must accord both in mode and arrangement with the education of mankind, considered historically. In other words, the genesis of knowledge in the individual must follow the same course as the genesis of knowledge in the race (ibid: 60).

Further defining moral education he illustrates that the method of moral culture by experience of the normal reactions, which is the divinely ordained method alike for infancy and for adult life, is equally applicable during the intermediate childhood and youth. Among the advantages of this method he argues that: First, which it gives that rational knowledge of right and wrong conduct which results from personal experience of their good and bad consequences. Second, that the child, suffering nothing more than the painful effects of its own wrong action, must recognize more or less clearly the justice of the penalties. Thirdly, that recognizing the justice of the penalties, and receiving them through the working of things rather than at the hands of an individual, its temper is less disturbed; while the parent fulfilling the comparatively passive duty of letting the natural penalties be felt, preserves a comparatively equanimity (ibid:100-101).

Moreover, Spencer argues that, the expenditure of vitality in growth is so great as to leave extremely little for either physical or mental action; so throughout childhood and youth, growth is the dominant requirement to which all other must be subordinated a
requirement which dictates the giving of much and the taking away of little — a requirement which, therefore restricts the exertion of body and mind in proportion to the rapidity of growth a requirement which permits the mental and physical activities to increase only as fast as the rate of growth diminishes (ibid:152). In this manner we see there are different schools of interpretation of education given by different thinkers. Almost all have tried to highlight the function of education.

**Durkheim’s Theory Function of Education**

Durkheim instead of defining the origin and development of education in the society elaborates on the functions of education. According to Durkheim (1956) “education consists of a methodical socialization of the young generation”. Durkheim (1956:70) saw the major function of education as the transmission of society’s norms and values. Its function, is to arouse in the child (1) a certain number of physical and mental states that the society to which he belongs considers should not be lacking in any of its members; (2) certain physical and mental states that the particular social groups (caste, class, family, profession) considers, equally, ought to be found among all though who make it up. It is society as whole and each particular social milieu that determine the ideal that education realizes. He maintained that, society can survive only if there exists among its members a sufficient degree of homogeneity, education perpetuates and reinforces this homogeneity by fixing the child from the beginning the essential similarities that collective life demands. Without a certain diversity all cooperation would be impossible; education assures the persistence of this necessary diversity by being itself diversified and specialized. If a society has reached a degree of development such that the old division
into castes and classes can no longer be maintained, it will prescribe an education more uniform at its base. If at the same time there is more division of labour, it will arouse among children, on the underlying basic set of common ideas and sentiments, a richer diversity of occupational aptitudes. If it lives in a state of war with surrounding societies, it tries to shape people according to a strongly nationalistic model; if international competition takes a more peaceful form, the type that it tries to realize is more general and more humanistic. Education is, then, only the means which society prepares, with in the children, the essential conditions of its very existence.

Further, Durkhiem narrates that, education is the influence exercised by adult generations on those that are not yet ready for social life. Its object is to arouse and to develop in the child a certain number of physical, intellectual and moral states, which are demanded of him by both the political society as a whole and the special milieu for which he is specifically destined. It follows from the definition that education consists of a methodical socialization of the young generation. In each of us, it may be said, there exist two beings, which, while inseparable except by abstraction, remain distinct. One is made up of all the mental states that apply only to ourselves and to the events of our personal lives: this is what might be called the individual being. The other is a system of ideas, sentiments and practices which express in us, not our personality, but the group or different groups of which we are part these are religious beliefs, moral beliefs and practices, national or professional traditions, collective opinions of every kind. Their totality forms the social being. To constitute this being in each of us is the end of education (ibid: 71-72). Society finds itself, with each new generation, faced with a *tabula*
rasa, very nearly, on which it must build anew. To the egoistic and asocial being that has just been born it must, as rapidly as possible, add another, capable of leading a moral and social life. Such is the work of education, and you can readily see its great importance. It is not limited to developing the individual organism in the direction indicated by its nature, to elicit the hidden potentialities that need only be manifested. It creates in man a new being (ibid:72).

This creative quality is, moreover, a special prerogative of human education. Anything else is what animals receive, if one can apply this name to the progressive training to which they are subjected by their parents. It can, indeed, foster the development of certain instincts that lie dormant in the animal, but such training does not initiate it into a new life. It facilitates the play of natural functions, but it creates nothing. Taught by its mother, the young animal learns more quickly how to fly or build its nest; but it learns almost nothing that it could not have been able to discover through its own individual experience. This is because animals either do not live under social conditions or form rather simple societies, which function through instinctive mechanisms that each individual carries within himself, fully formed, from birth. Education then, can add nothing essential to nature, since the latter is adequate for everything, for the life of the group as well as that of the individual. By contrast, among men the aptitudes of every kind the social life presupposes are much too complex to be able to be contained, somehow, in our tissues, and to take the form of organic predispositions. It follows that they cannot be transmitted from one generation to another by way of heredity. It is through education that the transmission is effected (ibid:73).
Talcott Parsons

Parsons (1964) explains the function of formal education through ‘school class’ in American society. He argues that, “from the functional point of view the school class can be treated as an agency of socialization. That is to say, it is an agency through which individual personalities are trained to be motivationally and technically adequate to the performance of adult roles”. Although he accepts that school class is not the sole agency of socialization, he is convinced that “in the period extending from entry into first grade until entry into labour force or marriage, the school class may be regarded as the focal socializing agency” (Parsons 1964:130). The socialization function may be as the development in individuals of the commitments and capacities which are essential prerequisites of their future role performance. Commitments may be broken down in turn into two components: commitment to the implementation of the broad values of the society, and commitment to the performance of a specific type of role with in the structure of the society. Capacities also be broken down into two components, the first being competence or the skill to perform the tasks involved in the individual’s roles, in the second being “role-responsibility” or the capacity to live up to other people’s expectation of the interpersonal behavior appropriate to these roles. The school class may be regarded as a primary agency by which these different components of commitments and capacities are generated, it is, from this point the view of the society, an agency of “manpower” allocation (ibid).

Further Parsons argued that, it is well known that in American society there is a very high, and probably increasing, correlation between one’s status level in the society
and one’s level of educational attainment. Both social status and educational level are obviously related to the occupational status which is attained. Now, as a result of the general process of both educational and occupational upgrading, completion of high school has increasingly become the norm for minimum satisfactory educational attainment. Moreover, this decides the occupational status of the people who belong to sane age-cohort and do not go to college (Parsons 1964:131). For Parsons the family is a collectivity within which the basic status-structure is ascribed in terms of biological position, that is, by generation, sex and age. There are inevitably differences of performance relative to these, and they are rewarded and punished in ways that contribute to differential character formation. But these differences are not given the sanction of institutionalized social status. The school is the first socializing agency in the child’s experience which institutionalizes differentiation of status on non-biological bases. Moreover, this is not an ascribed but an achieved status; it is the status “earned” by differential performance of the tasks set by the teacher, who is acting as an agent of the community’s school system (ibid:133).

In this chapter the essential point seems to be that the elementary school, regarded in the light of its socialization function, is an agency which differentiates the school class broadly along a single continuum of achievement, the content of which is relative excellence in living up to the exceptions imposed by the teacher as an agent of the adult society. The criteria of this achievement are, generally speaking, undifferentiated into the cognitive or technical component and the moral or “social” component. But with respect to its bearing on social values, it is broadly a differentiation of levels of capacity to act in
accord with these values. Though the relation is far from neatly uniform, this differentiation underlies the process of selection for levels of status and role in the adult society (ibid:138). It is true that the school age child, continues to live in the parental household and to be highly dependent emotionally as well as instrumentally on his parents. However once in school he spends several hours a day away from home, subject to a discipline and a reward system which are essentially independent of that administered by the parents. Moreover, the range of this independence gradually increases. As he grows older, he is permitted to range further territorially with neither parental nor school supervision, and to do an increasing range of things. In American society he often gets an allowance for personal spending and begins to earn some money of his own. Generally, however, the emotional problem of dependence-independence continues to be a very salient one through this period, frequently with manifestations by the child of compulsive independence (ibid:138).

Parsons further elaborates that, “Concomitantly with this, the area for association with age – peers without detailed adult supervision expands. These associations are tied to the family, on the one hand, in that the home and yards of children who are neighbors and the adjacent streets serve as locations for their activities and to the school, on the other hand, in that play periods and going to and from school provide occasions for informal association, even though organized extracurricular activities are introduced only later. Ways of bringing some of this activity under another sort of adult supervision are found in such organizations as the boy and the girl scouts” (Parsons 1964:139).
Parsons also describes the character of peer groups. According to him two sociological characters of peer groups at this age are particularly striking. One is the fluidity of their boundaries, with individual children drifting into and out of associations. This element of "voluntary association" contrasts strikingly with the child's ascribed membership in the family and the school class, over which he has no control. The second characteristic is the peer group's sharp segregation by sex. To a striking degree this is enforced by the children themselves rather than by adults. The psychological functions of peer association are suggested by these two characteristics. On the one hand, the peer group may be regarded as a field for the exercise of independence from adult control; hence it is not surprising that it is often a focus of behavior which goes beyond independence from adults to the range of adult-disapproved behavior; when this happens, it is the seed bed from which the extremists go over into delinquency. But another every important function is to provide the child a source of non-adult approval and acceptance. These depend on "technical" and "moral" criteria as diffuse as those required in the school situation. On the one hand, the peer group is a field for acquiring and displaying various types of "prowess"; for boys this is especially the physical prowess which may later ripen into athletic achievement. On the other hand, it is a matter of gaining acceptance from desirable peers as "belonging" in the group, which later ripens into the conception of the popular teen-ager, the "right guy". Thus the adult parents are augmented by age – peers as a source of rewards for performance and of security in acceptance (ibid:139).
Therefore Parsons concludes that, "The first major step in socialization, beyond that in the family, takes place in the elementary school, so it seems reasonable to expect that the teacher – figure should be characterized by a combination of similarities and differences from parental figures. The teacher, then, is an adult, characterized by the generalized superiority, which a parent also has, of adult status relative to children" (Parsons 1964:141). In this manner we see how Parsons has described elementary school as an important institution of socialization in which a child learns to take adult roles in the process of a teacher and peer group.

**S. Bowles and H. Gintis**

Bowles and Gintis have given Marxits account on education. Their fundamental idea is that education cannot be understood independently of the society of which it is a part. Rather, it is tied to society's basic economic and social institution. This is true, Bowles and Gintis argue, of both the 'Capitalist' societies of west and the 'State socialist' societies of Eastern Europe such as Russia (and they think that in certain respects the economic system of both capitalism and state socialism are similar, namely 'in their respective mechanism of social control in the economic sphere') (Bowles&Gintis 1976:57). However, the main focus of their attention is western capitalist societies and, in particular, the United States.

According to them education in United States serves to perpetuate or 'reproduce' the capitalist system. It is one of the several social institutions which maintains or reinforces the existing social and economic order. Because of this, the education can not act as a force for social change promoting greater equality and social justice. In this respect, it is similar to the state and government. Further Bowles and Gintis highlight
that: ‘education and state policy are relatively powerless to rectify social problems within the framework of a capitalist economy’ (ibid:20). Anyone who thinks that education can contribute to the solution of social problems has an ‘incomplete understanding of the American system’ (ibid:53). Indeed, only through an analysis of American capitalism ‘one can understand the workings of the US educational system’ (ibid:53).

Although the above analysis is done in the American society we would like to test the analysis in Indian society particularly in the tribal society of Orissa.

**Pierre Bourdieu & Jeen Claude Passeron**

Bourdieu & Passeron opine that every institutionalized educational system passes the specific characteristics of its structure and functioning. It is so because, it has to produce and reproduce the institutional conditions whose existence and persistence (self reproduction of the system) are necessary for both the exercise of its essential function of inculcation and to the fulfillment of its function of reproducing a cultural arbitrary which it does not produce (cultural reproduction). On the other hand the reproduction of which contributes to the reproduction of the relations between the groups or classes (social reproduction).

They have further elaborated that, an educational system cannot fulfill its essential function of inculcating unless it produces and reproduces, the conditions for pedagogic work capable of reproducing, within the limits of the institution’s means. Moreover this habitus should be homogeneous and durable as far as possible. Apart from this they also opine that, in order to fulfill its external function of cultural and social reproduction, an educational system must produce a habitus conforming as closely as possible to the principles of the cultural arbitrary which it is mandated to reproduce. The education
system should also produce such pedagogic work which coincide the conditions favouring the function reproduction. The pedagogic conditions should include a permanent corps of specialized agents, equipped with the homogeneous training and standardized instruments which are the precondition for the exercise of a specific, regulated process of pedagogic work i.e. the work of schooling. Further Bourdieu & Passeron have also discussed the institutionalized form of secondary pedagogic work. This is predisposed by the institutional conditions of its own reproduction to restrict its activity to the limits laid down by an institution mandated to reproduce a cultural arbitrary and not to decree it (Bourdieu & Passeron 1977:56-57).

Further, both the thinkers expect that educational system must produce the institutional conditions enabling interchangeable agents to carry on continuously, i.e. daily and over the widest possible territorial area, the work of schooling reproducing the culture it is mandated to reproduce. In the same vein the educational system tends to ensure that the corps of agents recruited and trained to carry out inculcation operate within institutional conditions capable of both dispensing and preventing them from performing heterogeneous or heterodox the work of schooling, i.e. those conditions most likely to exclude, without explicitly forbidding, any practice incompatible with the function of reproducing the intellectual and moral integration of the legitimate addresses (ibid:57). Above all an education system must ensure the institutional conditions for the homogeneity and orthodoxy of the work of schooling the educational system tends to equip the agents appointed to inculcate with a standard training and standardized, standardizing instruments. It must reproduce through time the institutional conditions for the performance of the work of schooling, i.e. it must reproduce itself as an institution.
self-reproduction) in order to reproduce the culture it is mandated to reproduce (cultural and social reproduction), every educational system necessarily monopolizes the production of the agents appointed to reproduce it, i.e. the agents equipped with the durable training which enables them to perform the work of schooling tending to reproduce the same training in new reproducers, and therefore contains a tendency towards perfect self-reproduction (inertia) which is realized within the limits of its relative autonomy (ibid:60).

In so far as educational system produces a school authority, an institutional authority which, resting on a two-step delegation, seems to be based on nothing other than the agent’s personal authority, the educational system produces and reproduces the conditions for the performance of institutionalized pedagogic work since the fact of institutionalization is capable of setting of pedagogic work as such without either those who carry it out or those who undergo it ever ceasing to misrecognize its objective truth, i.e. to remain unaware of the ultimate basis of the delegated authority which makes the work of schooling possible (ibid:65). In any given social formation, the dominant educational system is able to set up the dominant pedagogic work as the work of schooling without either those who exercise it or those who undergo it ever ceasing to misrecognize its dependence on the power relations making up the social formation in which it is carried on, because (1) by the means proper to the institution, it produces and reproduces the necessary conditions for the exercise of its internal function of inculcating, which are at the same time the sufficient conditions for the fulfillment of its external function of reproducing the legitimate culture and for its correlative contribution towards reproducing the power relations; an because (2) by the mere fact of existing and
persisting as an institution, it implies the institutional conditions for misrecognition of the symbolic violence it exerts, i.e. because the institutional means available to it as a relatively autonomous institution monopolizing the legitimate use of symbolic violence are predisposed to serve additionally, hence under the guise of neutrality, the groups or classes whose cultural arbitrary it reproduces (dependence through independence), (ibid:67).

The educational system owes to its essential function has almost always gone hand in hand with blindness to the relations between the school and the social classes, as if ascertaining the fact of autonomy presupposed the illusion of the educational system's neutrality. To believe that he meaning of any element in an educational system's exhausted merely by relating it directly to a reduced definition of the interests of the dominant classes, without inquiring into the contribution this system makes, qua system towards reproducing the structure of class relations, is an easy way of obtaining by a sort of pessimistic finalism, the facile answers of an explanation at once ad hoc and all purpose (ibid:195).

Indian Perspectives on Education

Rabindra Nath Tagore's Thought on Education

If we elaborate the thoughts of Indian on education there are so many social reformers and leaders who have given their views of the Indian education system. According to Tagore (Saiyidain 1966:57) "Education is not merely a means for the growth and fullness of the individual but is also concerned with the whole physical and social milieu in which his life is lived. If the masses of people live in a poor and inadequate environment,
education must have its ameliorative impact on it. Education can become dynamic and vital only when it is in constant touch with our complete life i.e. economic, aesthetic spiritual. Tagore emphasizes that our schools are at the very heart of our society, connected with the living bonds of varied experiences”. According to him rural education is to be integrally co-ordinated with the everyday needs of children, giving them an opportunity to carry out all kinds of practical activities in the school farm, the garden, the dairy, the poultry farm and the kitchen. The children would learn games, songs, carpentry, weaving and their crafts and relate their reading, writing and arithmetic to their practical experience he opined (ibid:57-58).

Tagore highlighted that love and action, “are the only media through which knowledge can be obtained, for the object of knowledge is not pedantry but wisdom” (ibid: 58). Action is needed, because it clarifies and fixes knowledge. On the other hand love is required because it gives true understanding and insight and transforms education into that wisdom which is the grace of knowledge. Further Tagore argues that and knowledge will come in aid in larger measures, because of the new experiments in teaching which show that, from the earliest years there are unsuspected, unutilized powers and possibilities in the child’s mind. They will not come as substitutes for vital educative experience but rather as supplementary, as helping to deepen the meaning and widen the range of that experience. Nothing that is done should repress the child’s creativity or ‘his inexpensive power to be happy’. This power is natural to him unless it is corroded away by the unintelligent environment, physical, social or moral, which the school builds around him (ibid:58).
Mahatma Gandhi and his Views on Education

Gandhi’s educational concepts were not drawn from book but stemmed from his direct knowledge of the national situation and needs, particularly of the vast, inarticulate rural population. Writing in young India in 1921, Gandhi had himself summarized the main defects of the existing system of education under three heads”. The first defect according to him was that “It is based upon foreign culture and totally excludes the indigenous culture. In his own words, “It ignores the culture of the heart and the hand and confines itself simple to the head . Real education is impossible through a foreign medium” (ibid:57).

At Sevagram conference Gandhi (1937) was of the view that”Education has been cut off too long from the concrete, meaningful realities of life; it must be placed right back into it in order to enrich it. It has run away from experience, from work from social relationships and taken refuge behind a barricade of books but dead and dreary text books”. In the early, education of children books must yield priority of place to productive work, to which he called 'basic craft’ and the stimulus for the acquisition of knowledge must arise out of this socially useful productive work in which the child is happily engaged. The whole world around the child is school and the living, breathing source of vital curriculum-the physical environment or the world of nature, from which arise all the sciences, the social environment or the world of man which is the source of all the humanistic studies like history, literature, philosophy, art, psychology, economics etc.and productive work or the crafts which form a bridge between these two worlds, using the resources of the former to achieve purposes which belong to the latter (ibid:57).
On the other hand Zakir Husain builds his theory of education taking clues from two sources German educator Kerschensteiner and Mahatma Gandhi. Husain as quoted in (Saiyidain 1966) views education as a growing relationship between the individual and the community. His starting point is the ‘correspondence’ between the growing powers of the individual mind and the totality of the cultural goods by which it is surrounded and in which it must find appropriate nourishment (ibid:185).

Husain, advocated that the process of education broadly consists of the establishment of a living and fruitful relationship between the mind of the child and appropriate and congenial elements of this heritage which it assimilates, in gradual stages, for its enrichment. The cultural wealth of a nation or community becomes the educative medium for each generation; it keeps going a constant dialogue between the generations, all the preceding peoples and ages speaking to the new comers through the language of their cultural and material achievements. The vitality of this inherited cultural wealth does not depend on its passive assimilation or blind worship but on the readiness and the ability of the individuals educated through it to protect and cherish it and to ‘cleanse it of decaying material’. The process of creation and re-creation is not less but more important than that of preservation (ibid:185).

Having defined education we would like to engage ourselves with the theories of development. We have done so because one of the function of education in the tribal areas is that it leads to development.
Understanding Development

Development as a practical and intellectual project has been steeped into optimism. Yet, many areas of the world are worse off today than they were thirty years ago, despite development programmes and aid. Millions of Africans suffer and die from starvation and malnutrition. In the pace of such failure, deterioration and destruction, we can not persist in talking about development as the harbinger of human emancipation. It would seen that model of development now widely pursued is part of problem rather than solution. The sooner we demythologize this ideology the better. It distorts our imagination, limits out vision, blinding us to the alternatives that human ingenuity is capable of imagining and implementing. The myth of development is elevated to the status of natural laws, objective reality and evolutionary necessity. In the process all other world views are devalued and dismissed as “primitive”, “backward”, “irrational” or “naïve”.

Development is process whereby other peoples are dominated and their destinies are shaped according to an essentially Western Way of conceiving and perceiving the world. The development discourse is part of an imperial process whereby other people are appreciated and turned into objects. It is an essential part of process whereby the ‘developed’ countries managed, control and even creates the Third World economically, politically, sociologically and culturally. It is a process whereby the lives of some peoples, their plans, their hopes, their imaginations, are shaped by others who frequently share neither their lifestyles, nor their hopes, nor their values. The real nature of this process is disguised by a discourse that portrays development as a necessary and
desirable process, as human destiny itself. The economic, social and political transformations of the Third World are inseparable from the production and reproduction of meanings, symbols and knowledge, that is, cultural reproduction.

Development theory seeks to account for the uneven pattern of development worldwide and to recommend measures to overcome underdevelopment. Following the Second World War, the modernization perspective, generated in the United States became the dominant development discourse. Everything would be for the best in the best of all possible worlds if countries and their people followed the US model to the letter. In this chapter I have attempted to sketch the outline of the intellectual resources open to those scholars concerned with development who are working within, or with reference to, the classical European tradition of social theorizing. It seems to me that it is only on the basis of a critical appreciation of the scope and possibilities of received sets of ideas that more particular dialogic arguments and proposals for development can be made.

**Understanding Development Theory**

**Adam Smith**

Initially the debate on development was restricted to economic development. Adam Smith is considered to be pioneer in giving an economic theory of development which was debated for long. At the outset he in his *Wealth of Nations* (1776) affirmed the Newtonian method of proceeding from first principles to reconstruct the complexity of the observed world. Smith presents a model of the economy as a developing system centred on the market carried refinement of the division of labour which ensures, in the
absence of interference, the evolutionary growth of the wealth of the nation. His work can be understood to comprise an interrelated series of claims in respect of the economy, society and government of the 18th Century Britain (ibid:52-53). Smith’s work is concerned to show how the free pursuit of private gain can act to raise the levels of living of the entire community. In his work on ethics Smith shows how self-interest can be linked to an appreciation of the role of the community in supporting and disciplining individual activities.

The ethic of individual action within the community was represented in his Wealth of Nations (1776) which offers a political-economy of the growth of nations which is built around the observation of the increasing interdependence of people within society as the underlying productive system advances. In Smith’s analysis wealth was derived from creative human labour working on available natural materials in order to produce useful objects. The key to the increase in the wealth of nations is the rise in labour productivity associated with the increasing division of labour. As the tasks of production are broken down into specialist parts on the basis of advances in productive techniques and machinery then both the over all output of the economy increases and the interdependence of the various elementary of the economy also increases. The interdependence and productivity which Smith identified thereafter generated a further question in respect of the manner of the ordering these individual actions so as to generate general wealth harmoniously. The answer which Smith gave was that the mechanism of the market place acted to regulate economic exchanges and Smith went on
to analyze the working so the market place in terms of the contributions and rewards of land, labour and capital to the productive process (ibid:55).

We can say that Smith presents a model of the economy as developing system, including the following key ideas: a) the division of labour, where specialization in production coupled with technical innovation allows vastly increased production and economic growth; (b) the notion of the market, an institutional structure which allows products to be offered to consumers; it is the sphere of exchange where buyers and sellers meet and agreements on price signal to all parts of the economic system how future economic behaviour can be rationally ordered the key variables being land, labour and capital, earning respectively rent, wages and profit in a self-regulating system that rewards all its participants (c) the postulate of economic rationalist, the idea that all buyers and sellers are rational agents who know their own wants; (d) the notion of spontaneous order, the idea that the pursuit of individual satisfactions generates via the mechanism of the invisible hand optimal societal benefit and here in the invisible hand is Smith’s theory of social structure; and (e) the idea of economic progress over time as the market freed of mercantilist restriction worked to secure the growing wealth of the nation (ibid:55).

**Marx’s Concept of Development**

Karl Marx also views development in economic context. However he adds forces of production and accumulation of capital as the components of development. According to him development, in the restricted sense of capitalist creation of wealth can be described
in a two ways. In its material content, development is about the expansion of productive forces and the increased production of commodities. In its form development is about the accumulation of capital, that is to say, the drive of capital both to appropriate the surplus-value produced by labour and embodied in the commodities and to realize it by selling the commodities in the market, thus allowing the process to be repeated on a wider scale (Jorge 1989:41).

To increase accumulation is therefore to extract more surplus-value. Given the physical limitations to prolonging the working day (absolute surplus-value) capitalists must try to reduce the value of labour-power (relative surplus value) by increasing the productivity of labour by means of new technology and improved methods of production. There is a constant tendency among the capitalist class to heighten the productiveness of labour, in order, to cheaper commodities, and by such cheapening to cheapen the labourer itself. This is the reason why the process of development can be described simultaneously as increased capital accumulation and as continuous growth of productive forces and of commodity production. The latter is the condition for the former (ibid:42).

**Emile Durkheim**

Durkheim gives a different theory of economic development in the society. Taking clue from functionalist perspective of economy he sees division of labour as a starting point. For him the central claim of *Division of Labour* was that social life in contemporary Europe was not suffering a breakdown with the passing of traditional society, but on the contrary was moving to a new style of integration central on the social ethic of
individualism which expresses the requirements of a complex industrial society. As the new form of society emerges it relies on a new form of social solidarity. Understanding the division of labour in the European society he argued that a new pattern of interdependent social relations and appropriate moral rules emerge in such a way that it can be said that the normal state of a complex division of labour is one of organic solidarity. The role of sociological analysis is to identify the problems occasioned by rapid complex change to those in society who are able to effect reform (Preston 1996:91).

Preston (1996:91) argues that, Durkheim follows what was a familiar 19th century strategy of attempting to grasp the nature of the present day by comparing it with the past. He identified the two ideal types of mechanical and organic solidarity by considering the nature of the moral order in traditional and modern societies. The enquiry continues by posting a mechanism to account for the shift from before (traditional society) to after (modern society); thus Durkheim speaks of increases in the moral destiny of society underpinning the evident increase in complexity of the division of labour. Finally having offered his interpretive scheme Durkheim adds a tail-piece by way of a discussion of normal and pathological forms of the modern division of labour. The strategy of enquiry is thus in essence a straight forward education of the evolution of the division of labour (ibid:91).

In this manner we can say that Durkheim’s project attempts to grasp the nature of the present by noting the increase of social differentiation. This way of grasping the present is informed by organicist ideas. The social organism becomes more complex as it becomes more highly evolved. The nature of the present can be elucidated in a
comparative fashion focusing upon the nature of moral order in traditional and modern societies. These are ideal types and are constructed with reference to types of legal codes. A legal code is an ‘index’ of the moral character of a society (ibid:95).

Max Weber

Weber was concerned to elucidate the dynamics of complex change in order to argue for the political role of the nationalist bourgeoisie in Germany. The key issue for Weber was whether the German bourgeoisie were mature enough to assume the leadership of Germany. The concern with the development of capitalism in Germany was subsumed within a series of broader enquiries into the nature of Capitalism in general (Preston 1996:107). Weber broadens his interest in the development of capitalism in the Protestant Ethic and against the mechanist Marxists interpretation of economy. Therefore Weber argued for the effective role of ideas in the development of economy. In Protestant Ethic Weber discusses the role which certain religious doctrines played in facilitating the emergence of Capitalistic social form. Weber rejects the then current Marxian view that Protestantism was simply the ideological consequence of earlier economic changes and instead advances the claim that ascetic Protestantism actually aided the emergence of capitalism (ibid:108).

The analysis begins by noting the apparent anomaly that whereas it is usually said that those with a strong religious faith are comparatively different or hostile, to material advancement it is also true that Protestants are disproportionately over represented in modern industrial enterprise. Weber, then goes on to analyse in an ideal-typical way, both
the spirit of modern capitalism and the particular belief system of Protestantism reduced to its back bones Weber’s argument points to an effective affinity between the protestant (in particular, Calvinist) notion of calling—which has been transposed from a monastic reflective form into an outwards-directed active form and the requirement of capitalistic material accumulation which requires, amongst other things, the habit of delayed gratification. As a historical phenomenon then, the rise of capitalism can be seen to have been assisted by particular sets of religious ideas. The belief system of the Calvinists led them to act in such a way that they served as the catalyst for widespread changes in the economic character of society (ibid: 109).

**Peter Worsley**

The work of Peter Worsley is an example of the social philosophical strategy of enquiry and is concerned with analyzing the historical development of the capitalist form of life. Worsley analyses the situation of the countries of the Third World in terms of the dynamic of expansion of the global system and the process of absorption experienced by the countries of the Third World. The absorption within the expanding global capitalist system can be understood as an episode of complex change which ushered in the slowly changing systems of colonialism. The collapse of the colonial system ushered in a new phase of complex change as territorial areas which had been elements of wide Europe-centered empire trading blocks reconstituted themselves as sovereign nation states within the global system with its transient bipolar character (in Preston 1996:15).

Worsley begins his detailed analysis by noting that most of the people of the world have organized and continue to organize their livelihoods with small-scale farming.
If we consider the peasantry it is clear that their fates in the developed West, the Old Second World and the Third World have been shaped by the rise of industrial capitalism. Worsley notes that it is typical of the broad shift to the modern world that there are large population shifts from rural-agricultural patterns of life to urban-industrial patterns of life.

Peasant forms-of-life revolve around subsistence agricultural production and whilst peasants are different to define the key seems to be that the basic economic and social unit is the household (a) economic activities centers on the household (production and consumption )and (b) the household is the crucial unit for most social matters (marriage, residence, Kin net works). The key resource is land which is typically viewed as help in trust so it is not a commodity and it cannot be bought and sold. The exchange of peasant households with the wider political-economic world was usually asymmetric and peasants were the weaker players who were often exploited either directly via tithes, rents, taxes or theft or indirectly via credit/debt relations (ibid:16-17).

The work of Gunnar Myrdal

In the areas of development theory Myrdal has presented institutionalist analysis of the causes of persistent poverty in Third World economies and societies. Myrdal’s writings are very extensive and commentators have called him a ‘generalist’. The work involved a reaction against mechanico-formal neo-classical equilibrium theory and in its place Myrdal offered a substantive institutionlist analysis which had at its centre the idea of circular cumulative causation (Preston 1996: 200-201). It is claimed that the general
direction in which a socio-economic system was developing would be self-reinforcing so that the countries of the Third World, with their weak position within the world system and weak internal institutional structures tended to fall into a position of low level equilibrium whereas the countries of the First World were firmly lodged on an upward development path.

In Myrdal's work the economic system is no longer seen as a self-regulating and instead has to be seen as an element of a complex social system. A social system has to be analysed realistically and this requires detailed studies of the economic, social, political and cultural aspects of the system as a whole. It is only on the basis of a detailed knowledge of all the aspects of the social system that any grasp of the system as a whole can be secured and subsequent policy-making attempted. In respect of the business of ordering change in the system, Myrdal has a particular view of social system change and argues that once a direction of change is set then the social system adjusts to reinforce that direction of change. What we have is an idea of social inertia. Myrdal speaks of this in terms of the notion of circular cumulative causation. In the case of the Third World the original condition of underdevelopment, a low-level equilibrium was altered in the colonial period but only to the pattern of a dual economy with a traditional and a modern sector. The dual economy of the colonial period was only a slight advance on pre-colonial forms. However, in the period of independence as the institutional development of the typical Third World Country is low, with institutional arrangements only working with limited efficiency and as the position of these economies within the global system is weak, then the countries tend to stay in a position of low-level equilibrium. The solution
so far as Myrdal was concerned was for the state in the Third World to struggle on a broad front of social, economic, political and cultural reforms so as to redirect the socio-economic system onto an upward path of development (ibid:201).

In the work of Gunnar Myrdal the business of social scientific analysis, the pursuit of development and the realm of Political action all coincide in state ordered planning. It is a distinctive position and one which owes, as he reports, much to the experience of the Great Depression. It is clear that Myrdal’s work has had a widespread influence within contemporary development theory and it is to the particular intellectual logic of his work that we can now turn (ibid:201-202).

B.F. Hoselitz

Hoselitz (1960:29) was one of the earliest modernization theorists to apply himself to an “adequate theoretical explanations of economic progress”. His produce is first of all to distinguish “economically” advantaged from the “underdeveloped” countries, in terms of a set of four pattern variables as formulated by Parsons. In applying this scheme, Hoselitz is only concerned with those “sets of action systems which pertain to description of economically relevant behavior, i.e behavior related to the production and distribution of goods and services (ibid:30). Hoselitz, argues that advanced economies exhibit predominantly Universalistic norms in the distribution of economic roles are functionally specific, which ensures specialized intellectual or manual skills for the industrial economy characterized by a complex division of labour; the predominant norms by which the selection process for those roles is regulated are based on the Principle of
achievement or “Performance”, and the natural or group elites – as legislators or administrators are required to maintain collective orientation (public interest) in the production and distribution of economic goods.

In contrast the underdeveloped economies are regulated by the opposite set of value – orientations: Particularism, Functional diffusions, the Principle of ascription as well as private orientation on part of the elites (ibid:30-42). The modernization process therefore, involves a structural shift in terms of these patterns variables. However, when he comes to the second level analysis of pertaining to the mechanisms by which this structural shift is effected (i.e. a theory of capitalistic dynamics), Hoselitz is unable to provide an adequate causal analysis, Western capitalist development was an “unplanned autonomous” process which displayed the priority of non-economic variables, especially the influence of a religious ethic, in transforming economic development thinking and practice. On the other hand, socio-economic development in the 3rd world nations is “consciously initiated” and “carefully planned”. Under this condition non-economic or socio-cultural variables do not determine economic growth, but merely ensure how “easily and smoothly” the objectives of a development plan can be attained and at what costs” .... cultural and social structural variables may be assumed to have created the conditions for economic change (in Western European capitalist Societies). In all those instances which economic change is planned the social structure and the culture imposes modifications and in some instances barriers to the process of economic change” (ibid:44-45).
N.J. Smelser

Smelser (1963) used the idea of structural differentiation to depict the process of change in development. He distinguishes between the highly differentiated socio-economic structures of the developed nations and the relative lack of differentiation in underdeveloped countries so as to map out the nature of social transformations in 3rd world countries, which accompany economic development. He analyses at a very general plane, economic development as taking place through

(a) The modernization of technology, leading to a change from simple traditional techniques to the application of scientific knowledge;

(b) The commercialization of agriculture, characterized by a shift from subsistence to commercial farming, leading to a specialization in cash-crop production and the development of wage labour;

(c) The industrialization process, which depicts the transition from the use of human and animal power to machine power and lastly,

(d) Urbanization, which consists of changes in the ecological dimension and is the movement from farm and village towards the growth of large urban centre.

Smelser does not analyse the sources, problems and potentials of techno-economic change in 3rd world countries and we may presume that these are to be introduced (or diffused) into these nations from the 1st world countries. Instead, he goes
on to analyse in highly generalize propositions, the institutional changes that are likely to occur in "traditional" social structures, under the impact of economic development.

Samir Amin

Amin (1972) demonstrates that development and underdevelopment is the two opposite poles of a dialectical unity: under development is the consequence of development of capitalism on the world scale. The contemporary world economic system is characterized as unitary i.e as a capitalist world market or system. It is conceived of or having a centre (North America, Western Europe, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa as well as Russia and Eastern Europe) and a Periphery (Asia, Africa and Latin America). The emergence, growth and development of the centre historically necessitated the degeneration of the three continents of the periphery into abject poverty and distorted "underdevelopment". Amin begins by arguing that, the predominant mode of production in the periphery are owned by the capitalists; Secondly, this mode of production is distinguished from the capitalism of the centre as its initial starting point was exogenous and it remains anchored in the centre. Hence underdeveloped societies are characterized by a historically specific form of capitalist developed called "Peripheral Capitalism".

Thirdly according to Amin, the capitalist mode of production in the centre is dominant and tends to become exclusive with the expansion of the internal market. In the socio-economic formations of the periphery, however, the capitalist mode of production only predominates, but can not destroy the pre-capitalist modes of production. The latter are four in number namely a) primitive community; (b) slave-owning mode of
production; c) Feudalism; d) the tributary mode of production or the Asiatic mode of production. These are transformed under the external aggression of the capitalist mode of production and subjected to it, both internationally and locally.

Finally, the explanation for the dialectical processes of development and underdevelopment inherent in the capitalist mode of production lies in the mechanisms of primitive accumulation. This process is both permanent and on-going. The chief mechanism is unequal exchange between the centre and periphery i.e. the exchange of products of unequal value or those precisely, whose prices of production are, in the Marxist sense, unequal. Unequal exchange in international trade also means unequal specialization in all branches of production between the centre and periphery. The dynamics of unequal exchange lie in the internal contradiction of the capitalist mode of production between the capacity to produce and the capacity to consume- which accounts for the impulse towards expansion of markets and towards international movement of capitalism (ibid). Within the above framework, Amin gives a demonstration of the historical development of peripheral capitalism and variant forms of peripheral formations. The variations in the peripheral formation, namely, between the “American” and the “Eastern” and “African” result from the initial conditions (pre capitalist) of the formations and the stage of capitalist development at the centre at which they were integrated. Three stages can be distinguished:

a) The ‘prehistory’ of capitalism that extends to the Industrial Revolution of the 18th and 19th centuries and which was predominantly mercantile in character.
International trade was the main element in world exchange with the centre mainly redistributing in the periphery.

b) The "classical" period which was predominantly Industrial and competitive and established the capitalist mode of production. With the industrial Revolution, trade changed its function. The Centre exported to the periphery manufactured goods (e.g. textiles) for current consumption; and it mainly imported agricultural products coming from East or the Americans. It was in this period that the international specialization between Industrial and Agricultural countries was decided. Specialization and internal trade within the centre also began.

c) The "Imperialist Monopoly" period beginning at the end of the 19th century. 1870-1890 onward the centre exported Capital along with goods. Foreign investment made possible changes in specialization within the periphery, so that the periphery exports goods produced by Modern capitalist enterprise with a very high productivity.

This is an expression of capitalist development. However, this is an asymmetrical specialization, as 80% of the periphery's trade is with the centre, whereas the internal changes at the centre have developed at such as fast rate, that 80% of the foreign trade of the central countries is carried on among themselves (ibid).
Conclusion

Development means a purposeful change in a society that contributes to social and economic well being and advancement of its people without creating any disharmony. In other words development includes the fulfillment of each person's material, spiritual and societal needs. Development empowers people and promotes important changes in their lives. However, development cannot take place by itself. It requires an educated, skilled and competent people. Seen from this angle, education becomes the most important factor for development as well as for empowering people. Education provides with knowledge and information which in turn bring about desirable changes in the way one thinks, feels and acts. Education also builds one a strong sense of self-esteem, self-confidence. It contributes very effectively to the realization of one's potential. Therefore, education is considered as a social instrument for developing human resources and human capital formation.

People having reasonable learning and skills tend to produce more farm crops, have limited number of children and enjoy a relatively better quality of life as compared with uneducated families. Educated people earn more and are respected by the society. It is because of its tangible contributions in changing the lives of the people that education becomes an important part of the development policy in every country. However, the relationship between education and development is not as simple as it appears to be. In fact, the impact of education on development depends basically on what we teach and how much the learners learn. In simple words, it is the education contents and the teaching methods that make the difference. Equally important is the interaction of
education with other social and economic factors. One may argue that education can only be useful and meaningful when it brings about positive changes in one's life and empowers a person to face day-to-day challenges. On the same grounds, one may assert that education becomes meaningful when it provides knowledge and skills of reading, writing, simple arithmetic, and problem solving and for improving the quality of life. Education organized and oriented on these lines is certainly going to have a lasting impact on income, agricultural productivity, fertility rate, birth spacing, pre- and postnatal health, nutrition, knowledge, attitudes and values.

From the above discussion, it is now be clear that education is crucial to every aspect of social and economic development. One may also notice that education is also important for influencing social behaviour. For example, education widens people's choices. It expands their perceptions and capabilities for leading a better quality of life. Adequate and good quality food (nutrition), access to safe drinking water, better health care services, relevant and quality education for children and youth constitute the core elements of one's life. Hence education is increasingly recognized to be at the heart of the development process.

The direct impact of education on economic benefits has been noticed in many countries. For example, it is observed that each additional year of schooling for men and women increases wages by between 10 to 20 per cent, and farm output by up to 5 per cent. In contrast, a population with a low level of education has little or no capacity to increase productivity. An educated person can make effective use of new technology, engage in entrepreneurial activity, and be responsive to market demands and changes. Apart from the powerful direct economic benefits of basic education, its indirect benefits
in changing human attitude and improving human welfare are equally important. The relationship between women’s education level and population growth is dramatic. Women with more education have fewer children than uneducated women. An extra year of schooling reduces female fertility by as much as 5 to 10 per cent. Those children who are born to an educated mother have a much better chance of surviving and being healthy. The rate of child mortality is twice as high for uneducated mothers as compared to mothers with a basic education.

A common and universal system of basic education is necessary for democratic society to function properly. To participate with knowledge and understanding in policy issues and decision-making processes requires literacy, knowledge of the world, and the ability to think independently based on evidence. The full impact of education is found where sustained investments in people are accompanied by respect for individual human rights and participation in democratic institutions. Following from the above arguments, one will certainly agree that education is very important for economic prosperity and a decent quality of life. Hence eradication of the widespread illiteracy from tribal community is essential. Education, thus, should occupy the topmost importance in your community development programmes and activities.
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