CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION

The paradox of human society - that it has a unity and continuity of its own and yet exists solely in the minds and actions of its members - can be resolved only by understanding how the member individual is moulded into a social being. Without this process of moulding, which we call "socialization", the society could not perpetuate itself beyond a single generation and culture could not exist. Nor could the individual become a person; for without the ever repeated renewal of culture within him there could be no human mentality, no human personality. Both the person and the society are alike dependent on this unique process of psychic amalgamation whereby the sentiments and ideas of the culture are somehow joined to the capacities and needs of the organism. No one understands the process thoroughly. It is still as mysterious as photosynthesis or organic aging.

An infant enters the world without knowledge of rules, roles or relationships among people. Between infancy and adolescence society's basic expectations and limitations are imparted to the child in a complex series of processes generally referred to as socialization.
Socialization is a process that continues throughout life. Through socialization an individual learns to behave in accordance with social traditions and mores. The human child possesses a tendency towards imitation (see figure 1). The child develops according to the environment in which he lives. The individual tries to win the praise of the group in which he lives. Man is a social being. He of his own nature tries to adopt the culture of society. Man becomes what he is by socialization and it is by virtue of this that he is believed to be superior to animals. Socialization brings balance to his personality because the social aspect of personality is extremely important. The prolonged helplessness and dependency of humans makes possible a long period of socialisation (See A1 in appendix section).

It is said that "society" teaches its values, beliefs and attitudes during the socialization process. It is individual members of a society who are responsible for passing on the culture to children and most studies have focused on the chief agents of socialization e.g. parents, teachers, and associates or peers (see figure 2).

Parents are the primary socialization agents. The family plays perhaps the most important and most dominant role in the individuals socialization. The child finds much to learn in the behaviours of his family members, parents, relations and friends. He imitates them.
Figure 1: The Human child possesses a tendency towards imitation

Children often learn by "modeling" parents' behavior.
Figure 2: Showing the process of socialization
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in their mannerism, behaviour, cliches, etc. It is the family which forms his good habits and it is in the family that he acquires deviant tendencies. In the book new light on delinquency and its treatment, Healy and Bruner have contended that juvenile delinquents mostly hail from families which at one time or another, have suffered hindrance in the fulfillment of social relations. Psychoanalysts, prominent among them are Freud (1922) and Adler (1927), have proved that a man behaves in society according to whatever he has become in the family. (see A 2 in the appendix section)

Teachers then begin to exert an influence on the child and with school and playmates become largely responsible for socialization. For the child the school is society and it is within its boundary that he is socialized, his abilities find expressions and he gets the opportunity of developing his personality. The personality and character of the teacher are ever present before him as ideals that continuously influence his own personality. Schools are charged with teaching young people the skills and knowledge they will need to be useful citizens. The school also introduces children, usually for the first time, to the impersonal rules and regulations of the formal organization. Thus, schools are officially designated agents of socialization (Epperson, 1988). (see A3 appendix section).
Peers influence one another primarily through interaction, particularly during play. And of course, children are also motivated to learn things on their own. After childhood, social interaction takes place increasingly in peer groups - equal in age, sex, occupational level and so on. Members of peer groups tend to become friends because of their equal status and mutual interests. Friends do not intentionally set out to change each other, but friendship leads to shared opinions and values. Peers influence each other and become significant others in socialization process.(see A 4 in appendix section).

The media is also an important agent of socialization. The available evidence indicates that they can and do affect social behaviours and attitudes. In addition to being our principal sources of information and entertainment, the mass media are important agents of socialization (Jennings, and McNeil, 1975; Geis and Brown, 1980, Morgan, 1982) (see A5 in appendix section).

Thus, through the process of socialization one learns norms and values. Social norm is defined as a standard or better as a scale consisting of categories that define a range of objectionable attitude and behaviour for members of a social unit (Kretch & Crutchfield, 1962). Thus, social norms is a concept that can be used generally
social life that can embody evaluation of objects, persons, actions and ideas.

An adequate theory of socialization or social learning has to deal with the child's acquisition of the norms upheld by "significant other" people. These significant others are typically members of a group to which he/she belongs or aspires to belong.

Thus, family is the main agent of socialization. And it is in the family that the child learns to behave as a male or a female. According to Sandra Bem (1987), socialization produces a gender schema, a cognitive framework that organizes and guides a child's understanding of information relevant to gender. On the basis of what their schemas are regarding what is or is not appropriate for being a male or female, children begin to behave in ways that reflect society's gender role. (see A6 in appendix section). Broadly speaking we can divide the various forms of family into two main categories, the patriarchal and matriarchal. All types of family organizations-ancient as well as modern, fall with in one category or the other represent a combination of both.

The Matriarchal family is that type in which the control of the family is centered around some women member. (see A7 in appendix section). In these families name, status and material inheritance are transmitted through the female line. The main features of this type are
i) descent is traced through mother, ii) and in most cases, the family resides at the home of mother, husband has only a secondary position in the home and often that is regarded as below the position enjoyed by brothers of his wife along, iii) due to above, authority in maternal family frequently belongs to some male representative of wife's kin. In this system, child's system is determined by the mother, and the father has little authority. As a result children are more closely tied to their maternal uncles.

But in the patriarchal family which has been the most prevalent type in both ancient as well as modern civilization, the male of the family plays the dominant role as compared to the position of womenfolk. Societies which follow the patriarchal system of family organization place the women on a lower level of social status than that of man. The usual way to trace descent is through the male line which is known a patrilineal descent system. Under this system a man gets his name, his social identity from his father, his paternal grandfather, and so on. A woman marries into her husband's family and takes his name. In advanced industrial societies patriarchal arrangements tend to break down in fact, although they may still persist in theory. Decision making is rarely left entirely to the male head of the family.

In modern type of family, the woman has been placed on equal footings with man but her status as a
whole continues as inferior to that of male. Thus, the type of family in which the children are reared gives rise to sexual differences.

Culture plays a vital role in the process of socialization. Roles of men and women are dramatically different from culture to culture. Margaret Mead, one of the most widely read researchers in this area studied island societies in the pacific cultures to see whether important behaviour patterns differed in various cultures. She reported that adolescents on Samoa did not experience emotional upheavals similar to those often reported in many western societies (1928). She interpreted this as evidence for the idea that cultural pressures and not simply glandular changes are involved in the emotional aspects of adolescence. She also studies sex differences in social behaviour in three New Guinea Cultures. In her early work on sex and temperament in three principle societies (just published in 1935), Mead noted sharp variation among in the roles played by the sexes. Among the Arapesh, sex differentiation was minimal. Both sexes were gentle, nurturant and cooperative. In contrast among the Mundugumore, who had been cannibalistic, in that both sexes were aggressive, undisciplined and ruthless. In these two societies there was little sex differentiation, but in the third, the Tchambuli, sex differences were prominent. Contrary to
western culture, the women of the lake-dwelling people were the dominant sex. They procured the food as fisherwomen and were impersonal and directive in social relations, while the men adorned themselves physically and were involved in the decorative aspects of the culture (carving, dancing and painting).

From her study on cultural influences on sex role behaviour, Mead concluded: "standardized personality differences between the sexes are: cultural creations to which each generation, male and female is trained to conform".

As we might expect, stereotypes and beliefs about gender roles or expected behaviour of males and females, differ greatly from one culture to another as well as groups and across time with in a given culture. For example, in the United States, African American culture, children often hold less stereotyped views of women than do white children perhaps because African American children have been exposed to more women as heads of households and as principal family wage earners. (Banedict, 1942).

Enculturation

Apart from the agencies of socialization, the learning of social expectations and norms is through the process of enculturation. Enculturation, as this complex
process is called, prepares the individual, from infancy through adulthood, to orient himself to his group, adjust itself to its demands and expectations, and acquire skill in interpersonal relationships. When therefore, we wish to define learning by what is learnt, we call the process enculturation: the assimilation by a human organism of the customs and traditions of his group. Rokeach (1960, 1961) has shown and demonstrated that our feelings towards other people are affected more profoundly by the degree to which we think they share our attitudes and values than by any other social categorization, including their race or ethnic grouping. According to this view if a poor white farmer in Mississippi is prejudiced against blacks, he is not responding to their race as such. Rather the former supposedly assumes that the values and beliefs of black people are very different from his own and he dislikes blacks because of this. Thus, social expectations becomes the norms. In short, in social learning the individual is conditioned to respond in prescribed ways, to "internalize" the social world of customs and modes of behaviours into his own action system. The content of social learning consists of the body of ideas, values, and traditions which we call the culture of the group. Thus, while we come into the world with fundamental biological mechanism of behaviour, the direction our behaviour will
take and the meaning it will have are determined by the norms of the society comprising family and larger groups.

Learning of social norms is through social influence. Social influence refers to the change in an individual that occurs because of contact with other people. Conformity is a major source of social influence for adherence to social norms. Social conformity facilitates social interaction. Crutchfield (1955) assesses that the essence of conformity is the yielding to social pressure.

The fact of behaviour as well as the factors that enhance its occurrence have been demonstrated in literally by laboratory and field studies. Muzaf er Sherif, (1935) conducted his classical study on the development of social norms. Social norms are patterns of behaviour typical of a particular group and sanctioned by that group. In effect they become standards of reference by which the behaviour of individuals can be judged. Utilizing the autokineticeffect, Sherif showed that individual judgments could be made to converge to a group norm in the micro society of the lab. According to Sherif social interaction brings about conformity.

According to Asch (1951, 1956) conformity to social norms is through social influence, who observed this by conducting conformity experiments in visual perception of line drawing with seven to nine person
groups who were confederates and one naive subject. But the process of learning of social norms and exceptions is different in different individuals because of their personality make-up. According to Brody (1972) the study of personality rests ultimately on the fact of individual differences. Personality is the overall pattern of integration of his structure, modes of behaviour, interests, attitudes, intellectual ability, temperaments, aptitudes and many other distinguishable characteristics. Eysenck’s personality theory throws light on the underlying dynamic factors of individual differences in the area of learning of social norms and the effect of social influence. This has been demonstrated through laboratory studies of the formation of conditioned responses through eyeblink conditioning in humans. According to Eysenck (1947), some people condition better and some condition slowly. Eysenck traces this differentiation in individuals to Pavlov’s (1927) experiments with dogs who found that not all dogs condition alike. There were some dogs in whom the excitation was quicker built up of inhibition slower and as such they could be conditioned better.

Franks (1954) conducted an experiment on eyeblink conditioning with matched groups of hysterics, dysthymics and normals and found that dysthymics condition more quickly than hysterics. The crucial experiments conducted by Field and Branglemann (1961) with eyeblink
conditioning, Vogel (1961) with measures of GSR conditioning, Quay and Hunt (1965) with conditioning gave conclusive evidence that conditioning was related to introversion mainly.

Eysenck has attempted to relate his biological theory to social behaviour. His notion of socialization to his personality theory by organizing that introverts by virtue of their greater capacity to form conditioned responses than extraverts would be more socialized than extraverts who are undersocialized due to their relatively poor capacity to form conditioned responses. The greater conditionability of the introverts is attributed by Eysenck to a higher level of cortical arousal in the ascending reticular activating system (Gray, 1972).

Not only this, the relation of Introverts/Extraverts with academic success is also an established fact. Eysenck (1955, 1957) has emphasized time and again that the learning and performance are related to extraversion because of individual differences in level of cortical excitation and inhibition. EEG Studies have provided evidence that there is a lower level of cortical arousal in extraverts (Gales, Coles and Blaydon, 1969 & Shagas & Canter, 1971) Eysenck (1969) attributes better performance of introverts to higher arousal and poorer performance of extraverts to their poor arousal plus quicker cortical excitation and slower accumulation
of Ir (reactive inhibition) and its faster dissipation in Introverts. Himmelweit (1946) has found that hysteric s have a bad vocabulary in relation to their intelligence. Broadbent (1958) and Furneaux (1956) have found that students who do well in the University examinations have a lower score on extraversion. Dennis Child (1964, 1966) too obtained that the promoted children were significantly more introverted than the demoted ones. Similar results were reported by Savage (1962), Mohan and Mohan (1972), Mehta and Kumar (1985). Mehta, Kumar and Jerath (1989, 1990) obtained positive and significant relation between introversion and academic achievement among school and college subjects. In this regard it would be plausible to state that two implications may be drawn from this that introverts in educational and other psychomotor tasks opt for accuracy and extraverts for speed (Eysenck, 1947). Brebner and Cooper (1974) later elaborated that introverts are geared to inspect and Extraverts are geared to respond. Introverts are stimulus hungry and Extraverts response hungry. Later Kumari, Malhotra and Jerath (1986, 1989) also did experiment on speed and accuracy of introverts and extraverts on Choice Reaction Time and Visual Selection Task among 60 University male and female students. On Choice Reaction Time an indices of performance in terms of RT and errors committed, and on Visual Detection Task, the indices of
Performance were the number of digits detected and errors committed. In visual detection task extraverts showed superiority initially but committed more errors in the process. But gradually, the speed of extraverts decreased and the errors increased in comparison to those of introverts. Similarly in choice reaction time, the results show the superiority of introverts over extraverts in terms of speed. Thus, from the above studies it can be concluded that introverts gradually due to their steady arousal maintain the speed as well as accuracy. The contentious issue is that in the society we find that individual differ in terms of learning of social norms and expectations i.e. some uphold the norms and behave in accordance with the expected standard of behaviour. The present endeavour undertakes to study the difference in learning of social norms and expectations through the personality differences with in the framework of Eysenck's model, because Eysenck had stated in (1947) that introverts learns social norms and expectations better than extraverts who are poor in forming CRs. But the statement regarding norms remained in the realm of uncertainty because no systematic lab. study was conducted to test his contentions and it remained only an observational affair. The present investigation undertakes to study the differences in introverts & extraverts and males and females through Sherif's experiment of
antokinesis as how the two groups learn to adjust and retain the norm through interaction with a group of 3 to 4 comprising of introverts and extraverts and the two genders. Secondly, in the Asch's study it would be seen that how the introverts and extraverts behave under social pressure of the confederates in the line drawing experiment in the two sexes.

Apart from these experiments of social norms it would also be tested that how introverts & extraverts differ in their performance through two learning tasks.

The Present Problem

The present endeavor is designed to cover the psychodynamic process of learning of social norms of expectations through the autokinetic effect of perceptual line drawing task in the gender and personality groups as no direct attempt seemingly has been made.