

Classical Sociological Theory
Professor R Santhosh
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology, Madras
Lecture 49
Mind, Self and Society

(Refer Slide Time: 00:11)



Mind, Self and Society



Welcome back to the class, we are beginning to discuss some of the substantive ideas of G.H. Mead. We had a previous class on him, trying to look at his intellectual context and the kind of theorizing that G.H. Mead has become quite famous for. And we saw that unlike many other sociologists like Marx, Durkheim or Weber, Mead did not or his focus of analysis was not larger social processes or social structures, but rather he focuses attention to understand the micro social processes, specifically the field of study that is known as social interaction. Because when others talk about sociology as a study of social interaction, a series of scholars starting with G.H. Mead and C.H. Cooley and a host of others try to understand how this social interaction takes place. What are the dynamics of this social interaction?

So we are, in this particular class and in the coming couple of classes as well, we are trying to understand Mead's arguments about three very important and interrelated topics that is mind, self and society. It is a very, very fascinating story. And you will see that how this theorization is something quite different from what you have already seen in the previous classes.

(Refer Slide Time: 01:37)

- In contrast to influential psychological theories, Mead argued that for mind and self, as the two most distinctive aspects of human personality, and for “society” as maintained by mind and self, to be viewed as part of ongoing social processes.
- The unique attributes of humans, such as their capacity to use language, their ability to view themselves as objects, and their facility to reason, must all be viewed as emerging from the life processes of adaptation and adjustment. Mind and self cannot be ignored, as behaviorists often sought to do, nor can they be seen as a kind of mystical and spiritual force that elevates humans out of the basic life processes influencing all species.



So in contrast to the influential psychological theories, Mead argued that for mind and self as the two most distinctive aspects of human personality and for society as maintained by mind and self to be viewed as a part of ongoing social process. So, one of the most important things that distinguishes Mead from other psychologists who use the framework of psychology to understand mind and self is that he argues that there is a very close connection between the development and existence of mind and self, but to that effect that of with the society and the process of interaction.

So this is a very, very important and very significant point of departure between psychologist and sociologist. While psychologist try to understand mind as a kind of a process of or as a kind of an entity that is within the brain, within the human entity and then they try to explain a host of other things. Whereas sociologists were looking at social interaction, they aim to theorize the development of mind as well as the notion of self as a result of interaction with other people who are living in this particular society.

So that is an extremely important point and it will become more clear when we analyze his arguments about what constitutes mind, what constitutes self and what constitutes society. So as the two most distinctive aspects of human personality and for society as maintained by mind and self to be viewed as a part of an ongoing social process.

So, interestingly, Mead also argues that the society is an integral part of this interplay between self and mind and you cannot really keep that away. It is not an, it is not that an individual with a fully formed mind and self coming and then interacting with the society. On the other hand, society plays a very pivotal role in shaping the condos or giving kind of specific shape and content to what is understood as the self and mind.

The unique attributes of humans, such as their capacity to use language, their ability to view themselves as objects and their facility to reason, must all be viewed as emerging from the life processes of adaptation and adjustment. And we know that these are some of the very important features that distinguish us from the other animals, other living organisms in varying degrees, especially their capacity to use language, a host of other animals also use language, but at a very much lower level and it is no way comparable with the kind of complex form of language that human beings use.

And their ability to view themselves as objects that is, we are able to look at ourself from a distance. You can put yourself in somebody else shoe and then try to understand. For example, if we shouted at somebody. If we shouted at somebody and after some time we, when we think we might feel repentant. We will feel that, we will, we might feel sorry for that person. And how does we feel sorry for that person, we are able to imagine ourselves in that person's position, and then look at how we behaved, and then you develop, you can have, you might feel proud of yourself, you might feel bad at yourself, you might feel angry at yourself.

So this whole ability to look at ourself as an object as if you are able to take a step or two behind and then look at you from a distance is a unique ability of human being and their facility to reason must all be viewed as emerging from life processes of adaptation and adjustment which we discuss that how various arguments about behaviorism, utilitarianism and other things are, have influenced this argument.

Mind and self cannot be ignored as behaviorists often sought to do, nor can they be seen as a kind of mystical and spiritual force that elevates humans out of the basic life processes

influencing all species. So here it is, there are two extremes, on the one extreme, the behaviorists want to treat human beings as just like any other animal, who respond to certain kind of stimulus. So they would argue that human beings, since human beings are also animals, we also behave in a very more or less deterministic manner, where we respond to certain kinds of stimulus.

On the other hand, the psychologists would argue that they tend to look at the mind as a kind of a spiritual or as a kind of an enigmatic entity that makes human beings quite special from other animals. And sociologists, including Mead and others, they want to reconcile these two opposing arguments.

(Refer Slide Time: 06:49)



- Social behaviorism; social behaviorism stresses the processes by which individuals acquire a certain behavioral repertoire by virtue of their adjustments to ongoing patterns of social organization.
- The behavior of individuals—not just their observable actions but also their internal behaviors of thinking, assessing, and evaluating—must be analyzed within a social context.



So social behaviorism, social behaviorism stresses the process by which individuals acquire a certain behavioral repertoire by virtue of their adjustment to ongoing patterns of social organization. I hope you remember our discussion about social behaviorism by that Russian behaviorist. And so here we, social behaviorist trust the process by which individuals acquire a certain behavioral repertoire, a possibility was compendium of behavioral possibilities by virtue of their adjustment to ongoing patterns of social organization.

The behavior of individuals, not just their observable actions, but also their internal behaviors of thinking, assessing and evaluating must be analyzed with a social context. So, Mead argues that

when you look at from a perspective of a behaviorist, you tend to analyze a person's behavior from the external aspects from what does he do or how does a particular animal behave. Whereas, on the other hand, sociologists, including Mead argues that and this is a very important theme that all of you must have understood that we not only simply behave, we act, and there are very important emotional value oriented ideas that actually shape our actions.

So you need, it is not really that observable actions, but also their internal behaviors of thinking and assessing and evaluating must be analyzed within a social context. For example, why that I, if I am hungry, what are the options in front of me? So is stealing allowed or is begging allowed or is requesting somebody allowed. So, why, what are the things that I can adopt. And these options are heavily influenced by the social setting. I hope you understand that.

You all go for a movie and it is a very tragic movie. You feel very bad, you want to cry. But whether you can cry or whether are you supposed to cry or can you be seen as crying by others in a cinema hall will depend upon a host of issues. If you are a girl, mostly society would say that okay there is nothing wrong in being emotional and then crying. They are not put to so much fun. Whereas if it is a elderly man with a mustache and a very well-built man, if he starts weeping in a cinema hall watching a movie, definitely he will be ridiculed.

So the kind of options, so that person also must be having quite a lot of in a struggle within himself whether to cry or try to contain or try to control the feeling to cry, to control his tears. So human beings adopt and adapt to, on the basis of the kind of a social settings in which they are.

(Refer Slide Time: 09:58)



Mead's theory of mind

- For Mead, "mind" is a type of behavioral response that emerges from interaction with others in a social context. Without interaction, mind could not exist:
- *We must regard mind, then, arising and developing within the social process, within the empirical matrix of social interactions. We must, that is, get an inner individual experience from the standpoint of social acts which include the experiences of separate individuals in a social context wherein those individuals interact. The processes of experience which the human brain makes possible are made possible only for a group of interacting individuals; only for individual organisms which are members of a society; not for the organism in isolation from other individual organisms.*



So now we are coming to the three, the first of the important thematic areas of Mead that is his argument about mind. So, we will discuss his arguments about self and society in the coming classes. So let us see what Mead talks about the idea of mind. For Mead, mind is a type of behavioral response that emerges from interaction with others in a social context. Without interaction, mind could not exist. And this is a very, very important argument.

And for Mead and a host of other sociologists, you cannot think of human beings having a mind if without interaction or without being able to live in a society. And this has really given a whole lot of criticisms and debates, especially there were a couple of incidents where scientists, there were children who were reared by taken care or reared by wolves. You must have heard those stories.

So those children, they were human beings, but they were somehow lost in the forest and they were reared by wolves. But these children, even after they have grown up, they did not show any other mental faculties of a human being. And that almost justifies the argument of Mead that in order to have a proper usual mind, you need to be able to interact with others and you must be emits the people in a given society. So this is his own quotation, very important one, that is why I quoted at length.

Mead says, we must regard mind, then arising and developing within the social process within the empirical matrix of social interactions. We must, that is, get an inner individual experience from the standpoint of social acts which include the experience of separate individuals in a social context, wherein these individuals interact. The processes of experience which the human brain makes possible are made possible only for a group of interacting individuals, only for individual organisms which are members of a society, not for the organism in isolation from other individual organisms.

It is a very powerful argument. You think of a group of individuals. And when you talk about mind, a mind is a purely an individualistic one. I have my own mind. I do not share my mind with anybody else. I might share ideas, I might share arguments, but my mind is my own.

So when you are talking about a group of people, each of these people develops their own mind and each of this mind is their own entity, their own possession. But Mead argues that, if they have to develop their own minds, it is possible only when they co-exist. It is possible only when they interact with each other, only then this individual ability that is there in our body, in our mind begin to develop. And that is an extremely important argument as put forward by Mead.

So only for individual organisms which are members of a society, not for the organism in isolation from other individual organisms. So if you are alone as a child, for example, if you are stranded in a deserted island some shipwreck or something and then you have everything food and water, everything to grow up, and you grew up into an adult without interacting with anybody, you have not seen another human being, and then the kind of mind that you have, where we do not even know whether to, whether we can call it as a mind, that will be something quite different from our understanding of mind.

(Refer Slide Time: 13:55)

Gestures and Mind



- In contrast with Charles Darwin, who had viewed gestures as expressions of emotions, Wilhelm Wundt recognized gestures as that part of the ongoing behavior of one organism that stimulates the behavior of another organism. Mead took this basic idea and extended it in ways that became the basis not only for the emergence of mind and self but also for the creation, maintenance, and change of society.
- "conversation of gestures"-One organism emits gestures that stimulate a response from a second organism. In turn, the second organism emits gestures that stimulate an "adjusted response" from the first organism. Then, interaction continues.
- This form of interaction, Mead felt, typifies "lower animals" and human infants. Such gestural conversations limit the capacity of organisms to organize themselves and to cooperate.



Now, Mead comes to this very important concept called us gestures, gestures and mind. Why that, these gestures are something very important. In contrast with Charles Darwin, who had viewed gestures as expressions of emotions, Wilhelm Wundt recognized gestures as that part of the ongoing behavior of one organism that stimulate the behavior of another organism. Mead took it, took this basic idea and extended it in ways that became the basis not only for the emergence of mind and self, but also for the creation, maintenance and change of society.

So in contrast with Charles Darwin, who viewed gestures are expressions of emotions. That is what we usually understand. When we get angry, we shout at people or we show our face or we are so pleased, we smile, is not it. So every other animals show that kind of gestures, but Wilhelm Wundt would argue that gestures as that part of the ongoing behavior of one organism that stimulates the behavior of another organism.

So it is not only to express certain thing, it is not really the aim of the gesture, it is not only self-expression, but the aim of the gesture is that it must be understood by the other random stimulus and then stimulate a response. I hope you understand that, if you use a gesture which is not understood and then reciprocated by other, it no longer is a gesture as per Wilhelm Wundt. It does not make sense as a gesture.

And here this understanding is that your gesture must be able to develop a response from the other person. It, you must be able, so here, the core idea of communication comes into picture, the ability to influence others thinking and to elicit a response. So, a part of ongoing behavior of one organism that stimulates the behavior of another organism. Mead took this basic idea and extended it to the analysis of mind, analysis of self and even to the creation and maintenance and change of society. It is a very fascinating argument, is not it.

The whole question, how is that society came into picture, how is that society came into being, and right from the beginning of the course, you must have heard me telling that society simply does not come into existence. It comes only through interaction. If you put some thousand people together, it does not become a society. Or there are very fundamental processes which happen when people come together on a prolonged period of time in an institutionalized manner, in a predictable manner and that gives rise to this notion of society.

So conversation of gestures, one organism emits gestures that stimulate a response from a second organism. In turn, the second organism emits gestures that stimulate an adjusted response from the first organism, then interactions continues. And you know that it is not something confined only within human beings even when two dogs bark at each other and they are able to, and when there is a standoff between two dogs or when there is a standoff between two tigers or lions, you see that there is this, they try to threaten the other animal and the other animal is threatened sufficiently, it will leave or if it is not threatened or if it has more courage and then there will be a standoff and then it might lead to open aggression attack and then the end could be anything.

This form of interaction, Mead felt, typifies lower animals and human infants. You emit certain gestures that is understood by other and then he also, there is a kind of a, some kind of a communication takes place, some kind of exchange of ideas take place. But Mead would say that this happens only in the lower animals and the human infants. Such gestural conversations limit the capacity of organism to organize themselves and to cooperate.

So we know that the possibility of our gestures are very less. You can communicate very limited ideas through these gestures, is not it. You can communicate the idea of anger, happiness, love

towards each other through these gestures that is what every animals and birds do, but you cannot communicate something more complex than that. You cannot talk philosophy through gestures. You cannot talk about history through gestures. You cannot even show empathy through gestures. So more complicated ideas, more complicated emotions, messages cannot be conveyed through these gestures.

(Refer Slide Time: 19:02)

significant symbols



- When organisms become capable of using gestures that evoke the same response in each other, then they are employing what he termed *significant*, or *conventional*, gestures. Such gestures, he felt, are unique to humans and make possible their capacities for mind, self, and society.
- Development of the capacity to use significant symbols distinguished humans from other species. *Mind* arises in a maturing human infant as the capacity to use significant symbols increases. Significant symbols are, as Mead emphasized, the basis for language.



So that is why Mead brings in this idea of significant symbols. When organisms become capable of using gestures that evoke the same response in each other, then they are employing what he term as significant or conventional gestures. Such gestures he felt are unique to humans and make possible the capacities of mind, self and society. So what is the distinction here? What is the important point here?

When organisms become capable of using gestures that evoke the same response in each other, then they are employing, what he terms as a significant or conventional gestures. Such gestures, he felt, are unique to humans and make possible their capacities of mind, self and society. So when you are able to create gestures that evoke the same response in every member, then that is quite different than the cases what we saw earlier when two individuals come and then they interact and then the ideas get exchanged that is what Mead consider as happening among the lower kind of animals or among infants.

But here human beings are able to use significant symbols which are able to convey the similar ideas to everybody. And the most important example that comes to us is the most sophisticated form of language. So development of the capacity to use significant symbol distinguished humans from other species. Mind arises in a maturing human infant as the capacity to use significant symbols increases as other capacity to use significant symbols increases. Significant symbols are, as Mead emphasized, the basis of language.

So you are able to develop certain sounds and these sounds are understood by others and by others, in the sense, not only your mother or father, but even your neighbor, even other people, even your relatives who have not seen you for a long time, and gradually you, human beings are able to learn and articulate through this complex phenomenon called us language. And you know that through languages you can communicate even the most complex ideas, so this significant symbol. Why it is significant, because it has the ability to communicate the same meaning to people across the society, to at least to a substantial section of the people, as long as the cultural and linguistic barriers do not come into picture.

(Refer Slide Time: 21:43)

• In what ways, then, does language make mind possible?

- Mind is a behavior, not a substance or entity. It is a behavior that involves using significant symbols to stimulate responses but, at the same time, to inhibit or delay overt behavior so that potential responses can be covertly rehearsed and assessed. Mind is thus an "internal conversation of gestures" using significant symbols because an individual with mind talks to oneself.
- This capacity for mind, Mead stressed, is not inborn; it depends on interaction with others and the acquisition of the ability to interpret and use their significant symbols (as well as biological maturation).



So in what ways, then, does language make mind possible? So here Mead is talking about, Mead is bringing this idea of language as the most significant tool that plays a major important role in creating human mind.

Mind is a behavior, not a substance or entity. And this is an extremely important argument for Mead, because we had quite a lot of debate whether mind is a structure of brain or is it a process, is it something hidden inside the brain. So Mead would argue that mind is a behavior, not a substance or entity. It is a behavior that involves using significant symbol to stimulate responses, but at the same time to incubate or delay overt behavior so that potential responses can be covertly rehearsed and assessed. Mind is thus an internal conversation of gestures using significant symbols because an individual with mind talks to oneself.

So he is talking about the ability of mind as a behavior. It is a, it uses symbol. It uses the significant symbol to stimulate a response. At the same time, to inhibit or delay overt behavior so that potential responses can be covertly rehearsed and assessed. When we, for example, when you sit in an interview, when you exchange, when you are answering to the questions, your mind is at work, or when you sit in a shop and then bargaining with a shop owner, your mind is at work or for that matter, your mind is at work all the time. And what does mind do?

Mind is trying to communicate with the other person, trying to convince the other person. At the same time, mind inhibits our human body, not to react too early. Mind, you might want to argue with the, bargain with the shop owner and then say that, okay, you want to, you do not want to take it because the price that he is quoting is too high and then you want to walk out. But before walking out, actually so that is what your body does. Mind calculates, whether is it the time to walk out, but still then you might have in your mind that when you walk out the person might call you back and then give you the item that you want at much lower price or he might not even call you back.

So when you walk out, there is a risk that something which you really wanted, you may not get it, or the other possibility is that, the shop owner, if he is so desperate to sell, he might call you back and then give you at a discount.

So there are quite a lot of rehearsals taking place, quite a lot of, we imagine so many other alternatives within the mind, and this mind actually control our action from taking a kind of very reflexive actions. We do not really behave. And Mead would argue that the kind of a complexity with which human beings are able to behave is incomparable with any other living organism in the world. We can put up a very, very different face. And then you can give a lecture for two hours on completely on different set of ideals, even while you practice completely different set of things in your life.

So mind is thus an internal conversation of gestures using significant symbols, because an individual with mind talks to oneself, is not it. You, we always do that. We always do that. This capacity of mind Mead's trust is not inborn. That is the point. So this ability to look at various possibilities, because the ability to realize or the ability to understand that walking out of a shop is a strategy with, of course, potential possibility of you never being able to get that item or else you go out, the shopkeeper does not call you back and then after some time you go and then buy the same thing, then you lose your pride, is not it.

You lose your pride because he would know that you really wanted and then you go there and then buy it at a higher price, the price that he quoted. Then you lose your pride. You shamelessly, you have to go and then do that. But this happens in our everyday life, whether in fish market or in every other place, other than this big shopping malls or big shops where everything is MRP is fixed, where we do not, we are not allowed to bargain. In these places, it is not allowed or other places we experience in our everyday life. So how are we doing that?

And Mead would argue that this possibility of conversing within the mind, of talking about various possibilities is possible only if you have ever lived in a society without that you do not even know what are the kind of options available, the very option of giving a slap to that shop owner and then taking that particular item. It is completely not possible. It is absolutely not possible because you know that it is a violation of a law. You will be penalized, it is a crime. Assault is a crime. Then you will be handed over to police and you can end up in jail.

So all these things get reflected on, these are being thought about in the mind. So it is not inborn. So this ability to look at various options and then control your body, control your action is not inborn. It depends on interactions with others and the acquisition of the ability to interpret and use a significant symbol as well as biological maturation.

What is the biological maturation here? You know that when you become more older, you become more mature. Children or teenagers are supposed to be more, they might act more instantaneously. They might act more on the basis of certain stimulus. But when you get more maturity, you realize that you have had such an experience early, so you better do not do that. So Mead is very emphatic in his argument that this ability is possible only if you have ever lived in a society.

(Refer Slide Time: 28:19)

Role-Taking and Mind

- A critical process in using and interpreting significant gestures is what Mead termed "taking the role of the other," or *role-taking*. An ability to use significant symbols means that the gestures emitted by others in the environment allow a person to read or interpret the dispositions of these others.
- Role-taking is critical to the emergence of mind, for unless the gestures of others, and the disposition to act that these gestures reveal, can become a part of the stimuli used to covertly rehearse alternative lines of conduct, overt behavior will often produce maladjustment to the environment.



So now another very fascinating area is the role-taking and mind. What does role taking? This role is a very important term that you come across in this, their arguments not only in Mead, but also most of other symbolic interactions. A critical processes in using and interpreting significant gestures is what Mead termed taking the role of the other or role-taking. An ability to use significant symbol means that the gestures emitted by others in the environment allow a person to read or interpret the dispositions of these others.

So when you use the significant symbols, you are actually it is not only that you are expressing your emotions, but other person is able to understand that you are, what are the things that you are actually experiencing. It is not that the other person is threatened by your facial expressions when you are able to fight, but even in other situations, when you narrate your story, when you narrate your very tragic story or a some sad incident that happened to you through language, through by using significant other or a significant symbols, what happens is other person is able to take your role.

Other person is able to imagine himself or herself in your position, is able to put himself or herself into your shoes, a particular, very, very tragic experience that you went through or a very, very occasion of extreme happiness. That person is able to share your happiness because that person is able to take your role, taking the role of the other. And this Mead would argue is a very, very important and unique capacity of human beings and mostly enabled by our ability to use these complicated complex set of gestures, especially that of language. Gestures emitted by others in the environment allow a person to read or interpret the disposition of others.

Role taking is critical to the emergence of mind, for unless, the gestures of others and the dispositions to act that these gestures reveal can become a part of the stimuli used to covertly rehearse alternative lines of conduct, overt behavior will often produce maladjustment to the environment.

So what does it mean? This particular ability to think about others, especially when you are conversing, when you are having a discussion, when you are discussing with each other, when you are bargaining with each other or when you are trying to convince somebody about a certain thing, two lovers trying to convince each other for some particular argument or a person who is attracted to another person is trying to convince that person, in all these complicated exchanges, what happens, you use these symbolic gestures, significant gestures and you are able to imagine how that person might be, what that person must be experiencing now. How that person might be thinking, whether using these strategies would or the other strategies would or to what extent that person is genuinely feeling sympathy for you. Is that person is having a genuine sense of empathy with you or is he not believing you.

That is also you will try to assess when you try to convince somebody. Whether that person is impressed or whether that person is only acting to be impressed. So you evaluate that person on the basis of your previous experiences as well. Is it a very crooked person or is he a very simple term or is he a very nice person. So a host of other things can become a part of stimulus used to covertly rehearse alternative lines of conduct as overt behavior will often produce maladjustment to the environment.

So without these so much of rehearsals and then active role-taking, you cannot really act all on a sudden. Very, very, acting very reflexively without any thinking will have quite a lot of serious maladjustment to the environment

(Refer Slide Time: 32:43)

The Genesis of Mind



- Mead saw mind as developing in a sequence of phases
- Because an infant depends on others and, in turn, these others depend on society for their survival, mind develops from the forced dependency of an infant on society.
- Through conscious coaching by others, and through simple trial and error, the infant comes to use significant symbols to denote objects relevant to satisfying its needs.
- The development of abilities for language, role-taking, and mind are selected as the infant seeks to consummate impulses in society. If the infant is to adjust and adapt to society, it must acquire the ability for minded behavior.
- Mind is a behavioral capacity acquired in stages, with each stage setting the conditions for the next. As mind emerges, so does self-awareness.



So then Mead also has something very interesting thing to say about the genesis of mind, the creation of mind. How that mind gets developed. Mead saw mind as developing as a sequence of phases. It is not that when a child is born, the child already has a mind in itself. And then it simply develops. It is not, Mead says that it develops in sequence of phases.

Because an infant depends on others and, in turn, these others depend on society for their survival, mind develops from the forced dependency of an infant on society. The mind develops from the forced dependency of an infant on society. So his analysis about the mind, development of the mind is look by, is generated by looking at the development of an infant. Why that infant is important, because you know that among all other living organisms in the world, a human infant requires the maximum time to become independent.

Have you ever thought about it? Any other animals whom you see whether even mammals or primates who are very close to us orangutan or gorillas or chimpanzees, even their infants become independent much, much faster than a human child. A human child is completely dependent on their parents for an extended period in time, being absolutely unable to move for maybe the, till the one year to, when does a child become independent. A child becomes independent after a prolonged period of time.

So that Mead would argue is also a reflection of the time, of the argument that the mind develops very slowly because the child is dependent on the society. The parents are dependent on the society. It is not like an animal who is born and within a few hours it is able to walk and then run and then fly and escape its predators, and then it only needs to hunt for its food or to escape from their enemies. Human beings do not live like that.

So through conscious coaching by others and through simple trial and error, the infant comes to use significant symbols to denote objects relevant to satisfying its needs. And you must have closely observed how the child grows up or what are the kind of training that the child undergoes. Even starting with infants, when a child smiles, we also upload that, we also reciprocate, we show our happiness or we make the child to do, to smile again or to laugh again, the child enjoys that.

So the child understands a host of gestures that are good, that are useful, other gestures that are not useful, what is accepted, what is not accepted. So this learning process of child is something very, very important. Through conscious coaching by others and through simple trial and error, the infant comes to use significant symbols to denote objects relevant to satisfying its needs.

So whether it is mother's milk or food or mother's presence or whatever be that. Even the child takes quite a lot of time even to recognize its most important people. Father is absolutely a non-essential entity for a child, for a human child. And there is no biological attraction to the father. It is only to the mother that to only a certain extent.

The development of the abilities of language, role-taking and mind are selected as the infant seeks to consummate impulses in society. If the infant is to adjust and adapt to society, it must acquire the ability for minded behavior. So child develops this ability for language. It takes the ability for role-taking and mind are selected as the infant seeks to consummate impulses in a society.

So the child understands what are the, see, for example, if a child does something the parents pretend to be angry or parents pretend to behave that they do not approve of that particular

action. When the child grows up, the child understands that. The child understands that and the child will learn to act accordingly in the future.

So this whole idea of punishment and reward, punishment not in the sense of physical punishment, of course, that is still a very important part for many people, but this reward and punishment, a kiss, an appreciation or some food or a hug, these are the kind of the positive things for comforting the child, or whereas very stern scolding or a small pinch or a small slap or a strong shout, these are the things which will make the child understand that what he or she has done is not correct. And the child gradually develops the ability to understand that.

So mind is a behavioral capacity acquired in stages, with each stage setting the condition for the next. As mind emerges, so does self awareness. So Mead strongly places the development of mind in the process of socialization. And whatever we discussed so far you know that the sociological term for that is socialization, is the process through which a newborn child understands the social norms, cultures and everything.

So for Mead, mind is something which cannot be disconnected from the process of socialization. It is something so closely connected with the process of socialization and socialization begins the moment a child is born. And for anybody socialization ends only with their death. Do not think that socialization ends when people become matured. No, it does not happen, especially in our modern society which are so chaotic, which are so dynamic, even elderly people are supposed to learn a lot of things. You know that in this world of online world elderly people cannot say that we know everything that is happened. They need to learn, they need to learn new etiquettes. They need to understand how the world move.

So, socialization does not end till a person's death. So as mind emerges, so does self-awareness. So this is, again, a very fascinating area of what constitutes self according to Mead and that we will discuss in the coming class.

So let us stop here and we will meet you for the next class. Thank you.