CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Conceptual Framework and Review of Literature

In the previous chapter the present problem has been delineated in the form of social norms and social expectations being learnt separately i.e. simply and normally in different personality groups.

The focus of the present chapter would be on providing a theoretical foundation of the variables used along with the review of literature in the light of which the hypothesis of the present investigation would be formulated.

History of Social Norms

The history of social norms is as old as the history of civilization. Social norms develop due to needs and also due to joint effort more precisely due to individuals of the group through social dependence on others interaction. A recurrent question has often been raised by philosophers throughout the intellectual history of Western civilization - "How and why did organized social systems among men arise? The opinions and points
of view have been manifold. Plato, more than centuries before the time of Christ, suggested in "The Republic" that states originate because man, the individual, is not self sufficient. Plato argued that each man in order to satisfy his own essential goals needed the conjoint effort of others. Thus, his proposed answer to the question is a utilitarian one. He suggested that man is committed to be a social organism because of pragmatic, presumably reasonable, voluntary entry into cooperative organization.

Somewhat in contrast to Plato, Aristotle (also, some few centuries before Christ) in his Treatise on Politics posited an instinctual basis for man's entry into the organized social system. Like Plato, Aristotle conceived man to be clearly committed to social participation, but he suggested that man is bound by his inherent nature to be gregarious and affiliative with others. Aristotle's arguments like many that have followed, even into the twentieth century unfortunately tend to dismiss the most provocative aspect of the question by simply ascribing the basis of man's participation in societies to "human nature".

Recovery from the intellectual stagnation of the "dark" Middle Ages led eventually to a late Renaissance burst of intellectual and philosophical concern with the same old problems. The seventeenth century represents a phenomenal peak of intellectual
focus on social and political questions. A number of philosophers who have profoundly influenced the evolution of western political social thought wrote during this period, and perhaps not merely as coincidence, several crucial social movements followed within the century: the Protestant Reformation, the French Revolution, the settlement of the New World, and the origin of new focus of government in the New World. All of these carried the dominant theme of the dignity of the individuals within the framework of a social system. Rousseau, in the middle of the seventeenth century wrote the social contract as an exposition and extended development of the utilitarian notion that man's entry into organized social systems was essentially an act of compromise for his own eventual benefit.

John Locke, during the latter part of the seventeenth century, reiterated much of Rousseau's point of view, stressing particularly man's rationality. Locke, with rather strong convictions about the dominance of man's intellect over his emotions, found his attention on the argument that man is basically a rational and logical creature, and that his intellect underlies his practical and utilitarian decision to participate in social organizations.

Also during the seventeenth century, Hobbes wrote an intellectual fantasy about the origins of a hypothetical state, the Leviathan, which is essentially
congruent with the ideas of Locke and Rousseau in arguing that man voluntarily enters into social organization and thus evolves complex social systems. Although the many interpreters of Rousseau have difficulty in selecting his quotations to determine exactly how "good" or "bad" he thought society was for man, there is little doubt that Hobbes conceived social systems as highly ameliorative (become better) and ennobling (making noble). Rousseau referred in his writings to "the noble savage", implying that man in his preorganized state was essentially a noble and beneficent creature, and also to the fact that social organization was sometimes a set of "shackles" in which man is "enchained". Thus, there is some reason to argue that Rousseau regarded social organization as a "compromise" at best and as a "necessary evil" at worst.

Hobbes (1651 A.D.), in contrast, characterized the natural and presocial states of man as solitary, crude, and savage, and argued that it is through social organization that he is able to rise to something better. Locke (1689 A.D.), more of a neutralist in the matter, simply held that man is reasonable, and that he arrived at the logical conclusion that social organization is to his advantage. Bentham (1789 A.D.), stressed collective practicality and implied that man realizes, rationally, that
societies provide "the greatest good for the greatest number."

*There are certain prescientific notions of man and his fellow man regarding the basis of social interaction from which social norms develop. Following are these notions:

1. Confucius (520 B.C.), in "the Analects" said that the word shu serves as the principle of life (it means) do not do unto others what you do not want others to do you (social contract).
2. Plato (360 B.C.), in "The Republic" said that A state arises out of the needs of mankind. No one is self sufficing, but all of us have many wants (utilitarianism).
3. Aristotle (350 B.C.), in "Treatise on Politics", said that to live alone, one must be either an animal or god. Thus, he referred to the suggestions instinct.
4. Mathew (100 A.D.) in "The New Testament" said that, As ye would men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise. Thus, he emphasized the social contract.
5. Ibn - Khaldun (1378 A.D.) in 'Prolegomens' said that it is evident that men are by nature in contact with and tied to each other. Such contact may produce solidarity nearly as powerful as that produced by kinship. Thus, he

* These have not been seen in original but are taken from John V., McDavid and Herbert Harari, (1967) Social Psychology, Individual groups and societies. A Harper International edition. New York; London; ToKyo.
referred to gregarious instinct. (6) **Hobbes (1651 A.D.) in 'The Leucathan'** by emphasizing on beneficial social contract said that without social interaction, the life of man is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short. (7) **Locke (1689 A.D.) in an 'Essay on Human Understanding'** emphasized on rational social contract by saying that, for god having joined virtue and public happiness together, and made the practice thereof necessary to the preservation of society, it is no wonder that everyone should not only allow, but recommend and magnify those rules to others, from whose observance of them he is sure to reap advantage to himself (8) **Rousseau (1762 A.D.) in 'The Social Contract'** said that all men are created free. Society takes from man his native individual powers and equips him with other powers, which he cannot use without the assistance of others (men). (9) **Bentham (1789 A.D.) in the 'Introduction to Principals of Morals and Legislation'** said that social interaction is guided by the principle of utility; the greatest possible number of members of society.

Thus, the above quotations suggest that man participates in organized social systems voluntarily, by choice, and presumably for some purposive end which is the basis of social interaction. When the human interacts with others then only he learns to behave in the society. Hence dependence and interaction play a vital role in
learning social expectations. This is the first stage of the development of social norms.

Another set of ideas, developed during the latter part of the 19th Century, had a profound effect upon virtually all of the life sciences especially Darwin's theory of evolution and the survival of better adapted forms of life. Although Darwin's theories were primarily addressed to biological evolution and accounted for the apparent phylogenetic continuity of the world's variety of living organisms, they contained implications for social adaptation as well. Herbert Spencer (1855) and Lecomte de Nuoy (1947) articulated these implications in the argument that social evolution seemed to proceed also as though a principle of "survival of the fittest" were in operation.

Just as biologically well adapted forms of life were more likely to survive and reproduce their own kind, so also were socially well adapted organisms more likely to survive and perpetuate their forms of social adaptation. Thus, the utilitarian aspects of man's purposive entry into organized social systems were further emphasized by the claim that social organization has survival value and contributes directly to the maintenance of man as socially participating organism.
Thus, social norms are the essence of social interaction which serve as the basis for organized social system among humans.

**Concept of Social Norms**

A norm is a rule, standard, or pattern for action (from the Latin "norms", a carpenter's square or rule). Social norms are rules of conduct. The norms are the standards by reference to which behaviour is judged and approved or disapproved. A norm in this sense is not a statistical average of actual behaviour but rather a cultural (shared) definition of desirable behaviours.

Norms are mental models or guidelines by which, ideally we control and evaluate our action and that of others. Normative order is control because upon it largely depends the possibility of mutual cooperation, which should be taken here to include mutual non-interference of action units that are engaged in distinct activities.

Henri Jules, defines the social norms as the "law" (the rule or the principle) intended to orientate the behaviour in keeping with the values. We then call "norms", the rules of collective behaviour which, without our continuously assuming consciousness of them inspire our actions.
Norms are prescriptions serving as common guidelines for social action. Culture provides with a set of guide posts ready-made definitions of situations by which we align our individual actions to create social or joint actions, these guide posts are norms. Norms are rules that specify appropriate and inappropriate behaviour. Norms are expectations - consumption of ideal behaviours - that are shared by the members of a society at large or by the members of particular group within a society.

Human behaviour exhibits certain regularities, which are the product of adherence to common expectations or norms. In this sense human action is 'rule governed'. A social norm is not necessarily actual behaviour and normative behaviour is not simply the most frequently occurring pattern. Since the term refers to social expectations about 'correct' or 'proper' behaviour, norms imply the presence to legitimacy, consent and prescription while deviation from norms is punished by sanctions - norms are acquired by internalization and socialization.

Social norms play an important role in the regulation of social behaviour. Through social norm we distinguish between accepted and deviant behaviour. Social norms are nothing but those laws and values that have grown and developed for controlling social
behaviour of the humans i.e. the social interactions which regulate activities. It is these norms that determine the ideals of behaviour and society. Generally most of the members of the society accept them and their social behaviour is guided by them. These social norms determine and guide the status of different individuals.

Social norms are standards of behaviour that are agreed upon by group members and exert a powerful influence on social behaviour. They are thus considered to have agent characteristics, even though no actual person need be present when their influence occurs. At a minimum, it is only necessary for the focal person to be aware of the norm to be subject to its presence.

Social norms regulate the performance of the group as an organized unit. Social norms are those accepted criterion developed by the group that regulate the behaviour of the members of the group. Like other aspects of social organization, norms may be either formal as in the case of written constitution, by-laws or recorded laws governing conduct, or informal as in the case of unstated, more or less "intuitively" accepted conventions that bind participants in a society or group. Group norms specify not merely a "straight and narrow path" of prescribed behaviour, but a range of acceptable variability in behaviour.
Society and Social Norms

Social norms develop due to society. Groups cannot exist without rules that regulate the member's behaviour. The chief advantage of rules or norms has been discussed by Thibaut and Kelley (1959), who note that rules serve to coordinate behaviour, that is rules are established to avoid conflicts i.e. between a member's self interest and the groups interest or conflicts between group members and non group members.

The term "society" or "social group" can be applied to no animals other than humans for the ties that bind a human group are abstract social relations and not merely biological needs. Human beings depend upon each other from birth not only for physical and economic survival, but they also rely on each other socially and for personal development. Human beings alone live in true social groups. Although most animals, like humans, form groups, with even prolonged association, mutual dependence, and cooperation toward biologically common goals, only human social groups share sets of common meanings or symbols and social systems of mutual obligation. Although some people may say that certain human counterparts characterize the lives of other animals, human beings alone have such social institutions as a political state, an economic system, and a religion. Only humans have laws and moral judgments, and only
humans experience recurring and repeated social interaction leading to complex social relations. In this process of social interaction each individual, by his actions, takes into account what he considers to be the expectation of others, in turn his behaviour shows that he expects others to act toward him in a certain manner.

As a result of group experiences, a human being becomes dependent upon others for human associations, conversation, and social interaction. The importance of this dependence on groups can be demonstrated in situations where group contacts are removed e.g., prison officials have learned that solitary confinement, with its almost complete isolation from human association, is one of the most severe forms of punishment for any human being. A few days of this type of treatment will usually render the most defiant prisoner tractable. Admiral Byrd, the famous explorer of the Antarctic, voluntarily isolated himself for several months in uninhabited polar regions more than a hundred miles from the nearest human being of his expedition. He described his experiences of being alone and vividly showed how dependent the individual is on social groups when such contacts are removed.

Seeing interaction among individuals in pursuits of life and its betterment a group structure takes shape. The individuals take on different functions. Each
acquires a relative status. A routine and rules for the conduct of affairs are stabilized. Routines, rules, standards of conduct, values to uphold are thus byproducts of group interaction. Such a superstructure of rules, standards and values is referred to generically as the social norms of the group.

It is hardly possible to discuss group formation and functioning without discussing their products. Therefore, group norms figured prominently in our dealing with status relationships, leadership, and group functioning. When individuals with common motives or problems interact over a sufficient time span, a group structure evolves. Concomitant with differentiation of group structure, by products of the interaction process are stabilized in the form of catchwords, nicknames, jargon, slogans, customs, traditions, values and the like. Most of the byproducts thus stabilized may be referred to under the genesis term social norms.

Social norms refer to any criteria of experience and behaviours formed in group interaction which regulate the behaviour of individual members of relevant stimulus situations. Thus, norms represent standardized generalizations concerned with expected modes of behaviours in any matter of consequence to the group. Human social relations and behaviours are regulated through social norms. As standardized generalizations,
norms are concepts. They are concepts which are evaluative by nature. They not only encompass the given ranges of behaviour in relation to persons, objects and situations, but incorporate value judgements concerning them. Therefore, norms denote expected behaviour or even ideal behaviour. Social values or norms seldom specify just one point or a one single way of behaving like all concepts, norms encompass, a range of behaviour which is tolerable (permissible) to the group. The range of tolerable behaviour varies in extent, specificity, or permissiveness both in terms of the importance of the position of a particular member in the group hierarchy.

Through participation in the formation of group norms, individual members take part in the production of new values, new goals, new ideals. The individual acquires personally experienced motives which are truly social in origin. To the new group member, social norms are initially external. No matter what urgent pursuits brought individuals into interaction or led them into an existing group, they form new motives as they become functioning members of a group structure with particular norms. Men come into industrial plants primarily to earn a living for themselves and their families. If they are paid rates for each piece of work with a bonus for production above a certain level, it would seem that they would work and strive to produce as
much as possible, with in limits of their physical capacity and health. However, the worker in this situation finds himself in an informal work group. He soon learns from the others that one does not produce above a certain amount even if he can. There is a social norm governing production output, the good member of the group keeps his production within a certain range as governed by the norms. If he does not, he will receive notice from others in the form of comments, warnings, standardized physical annoyance or ostracism by the group members. Those who persist in ignoring the group norms for production, are the ones who do not relate themselves to the informal work group.

The fact that the production norm is informal working group may be below a feasible ceiling, for production does not indicate that the group norms usually bring a "levelling effect". In the case of this norm; there are reasons why adherence may result in lower production than is feasible for some individuals.

The social norms of the group make explicit a bottom and a ceiling for aspirations of individual members. They constitute a reference scale for the aspirations and experience of failure or success of individual members. Social norms provide one of the most important mechanisms of social control of the behaviour of individuals within a society. M. Sherif and
Carolyn (1936) have defined social norms in the following terms: "Super structure rules, standards and values is referred to generally as the 'social norms' of the group. In fact it is a social expectation."

Group norms regulate both diversity and uniformity within the group by prescribing rules of conduct for individual members of the group. Uniformity of individual behaviors within a group stem from variety of sources. For one thing, individuals who participate in a group are usually exposed simultaneously to the same general patterns of stimulation from events that confront the group and the environmental context of the group. Members of Boy Scout troop, for example, tend to be influenced by the same agents of socialization, by the same kinds of activities and by the same kinds of presentations of information about the world. Homogeneity of behavior among individual members of the troop develops in part because each member is individually influenced by the same kinds of forces surrounding the group, and not necessarily because of the factors within the group. Members of delinquent adolescent street gangs tend also to be homogeneous, although quite differently from Boy Scouts, because they too experience the same kinds of activities and are presented the same kinds of information about the world and certain patterns of stimulation that might be common
for delinquents may be quite rare for the average Boy Scout.

However, group norms also account for a great deal of uniformity among members of a group. There are at least two important ways in which group norms operate to induce uniformity of behavior: First, group standards may provide information and guidance to the individual with respect to matters he cannot handle independently. One may act like others in a group simply because he is uncertain as to how he might otherwise behave, he may merely look to others for information about possible actions that will be effective in meeting the circumstances. Thus, the influence of group norms on the individual may stem from his quest for information from other members of the group. Second, group norms may be a key to the individual's acceptance by others in the group. One may adhere to group norms because he sees direct values in uniformity and simply feels that some kind of advantage is to be gained by heaving as others expect. This advantage may be some instrumental means to satisfy his own personal goals, or it may be the reward of social acceptance and membership in the group or of interpersonal approval and nurturance. Thus, the influence of social norms on the individual may also stem from his quest for agreement with the group for its own sake.
Characteristics of Social Norms: Following are the essential characteristics of social norms:

1. **Norms are standards of group behaviour**: An essential characteristic of group life is that it is possessed by a set of values which regulate the behaviour of individual members. When a number of individuals interact, a set of standards develop that regulate their relationships and modes of behaviour. These standards of group behaviour are called social norms.

2. **Norms incorporate value Judgements**: Secord and Druckman say "A norm is a standard of behavioural expectations shared by group members against which the validity of perceptions is judged and the appropriateness of feeling and behaviour is evaluated." Members of a group exhibit certain regularities in their behaviour. Such regularities in behaviour have been explained in terms of social norms. Norms represents "standardized generalizations" concerning expected modes of behaviour. It may be said that norms are based on social values which are justified by moral standards or aesthetic judgements. A norm is a pattern, setting limits on individual behaviour, as defined by Broom and Selznick, "The norms are blueprints for behaviour, setting limits with in which individuals may seek alternate ways to achieve their goals."
(3) **Norms are related to factual world**: It may not however, be presumed that norms are abstract representing imaginary construct. Sociologists are interested mainly in 'operative norms', that is, norms that are sanctioned in such a way that violater suffers penalties in the group. Norms in order to be effective, must represent correctly the relations between real events. They must take into account the factual situation. Normative system, since it is meant to achieve results in the factual world should be related to the events in the real world.

(4) **Norms are both generalized and generalizable**: Norms are always to some extent both generalizable. They may refer to all human beings at all times and in all places or they may refer only to a specific category of persons in specific type of situation. A norm calls for "right action" and implies a generalizable reason for the rightness of the indicated conduct. Ultimately this propriety or rightness traces back to some standard of value that is taken without further justification as valid by the individual or group in question.

(5) **Norms are more than an idiosyncratic expression**: Norms are more than an idiosyncratic expression of the wants or desires of a particular person. Even quite specific norms imply a basis for assent by someone other than the norm sender himself. At the same time, norms
actually can guide conduct only if they prescribe or proscribe identifiable courses of action; therefore norms are more specific and socially imperative than values or ideals. For example, "honesty" is a generalized value (a conception of desirability) but it is still found socially necessary to have specific rules for concrete situations such as student's behaviour in examination or the financial responsibility of banking officials.

(6) **Norms are learned** : Norms are learned by individuals in social intercourse with others - that is, in the process of socialization. By definition, then norms are shared by two or more individuals. Some norms are particular to quite small groups, such as a husband-wife pair or a clique of friends, while other norms may be held by a large collectively that is one of several existing in one nation. Still other norms may be shared by most adult members of a nation or of an entire civilization.

(7) **Norms may arise in relation to any aspect of human activity** : Norms may arise in relation to any aspect to human activity and expectancy that comes to be regarded as of any importance or consequence. There are norms for perceiving, feeling, thinking, judging, evaluating and acting. Thus, there are cognitive and logical norms for carrying out scientific investigations, aesthetic norms for judging music etc. There are the norms of moral conduct which guide direct social interaction. The term "social
norm" may refer to any of these but most commonly is used to designate rules for social interaction.

(8) Norms are diverse: Norms are exceedingly diverse not only in their objects but in respect to their important properties in different societies and in different historical periods. Some norms are widely known, accepted and followed where as others are characterized by low consensus and only partial conformity. Some norms are learned early in life through identification and socialization. Others are acquired in later life through secondary social relations. To understand any particular norm it is important to know whether it has been "internalized" so as to become part of the conscience of self-ideal of the individuals in question, if so, there will be much conformity even if there is no external surveillance of conduct or punishment for deviant behaviour. Norms not thus internalized can be enforced only through external rewards and penalties. Those norms that are primarily enforced through punishment and threat contrast with standards that are maintained by a flow of the social rewards such as wealth, prestige or social approval. Great variations exist in consistency of enforcement, source of authority, degree of allowable variation in conformity, extent of deviance, and type of enforcing agency.
Legitimization of Norms: Social norms are supported by some form of legitimization, that is, an explanation of why the rule should be obeyed. In some cases the legitimization is fairly obvious; there is little need to justify the rules against murder, robbery and physical attack. In other cases, however, there is little rational reason for the rule; there is no known biological reason why adultery should be outlawed, why gentleman should shake hands, or why people should not smoke marijuana. In these cases the legitimization is usually based on appeals to Gods (Adultery is wrong because the Ten Commandments forbid it), or tradition ("well, we've always greeted others with a handshake"), or the good of the society ("what if everybody decided to smoke pot - nobody would work") often the legitimization makes no sense to the outsider, but to the people of the culture it provides adequate justification for the norms (see figure 3).

Sanctions: In addition to legitimization, norms are backed up by sanctions, either punishments or rewards; that literally "force" people to obey them. Sanctions for some norms are very minor. Using the wrong spoon or belching in public draws only frowns of disapproval at worst. Sanctions for major norms, however, are quite severe and include fines, imprisonment and even exile or death. Although Jails and electric chairs are available for
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the worst violators, social disapproval a weapon in almost all known societies is the usual punishment. The Amish a sect of the Mennonite practice a punishment called "Shunning" in which violators are systematically excluded from the activities of the community and avoided like the plague, in New England, the Puritans placed sinners in the stocks, not so much for physical punishment but for public ridicule and harassment, Eskimo tribes are often out as if a moral violator does not even exist, and they have been known to set up a separate home in which the offender lives in exile; in 1973 a cadet finally graduated from West Point who, because of his supposed cheating, was subjected to four years of "The Silence : a punishment in which no classmate at West Point ever spoke to him. In general, societies depend more on this kind of informal ridicule than on formal punishments dealt put by courts.

Not all sanctions are punishments, however, in many cases a person obeys the norms because of rewards - social prestige, money and power. Usually, the carrot is more effective than the stick. In effect people are rewarded if they obey the norms and punishment if they disobey them. Rewards and punishments are two sides of the same sanction coin.
Internalization of norms

The final reasons people obey the norms are that they are so constantly exposed to these cultural rules that they simply accept them as the natural way to act. After prolonged exposure people literally take the cultural rules and make them a part of themselves - they internalize them. People seldom have to be rewarded or punished for their behaviour, they are so socially brainwashed that they rarely think of doing anything to violate the norms. In most cases people literally do not realize that it is possible to violate the norms. The few obvious violations such as murder and other crimes cover up the fact that most of the time people simply cannot violate the norms because they do not know of alternatives. They obey the norms simply because they have been culturally taught that no civilized human would act otherwise. (see figure 3)

There are three types of norms

Folkways

Not all norms have the same seriousness; committing murder and violating etiquette are hardly on the same level. They are the most usual and least serious types of norms which are the customary patterns of behaviour that Sumner (1906) called folkways. The most
obvious way to determine the importance of a norm for the society is to observe how severely they punish who violate it. Norms which are not looked upon as extremely important or to state it another way, norms which can be violated without severe punishment - are called folkways. Adult males should wear coat and tie to church. People should be on time for appointments. Professors should not serve whisky in their offices. These are some of the folkways which refer to the old customs whose origins are lost in antiquity but continues to be followed (see figure 4).

Mores: Whereas, folkways are relatively minor regulations for social conduct, mores are serious social rules, people believe that if the mores are violated, the society may actually fall apart. Examples of American mores include protection of young, helpless children, patriotism to the nation, monogamy and sexual fidelity to one's mate, male leadership in dating, respect for elderly people, and reverence in church. The legitimization for mores come from people's sincere belief that if they are violated, reasonable social life would be impossible. Of course this legitimization is not necessarily valid. Bigamy might very well alter the present family structure, but would it destroy the society? Would female leadership in dating cause society to crumble? The objective facts do not justify people's fears about violating mores, but since
people firmly believe them, they obey them. Sanctions for violating norms can be severe (see figure 4).

Figure 4: Comparison for 3 kinds of Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Folkways</th>
<th>Mores</th>
<th>Laws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Minor rules about social conduct</td>
<td>Major rules of conduct deemed essential by society</td>
<td>Formally enacted norms enforced by police power, codified into documents and sanctioned by specific penalties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Dress, patterns, dating table manners</td>
<td>Adultery rules, Incest taboo, patriotism.</td>
<td>Laws against murder, stealing, using drugs or fixing prices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimiza-tion</td>
<td>Tradition: &quot;That's just the way we have always done it&quot;</td>
<td>Religious observances</td>
<td>Official enactment by the state &quot;for the good of the people.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Sanction</td>
<td>Minor social gossip and ridicule</td>
<td>Severe ridicule in social relationship physical attack</td>
<td>Enforcement by police and courts: fines, imprisonment and death.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Laws: Some norms, considered so important that their enforcement cannot be left to chance, are made into law. Laws are norms with several special characteristics.

1. Laws are formally enacted by the states. The legitimization for law is an official enactment.
2. Laws are not left open to informal public understanding; they are codified into written documents that are precise and subject to legal interpretation.
3. Laws have special enforcement agents: police, judges, district attorneys, lawyers and so forth.
4. Laws have definite, specified sanctions. Whereas the penalty or reward for less serious norms may vary considerably, the penalty for disobeying a specific law is clearly stated in the law itself. If you rob a bank, you get 20 years in jail; if you murder your landlord, you get life imprisonment or death (see figure 4)

Functions of Group Norms

Social norms have four major functions.

1. Group Maintenance: Norms help groups to maintain themselves as a group.
2. Group Locomotion: Norms help groups to accomplish their goals.
3. **Social Reality**: Norms help the groups to create and maintain a commonly shared frame of reference which seems as a social reality.

4. **Defining relationship to social surroundings**: Norms help group members to define their relationship to social surroundings such as other groups, organization, institutions and other components of the society.

**Group norms are social products**

A necessary condition for the formation of group norms is interaction of individuals with common motives or problems over a time span. One person cannot form a social norm. Since group norms are products of interaction, the concept is a sociological designation. Social norms refer to any criteria of experience and behaviour formed through group interaction which regulate the behaviour of individual members in relevant stimulus situation. Since social norms are formed by individuals interacting in groups, the terms, "said norm" and group norm may be used interchangeably. Some use the term group standard. At some time in past, or recent history - social norms evolved in specific group interaction. When that group and its membership can be specified, group norm is the more accurate term since it makes explicit the relationship between behavioural
criteria and group membership. Characterized here, group norm is a generic term, concerning a host of products of past and contemporary group interaction. Among these are social values, standards, customs, mores, folkways, rules, fads and fashions. However, referring to these various social products generically does not imply that they are identical.

Social norms of any description represent standardized generalization concerning expected behaviour in matters of consequences to the group or groups in question. In other words, social norms represent one particular kind of concept. Like all concepts, norms refer to groupings or classes of items. They do not usually refer to just one behaviour for one specific situation. A concept denotes a generalization encompassing a range of items with more or less clear limits.

The feature distinguishing norms from concepts in general is their evaluative nature as evident in the examples. Social norms incorporate value judgements pertaining to a range of items. They imply evaluations of modes of behaviour relative to persons, objects or situations. Specifically norms refer to the expected or even ideal behaviour in matters of some importance to the group.
Norms are not formed by all groups in relation to every kind of behaviour and every possible situation. They are formed in matters of consequence to the group in question. Ordinarily, the relationships among members and the unity and continued existence of the group as a social unit are consequential to any group.

The scope of behaviour regulated by norms varies considerably in different groups. For example, the norms of most Protestant Churches in America today pertain chiefly to ethical matters. However, some sections like certain memonite groups have norms concerning a much broader area of life, including apparel, modes of transportation, forms of entertainment, schools and so on.

The average behaviour of members in a group may or may not coincide with that denoted by its norms at any given period in its history. In fact, certain norms may set such a high level for desirable conduct that average behaviour of members could approach it only at exceptional times. Nevertheless, the degree of adherence to major group norms by members is one index of solidarity in the group.

When the behaviour of member begins to diverge consistently from the bounds implied by group norms, it is safe to predict significant changes in group functioning. The nature of such change depends of course on other factors. It may be that as a result of external
conditions or internal frictions, the group is in the process of disintegration or changed conditions facing a group may lead to weakening its norms and to the formation of new norms more congruent with the new conditions. In modern differentiated societies, the degree of adherence to norms in a particular group is affected by the fact that members frequently belong to a number of groups. These various groups may have conflicting or even contradictory norms. Therefore, the degree of adherence to norms in one group may in part a function of the extent to which norms of other reference groups of the membership are congruent with them.

When informally organized groups function once a period of time, norms become formalized and may even be written down as rules, regulations and laws. Analysis of formalized norms and legal regulations in large social organization has to begin in by specifying the different groups functioning within the larger structure, their norms and the power relations among those groups which are most influential in establishing the laws and in enforcing them. Large organizations today are seldom composed of just one group encompassing all individuals, although this might still be the case in relatively small, isolated societies. As a recent analysis for French governmental structure indicates, persons with in such
structure may be members of groups with widely differing norms and interests.

**Classification of Norms**

Norms may be classified according to the degree of their acceptance, the mode of any given norms enforcement, the way any norm is transmitted, and the amount of conformity required by the norm. Some norms are fairly stable in nature, others are more localized. Some social norms may require considerable force to ensure compliance, others may require little or none. Rarely are individuals in a society consciously aware of the often arbitrary nature of the social norms of a culture or subculture, since they have been introduced to them in the ongoing process of living. They have been learned in this process and transmitted through groups from generation to generation; in this way each individual has incorporated into his own life organization the language, the ideas, and the beliefs of the groups to which he belongs. In the maintenance of order, norms are crucial. They may be regarded as cultural ideals, or they may be considered in terms of actual behaviour in a statistical sense: for example sexual norms can be examined as cultural ideals or in terms of actual practices. Ideal cultural norms can be inferred from what people say or by
observing what they support through their sanctions in the form of rewards or penalties.

Norms may emerge in a variety of situations/ways: institutions may prescribe behaviour (institutional norm formation), they may be created by a social contract (voluntary norm formation) or they may gradually emerge without either bargaining or the involvement of norm making institution (evolutionary norm formation). There are three types of norm formation.

(1) Institutional Norm Formation: especially in industrial societies, either certain individuals (for example owners of firms, heads of departments, kings or dictators) or institutions (example parliaments or bureaucracies, boards of films or of voluntary organizations) may be authorized to form and enforce norms, and thereby regulate the behaviour of certain groups of individuals. Since institutions or persons occupying certain positions in institutions state the norms, we may speak of institutional norm formation.

(2) Voluntary Norm Formation: Norms may also emerge because groups i.e. two or more persons reach a voluntary agreement that some of their actions are on the one hand, compulsory, or on the other hand forbidden. A collective decision may also operate to enforce a norm. Such voluntary norm formation may effect only two
people (example neighbours agreeing to take it in turns to meet the border between their gardens) or it may occur among all the citizens of a country (as in the case of a referendum). A characteristic of voluntary norm formation is that only those who participate in the decision are actually affected by it.

**Evolutionary Norm Formation:**

Unlike institutional or voluntary norm formation, in the case of evolutionary norm formation, norms and or measures for their enforcement are not explicitly stated or planned. This is the critical difference between this and the two previously discussed types of norm formation. Thus, norms are the unreflected result of social development according to Megner. They develop as a result of trial and error (Thibaut and Kelley, 1959) in an unplanned and obscure manner rather than by deliberate inauguration (Davis, 1966), in a process of gradual change according to Demsetz, or they develop spontaneously or in an evolutionary way according to Von Hayek. These writers in all, in their own terms are referring to evolutionary norm formation.
"Conformity" and Deviation Imply the Existence of Norms

The existence of norms is inferred from the general sorts of behaviour: conforming behaviour on one hand and deviation or nonconformity on the other (Berg and Bass, 1961).

The terms "conformity" and deviation (nonconformity) imply two definite conditions. First they both imply the existence of some standard or norm in terms of which particular behaviour is evaluated. Second, they both imply membership in a social group which possesses the norm in question.

It is obvious that an individual's behaviour can be characterized as "conforming" or "nonconforming" only in relation to a relevant standard or norm for the behaviour in question. Furthermore, "conformity" and "deviation" are meaningful characterizations of behaviour only when the individual whose behaviour is in question is a member of a group possessing the norm. It would be observed to speak of a Methodist who refrains from dipping his fingers in holy water at a Catholic Church as a "nonconformist" or "deviate". Therefore, it is seldom feasible to refer in an overall way to the conformity or deviation of a large population for a particular social norm. Most large populations, like modern nations are composed of diverse groups with different or even
contradictory norms in some respects. Of course, some norms will be common to all groups in the general culture. But the meaningful analysis of conformity to social norms in such large population starts by referring specific norms to membership in specific groups. What appears at first sight, to be deviation by large sections of a population or "patterned evasion" may in fact be conformity to other norms by members of groups who are at an advantage in the power structure at the time. For example, a legal regulation exists in the state of Oklahoma today prohibiting the sale of intoxicating beverages. "Patterned evasion" or deviation from this legal norm exists. However, a recent referendum and continuing agitation for enforcement indicate that the law in question represents a functioning norm for a considerable portion of the population. This part of the population has identifiable group memberships. Certain other organized groups support the law for reasons related to their own interests. Widespread and continuing deviation from legal norms becomes possible when groups within the population do not possess the norm and when the membership of these groups is in position to influence enforcement processes. Thus, deviance in the recognised violation of cultural norms (see figure 5)
Each and every normative pattern creates the possibility for deviance. Many societies retain traditional norms that women should be soft and submissive; in this context, women who develop their physical strength or those who are assertive may be viewed as deviant.

Typical examples of conforming behaviour which reveal a group norm may be observed in functioning group units. Members of Youthful gangs in New York City in the 19th century were identifiable through their conformity in matters of dress (see figure 6). The "Shirt Tails"; all wore their shirts outside of their trousers. The "Plug Uglies"

Sutherland, in his differential association theory of deviance, suggested that criminal and deviant behaviours are learned in group interaction. Members of gangs, for example, socialize one another as to what type of behaviour are appropriate or inappropriate and what norms and laws can be violated.
adopted large plug hats which they stuffed with wool and leather and drew down over their ears during fights. Some gangs wore stripes of a certain colour on their trousers. The recent zoot-suit styles and their modifications are well known. When workers taking part in a strike refuse to participate in the services of their church because a nonstriker is present or when "strike breakers" are ignored by people they have known for years, it can be inferred that a group norm formed in previous or current strikes is regulating behaviour toward those who do not take part.

A norm is not always a prescription for a single act; it is, more typically, a set of categories defining classes of acceptable and objectionable behaviour. It follows that in assessing norms, the norm cannot be represented as a point or as a single value. This deduction is particularly important in determining whether an action is conforming or represents a case of deviation.

Groups everywhere recognize individual differences within an acceptable range. It follows that a social norm is best represented as a class of behaviour that are acceptable or permissible and a class of behaviour that are objectionable and punishable. Social norms define a latitude of acceptance and a latitude of rejection.
What kinds of data are needed to characterize a norm, hence to provide the baseline for assessing conformity or deviation by single members? Research has included the following observations:

1. Observed similarities and regularities (over time) in attitudes and behaviour among one set of persons that are not evident in another set and that vary within more or less definite limits.

2. Increasing similarity or convergence toward a range and mode of behaviour during interaction over time. For example, the entrance of a new member into a group or confrontation by a new problem situation provides an opportunity to detect the existence of a norm.

3. Sanctions (correctives) for certain behaviours and praise or regards for other behaviours. Reactions to deviations and to idealized behaviour are among the best indicators of the existence of norm and its limits. Sanctions may range from disapproval, frowns, a silent treatment, to threats and actual punishment.

Social Norms and Individual Behaviour

We are frequently admonished by our elders and our teachers to think about what we are doing. The late philosopher Alfred North Whitehead once remarked
that this advice is nuisance if it is meant to apply to the ordinary affairs of life. As a matter of fact, he continued, the more things we can do without thinking, the better off we are. If we had to reflect and deliberate and think about what we are going to do when we enter a store, classroom, cafeteria, or ticket line and meet a clerk, teacher, cashier or ticket seller, we should be able to accomplish only a very small number of our objectives in the course of a day. The principal function of the norms for the individual is thus to reduce the necessity for decision in the innumerable social situations that he confronts and in which he participates. Without them, we should be faced from moment to moment with an almost intolerable burden of decisions. One can only imagine the confusion that would result in the absence of norms.

Indeed it can readily be seen that without norms social relations would be haphazard, chaotic and possibly even dangerous. It is the norms therefore that give order stability and predictability to social life and that in consequence, all exceedingly important elements of the social structure. A situation of complete normlessness, or anomaly, as Durkheim (1915) called it would be intolerable, and no normless or anomie society could long endure. As anarchy is the contradiction of government, so anomaly is the contradiction of society. Where there are no norms, there is also no society. Thus,
it is the norms that make possible the orderly social intercourse of people in societies and thus serve the individual as guides to conduct.

Social Norms are Initially External to the Individual

To a growing child, or a new member of an organized group, norms are at first external and are revealed through the actions and words of other people. Awareness of knowledge of norms does not lead automatically to regulation of behaviour by them.

Studies of children by Piaget (1932) and other have shown that young children first respond to the dicta (formal saying) of adults and rules of play set by elder children in much the same way that they respond to physical restraints. Moral dicta and rules are external stimuli which the child responds to and regards in a rather absolute fashion. Although he falls away from them under the firm hold of momentary desire or in the flow of fantasy, they tend to be regarded as final and inflexible, resting on the authority of Mommy or Daddy. However, as the child matures, he interacts with other children and grasps the notion of reciprocity with others. In the process of reciprocal interaction, the child comes to see rules or norms as based on mutual agreement. He finds that they can be changed and that new rules can be made. When he begins to take part in the process of changing
and making rules himself, they truly become his "own" rules by which he abides through inner autonomy. Thus, the crucial condition for willing, autonomous, and even enthusiastic internalization of social norms is participation in reciprocal interactions with other people.

**Properties of Social Norms**

Social norms have a variety of properties.

1. They shape behaviour in the direction of shared values or desirable states of affairs.
2. They vary in degree to which they are functionally related to important values.
3. They are enforced by the behaviour of other persons.
4. They vary in how widely they are shared; they may be society wide, or they may belong to groups of varying sizes, even as small as a two person group.
5. They vary in the range of permissible behaviour; some norms set more stringent limits on behaviour than others.

**Social Differentiation and Subcultural Norms**

In complex modern societies, group norms may differ radically or only slightly from one another; in other cases the norms simply differ in emphasis. As a result persons who belong to a number of groups, with each group having either different norms or emphasizing them
differently, may experience much personal conflict. The norms and social roles a person acquires from the family group do not necessarily always agree with the norms and social roles of the play group, the age or the peer group, work group or political group. Certain groups may become more important to an individual's life organization than others, and he may as a result, tend to conform more closely to the norms of the groups with which he feels more closely identified. Although the family group is important, it is only one of the many groups related to a person's behaviour, whether deviant or nondeviant. Many other sources of norms and social relationships in modern societies are important: social class, occupation, neighbourhood, school, church, and the gang or clique (Robert Edgerton, 1976).

The subcultural norms of most large societies, because of the degree of social differentiation, are so diverse that in all probability only a few norms are accepted as binding on all persons. Sometime the social groups that have arisen in the manner described here may develop and share a set of values and meanings shared by society of which they are a part. When this occurs, such a group may be called a subculture. Simply speaking, a subculture is a "culture within a culture". The social norms and behaviour of social classes in the United States vary greatly with respect to many attitudes and values.
The norms of Longshoremen differ from those of doctors and professors; construction workers display markedly different attitudes than do college students. Child-rearing patterns have been shown to differ significantly. Lower-class parents, for example, tend to use corporal punishment more often as a disciplinary measure than do middle-class families. Nearly all crimes of violence, such as murder and forcible rape are committed by lower-class persons. Prostitution appears to be more prevalent among the lower-classes. The more ordinary, overt type of crime, such as burglary, are rare among members of the middle and upper classes; members of these groups are more involved in types of crimes termed white collar crimes. Such crimes of a different type, involving more sophisticated fraud and deception, are committed by white collar persons in the middle and upper classes, such as government officials, people in business, labour union leaders, doctors and lawyers. Neighbourhoods in large U.S. cities are often characterized by distinct behavioural norms and values. Those of one neighbourhood may contribute to the development of stealing among teenaged boys who regard it as a form of recreation or the means to gain social status, in another neighbourhood the social norms and values may encourage teenage participation in scouting programs or other community directed programs/activities more conducive to nondelinquent
behaviour. The neighbourhood norms of one area may define policemen as "enemies", while in another they are defined as symbols of respect for law.

Thus, in modern complex societies there may be almost as pronounced differences among the groups within the society in respect to the norms of accepted behaviour as there are differences between large cultures themselves.

Norms in the western countries and in the eastern countries are entirely different. People in western countries live an independent life from the very beginning. Parents adopt permissive approach in the development of their children. Thus, the more the freedom, the more is the aggressiveness which leads to violation of norms and thus indulge in crimes (See figure 7). That is

In Saudi Arabia, women cannot vote, drive a car, or appear in public without being veiled. Given this rigid regulation, crimes by women are rare. In the United States, women have much more freedom over what they do and how they dress. This greater freedom is reflected in crime rates that are steadily moving closer to those of men. Even so, women have less power and remain subject to more extensive social control than men.
why crime rate in western countries are much higher as compared to those of eastern countries for example in Britain which is just based on norms and there is no written court. But by and by as they are offing towards materialism, the written constitution is heading.

Factors associated with deviant behaviour, criminal behaviour and violence

(1) Urbanization

Almost everywhere, the spread of urbanization - in the United States, Europe, Latin America, Africa and Asia - has been accompanied by a marked increase in various forms of deviant behaviour. While city living has characterized some areas for centuries, urbanization has increased at such an accelerated rate over past century that today it encompasses hundreds of millions of people throughout the entire world. Urban life has produced what some people have called the mass society. It has greatly increased social differentiation, the clash between norms and social rules, and the break down of interpersonal relations (Gilbert, Geis, 1979).

Following the civil war, the United States changed from a society of rural communities to one of the most urbanized in the world. Urbanization leads to deviant behaviour. Since Greek and Roman times writers
have contrasted the morality of rural areas. On the whole modern cities as compared with rural areas, do appear to have higher rates of crime, illegal drug usage, heavy drinking and alcoholism, homosexual behaviour and mental disorder (Clinard, Marshall, B., 1965). Over 50 years ago, the French sociologist Emile Durkheim maintained that crime increases directly with the volume and density of the population. Urban life tends to foster increased individual freedom of normative choice. Norm and role conflict, or diversities of norms and behavioural standards, create situations in which no single standard is likely to upheld and in which deviation from it is not met with penalizing sanctions. The end result of urbanism is the creation and the strengthening of a variety of subcultures, and the norms of these subcultures are often conducive to deviance. The large city populations provide what is termed the "critical mass" of deviants as well as the opportunity to commit deviant acts.

(2) Rapid Cultural Change

Rapid social and cultural change and disregard for the importance of stability through the generations also characterize urban life. Consequently, elements that are traditional, or "scared", dwindle in importance. Sometimes the practical exigencies of urban life produce these changes; at other times, they seem to be outgrowth
of the failure of informal controls to uphold and to maintain the older values and ideologies. Urban living has brought such great changes in the modern family, as has been pointed out, that it is often referred to as the "urban family" the modern family is both a characteristic and a result of urban life. The reduced size of modern people are more often known for their gadgets than for themselves. People increasingly come to judge others by how well they display their wealth a display Veblen termed "conspicuous consumption". Persons emphasize the importance of status symbols in urban society, and it is on the basis of such readily visible criteria that status is assigned. Because of the status money and material goods provide, criminality, both in the lower and upper classes, becomes higher in urban areas.

(3) Mobility: Urban societies generally tend to regard mobility favourably, but frequent moves may have unsatisfactory effects. They tend to weaken attachments to the local community, particularly among primary or face to face contacts, to make persons less interested in maintaining certain communities, standards, and to increase contact with secondary groups of diverse patterns, thus weakening bonds which help to provide the basis for social control among members of local groups. As persons become more mobile they come in contact with many other different norms, and they begin to understand
that other codes of behaviour differ from their own. Mobility often means the loss of such personal relationships and kinship and neighbourhood ties and fewer close friendships. As a result of these factors, social controls and also legal controls are weakened.

(4) Materialism: External appearances and material possessions have become a primary importance in modern urban society, where people are more often known for the gadgets than for themselves. People increasingly come to judge others by how well they display their wealth, a display Veblen termed "consumption." Under urban conditions, the types of clothes a person wears or the automobile he drives, the costliness of his home and its furnishings, the exclusiveness of the club or association to which he belongs, and the knowledge of his salary or the amount of his financial assets are the sole means other have to judging him or his success in life. Persons emphasize the importance of status symbols in urban society (Erving Goffman, 1959), and it is on the basis of such readily "visible" criteria that status is assigned. Because of the status money and material goods provide, criminality, both in the lower and upper classes, becomes higher in urban areas.

(5) Individualism

Urban persons tend to regard their over interests and self-expression as paramount in their social
relations. The "I" feelings come to replace much of the feeling of cooperation characteristic of rural life. People increasingly feel that they must look after their own interests and increase their status through their own efforts. The urban person's strong belief is hedonism or personal happiness as the ultimate goal of life is increasingly seen. Individualism leads to competition. The extreme individualism and the competition of urban areas account, in part for their higher rates of crime, alcoholism, suicide and mental disorder.

As urbanism increases and conformity to social norms becomes less affected by informal group controls, greater opportunities and inducements develop for behaviour which deviates from that of others or the norms of others. As impersonality increases and intimate communication declines in the city, normative violations produce less and less informed censure of the kind seen in the rural areas. The conflicting normative experience in an urban setting tend to weaken parental authority and other traditional controls over youth and also over all individuals. As a result, responsibility for controlling behaviour in cities is shifting more and more to the police, the courts, and other agencies of government that tend to enforce the norms of certain power groups.
Society with a Higher Crime Rate

Criminality involves the learning of norms and attitudes conducive to law violation whether it is matter of burglary, an income tax violation, or false advertising. Some of these norms and attitudes are derived from society, and they may lead to criminality itself. Barron lists six values that are related to the high crime rate in the United States (Barron, Milton, L., 1974).

1. Success: Success is undoubtedly one of the prime values in the culture. When people come to the realization that they cannot attain success by conventional hard work and thrift, many are apt to turn to delinquency and crime.

2. Status and Power Ascendence: Americans have traditionally been status conscious, and the struggle for higher status marks the history of most of the immigrant groups coming into this country. When status and power desires are thwarted, they may be obtained through illegal means.

3. Pecuniary and Material Wealth: Money and the desire for success and status are closely interrelated, but money as much as any single symbol has come to denote "worthiness". "It is often not what a person is that matters, but rather what he has." Most of the crimes that are eventually punished through the courts are theft related.
(4) Resistance to authority: The "rugged individualism" and the "pioneer spirit" are still valued in U.S. society many years after their function in settling the country has waned. Americans tend to resist rules, and they prefer to be free from too many controls. In fact, complete conformity to rule is often ridiculed in our society because it indicates a person's failure to show independent spirit.

(5) Toughness: This value is particularly associated with males, but females also demonstrate this in psychological ways. Males are often defined in terms of toughness and on specific occasions, they show others how tough they are.

(6) Dupery: The best example of dupery relates to consumer fraud. The ability to manipulate people is an important value, it is prevalent for e.g., in the sometimes indistinguishable line between white collar crime and good hard business. Perhaps the best e.g. of dupery relate to consumer fraud. One study of a number of occupations showed that false repairs were made on merchandise actually in working order. This study reported that watch repairmen were the most honest of those surveyed, though they too were dishonest to some extent. For the watch repairmen, "the test . . . . was made by loosening the little screw that fasten the winding wheel in the watch. Of the 462 watch repairmen investigated throughout the
nation only 49% lied, overcharged, gave false diagnoses, or suggested expensive and unnecessary repairs. A bare majority of 51% were honest, only 8 of them charging nothing at all (Barron Milton, L., 1974).

A Low-Crime-Rate Society

Generally, high rates of conventional crime accompany a high degree of urbanization, industrialization, and affluence, as in U.S. society. Switzerland, however, represents an exception to this general rule. In terms of per capita wealth, it is the richest industrial country in the world, yet its crime rate is far less serious than it is in the next most affluent western countries (Sweden, the United States, and the Federal Republic of Germany). The crime rate in Switzerland is much lower than the aforesaid affluent countries due to the unique government and the political structure as well as to its historical development. The process of urbanization has been slow and the cities have never become too large (the largest Swiss city has a population of about 425,000 as compared with, for example Stockholm with nearly a million). The Swiss citizen's widespread sense of responsibility and active participation in community affairs affects each individual's behaviour and that of other, including compliance not only with the generally accepted social
norms but also with the law. It is commonly said, that in Switzerland "everyone is his own policeman". The people are conscious of the judgement that others make of behaviour that violates laws and regulations and thus risks public censure. The possibility of public censure restrains many from getting into trouble; in fact, the desire to avoid public censure is more conducive to conformity than fear of police reprimand. Here the family ties are very strong, even in urban areas which maintains the contacts between age groups and more conformity in the family due to which the crime rate is less, although it is developing due to urbanization process in industrialized societies in Switzerland (Clinard, Marshall, B., 1978).

**Enforcement of Norms**: Norms are enforced by means of sanctions. This term refers to the actions of other or of an actor himself that have the effect of rewarding conformity and punishing non-conformity to norms by facilitating or interfering with the need gratification of the individual. Positive sanctions involve the usage of reward or other forms of satisfaction such as approval or praise. Negative sanctions involve the use of punishment or deprivation of satisfactions. Further, where the source of reward or punishment is the behaviour of others, the term external sanction is employed. Where the source is with in the actor, internal sanction is used. Examples of
external sanctions are giving an employee a raise in pay or docking an employee who is late for work. Examples of internal sanctions are a feeling of pride for having conformed to a norm in the face of strong temptation to violate it or a feeling of guilt for having failed to conform.

Social norms include not only an overt behaviour but also verbal behaviour associated with in individual's perceptions, thoughts or feelings. Thus, norm is defined as an expectation shared by group members which specifies behaviour that is considered appropriate for a given situation. Two features of expectations which are especially important for understanding the concept of social norms are their anticipatory nature and their normative quality.

(a) **Anticipatory nature of expectation**: An individual regularly expects that he will behave in a certain manner, and he actually has definite expectations concerning the behaviour of persons with whom he interacts. This anticipatory quality of interaction is important because it guides the behaviour of an individual. One anticipates how the other persons might react to his various actions and shapes his behaviour accordingly. Often these anticipations take the form of rehearsing one's social interactions before they transpire.
(b) **Normative quality of Expectations**: Stems from the fact that only when one is able to anticipate consistently the behaviour of others can one maximize one's reward-cost costumes. The extent to which expectations are normative varies in proportion to the importance of reward and costs involved.

Social norms come to govern individual behaviour through the process known as socialization. Social norms provide one of the most important mechanism of social control of the behaviour of individuals within the society. By means of normative social control, the behaviour of individuals within an organized social system is regulated within acceptable limits that maximize the likelihood of survival of the system. It is through the process of socialization that cultural social values and norms come to govern individual behaviour. Without the process of socialization, societies would not endure in any consistent form.

Now a days social psychology is equally interested in the problems of norm formation and change. There is nothing final or absolute about social custom, tradition and values. Social norms grow slowly as a result of social interaction. Social norms do change, though very slowly at times. As a social psychological problem, the problem of social norms is at least as important as the
problem of conformity-deviation to existing standards. Social norms develop due to society and social influence in the form of its various agencies.

**Conformity and Social Norms**

Social influence refers to the change in an individual that occurs because of contact with other people in the process of producing this change, people are affected by the presence, opinion or behaviour of others. Social influence is exercised in six fundamentally different ways i.e. information, record, coercion, expertise, reference identification, legitimacy.

This is often asked as why do people change their views when they come in contact with other people. The answer to this widely asked question is social influence which leads to conformity. Conformity acts a source of social influence for adherence to social norms.

Social conformity facilitates social interactions. Conformity occurs when individuals change their behaviour in order to adhere to existing social norms - widely accepted rules indicating how people should behave in certain situations or under specific circumstances (Moscovics, 1985). Thus, it represents a crucial means through which groups or even entire societies mould the actions of their members. A clear example of conformity is provided by the fact that most
persons speak in a whisper when in libraries or hospitals, even if they usually prefer to converse in louder tones. They do so because both formal and informal rules indicate that this is the correct way to behave. Pressure toward conformity exist in many ways/settings and often exert profound effects upon social behaviour. Krechetal (1962) assesses that the essence of conformity is the yielding to social pressure. According to Allen (1965) conformity is a change in the behaviour of a person due to group influence resulting in the increased congruence between the individual and the group.

Social influence is subject to external and internal factors. The various external or internal factors are cohesiveness, group size, social support, sex, social status and organismic factor of personality.

1. Cohesiveness : is the degree of attraction to the influencing group. It is defined as the total field forces acting on members to remain in the group stemming from cohesiveness is the property called the "internal power of the group", which is defined as the magnitude of change, the group can exert in its members. The degree of internal power will be equal to the magnitude of the force on the number to remain in the group. Cohesiveness may be defined as the tendency to stick together and be in accord. The amount of cohesiveness not only varies from
group to group but also within the group from time to time. The group cohesiveness refer to the degree to which the members of a group desire to remain in the group. Thus, the members of a highly cohesive group in contrast to one with a low level of cohesiveness, are concerned with their membership and are therefore, more strongly motivated to contribute to the group welfare. It implies cooperation among members, affiliation and loyalty to the group. Thus, attraction toward a particular group to which we belong, or towards its individual members, is usually described by the term cohesiveness and there is little doubt about the impact of this factor upon conformity. The more cohesiveness of the group, the more will be conformity or adherence to the social norms. Cohesion is developed through social interaction. There are fewer deviates from highly cohesive groups than from less cohesive groups (e.g. Forsyth, 1983).

Thus, the more attractive a group is to its individual members, the greater the probability of their conforming to group goals and expectations and the more likely prospective members are to be willing to adjust their attitude and behaviour patterns in order to obtain membership. The highly attractive group can demand more than other groups can because the individual member will get more in return, such as higher satisfaction and status.
College fraternities and sororities are a good e.g. of these processes.

The more cohesive the group, the more likely it is able to impose negative sanctions on nonconforming group members. Sanctions imposed by less cohesive groups - groups to which members are less committed are likely to lack the effectiveness that coincide with high cohesiveness and commitment.

However, cohesive groups are not only characterized by higher levels of conformity, but they also face the very real danger of nonconformity. Thus, the more amiability and esprit de corps amount the members of an in group of policy makers, the greater is the danger that independent critical thinking will be replaced by group think which is likely to result in irrational and dehumanizing actions directed at outgroups according to Janis. A high degree of group cohesiveness is conducive to a high frequency of symptoms of group think, which is then are conducive to a high frequency of defects in decision making. Cohesiveness, then, is an important factor affecting conformity, but its consequence can be functional as well as dysfunctional (see A 8 in appendix section).

(2) Group Size: Second factor that exerts important effects upon our tendency to conform is the size of the influencing group. One might guess or think that the
greater the number of persons around us who act in the same manner or who state some opinion, the greater our tendency to do the same i.e. to conform. But, this is not true. In fact, the relationship between the size of the group and conformity is complex. Conformity pressures rise quickly upon 3-4 members but, beyond this level, it has less additional effects as individuals exposed to social pressure may begin to suspect collusion (e.g. Gerard, Wilhelmy and Conolley, 1968). They may conclude that members are not expressing individual views of behaving in accordance with individual preference. They are working together to exert influence.

(3) Social Support: Does having an ally help? In Asch's research and in many later studies of conformity, subjects were exposed to social pressure from the unanimous group. Although the other persons present seemed to hold views different from their own. Under such condition, it is hardly surprising that many individuals yielded to social pressure. What would happen, if persons facing such pressure discovered that they had an ally - someone who shared their views, or at least failed to endorse the same position as the majority. Under such conditions, perhaps conformity might be reduced (e.g. Allen and Levin, 1971 and Morris and Miller, 1975). In these investigations subject provided with an ally or partner showed much less conformity than
subjects not supplied with social support. Isolation from other people is one of the severest forms of punishment. Removal of social support is the means of inducing the psychological breakdown known as brainwashing" (See A9 in appendix section).

(4) Sex: In our culture, and in many others, there would appear to be a pronounced difference in the definition of sex roles in regard to the matter of conformity. The typical feminine role tends to be defined as involving promulgation of the conventional values of the culture, dependence upon the group, submissiveness to the male, avoidance of disagreement with others in the interests of group harmony. The typical masculine role tends to lay more stress on the ideals of self-sufficiency, self-assertion, independence of thought, standing on one's two feet and casting a shadow.

Thus, the socially dictated meaning of the group pressure situation might be expected to differ in significant aspects for males and for females, and females might be predicted to conform more readily in it. In Crutchfield's (1955) study, females consistently earned higher conformity score than did males. High conforming females tended to be generally characterized by easier acceptance of the conventional feminine role. On the contrary, many of the females who independently resisted the group pressure tended to be characterized by marked
signs of conflict in their feelings about the conventional feminine role, by rejection of a dependent relationship with parents and with others and by hostile attitude towards family. On a personality scale intended to measure "socialization" (Gough, 1960), the independent females scored significantly lower than did the conforming females. Among males, it is interesting to note that there was little difference in socialization scores between the independents and conformers.

Many early experiments on conformity yielded a result that females seemed to be much more yielding to social pressure i.e. more conforming than males (e.g. Crutchfield, 1955). According to Baron and Byrne, 1988, females in general seem to be much more conforming than males. This is so because men are tough and women are more yielding, and females are easier to push around than males because males are believed to be more influential than females. These findings were consistent with the then prevailing views about the supposed characteristics of the two sexes (e.g. men are "tough" and women are "yielding"). Thus, this result was quickly accepted as true by many social psychologists. Indeed for more than two decade the view that females are more susceptible to social influence than males went largely unchallenged. Beginning in the early 1970s, however it was subjected to renewed examination. The results of this "second wave"
of research were directly contrary to those of the first. No large or consistent difference between the sexes with respect to the tendency to conform were uncovered.

Thus, on the whole it is concluded that in number of researches, women have been found to be more easily influenced. But Eagley, (1987) after carefully reviewing these studies conclude that these sex differences arise because females are more concerned with social rational aspects of a group situations than males are, and they are especially concerned with maintaining social harmony and ensuring smooth interpersonal relations.

5. Social Status: has an important impact on social influence. It is believed that people who are low in status are easier to influence than higher status people. Many also believe that, on average, females have lower status than males both in society and in a range of most settings. Together these beliefs lead to the assumption that low status persons come around easily than higher status people. People who are low in social status develop low self stem due to which they lack confidence and are thus highly susceptible to punishment. So due to fear of success, they yield to social influence/social pressure to gain others friendship in order to avoid the rejection by the group and to maintain the friendly support and status quo with in the group. Thus, on the whole it is concluded
that lower status people are easily influenced by others in the group than the high status people.

**Internal factors affecting conformity**

There are individual differences in conformity proneness. Common observation over the ages seems to make obvious the point that individuals vary widely in their tendencies to conform. Some individuals give way to group pressure and others do not may only mean that their situations are different. One man yields because he fears reprisals of the group against his family, another man resists the same group because he has no family that can be threatened through him.

**Personality and Conformity**: There are numerous basic personality factors associated with tendency to conform or with tendency to remain independent under group pressures.

(a) **Cognitive functioning**: The conformists are prone to be significantly less intelligent than the independent persons. For e.g. the correlation of conformity with scores on the Concept Mastery Test (Terman, 1956), a high level test of intelligence, is .50 or higher. Conformists show greater tendencies toward rigidity of cognitive processes and poverty of ideas, as contrasted with the greater capacity for cognitive restructuring and for novel ideas found in the independent subjects.
(b) **Motivational and emotional functioning**: The conformists are lower in ego strength and in ability to cope under stress. For example, a measure based on the readiness of soldiers to fire their guns effectively under battle conditions in the Korean conflict is found to correlate .38 with conformity score in a sample of military officers. The conformists tend to exhibit emotional constriction, lack of spontaneity, repression of impulse, and indirect expression of hostility to a greater degree than do the independents. They also tend to be more anxious. (Score on the Manifest Anxiety Scale, Taylor, 1953) correlate in the range from .30 to .40 with conformity scores.

(c) **Self-Conception**: Conformists are inclined toward pronounced feelings of personal inferiority and inadequacy. They lack self-confidence. They tend to be less insightfully and realistic in their self-perceptions than are the independent subjects. For example, their self descriptions on an adjective check list (Gough, 1960) tend to differ much more from the composite adjective descriptions of them given by an expert assessment staff than do those of the independent subjects.

(d) **Interpersonal realities**: The conformists exhibit intense preoccupation with other people, as contrasted with the more self-contained, autonomous attitudes of the independent persons. The interpersonal behaviour of the
conformists tend to show far more passivity, suggestibility, and dependence upon others, while at the same time there is considerable evidence of basically disturbed and distrustful attitudes toward other people. Moreover the conformists prove to be poorer than others, the independent person in his ability to judge other people's traits accurately.

(e) Personal Attitude and Values: The conformists express attitudes and values of a far more conventional and moralistic nature than do the independent subject. This is often coupled with a "low tolerance for ambiguity" and a rigid dogmatic, authoritarian outlook. Thus, Nadler (1959) reports that F-scale scores correlate .48 with conformity scores as measured in the Asch technique. Conforming subjects tend to have occupational interest pattern as measured by strong Vocational Interest Inventory (Blank) which are similar to those professions generally regarded as placing more stress on conventional social values.

Reasons of Adherence to the Norms

We have seen that society, as represented by our associates, exerts a steady pressure upon us to adhere to the norms and that in the case of some norms - the laws - these pressures are institutionalized and applied by agencies. It is easy to see that we do not enjoy the
disapproval and displeasure of our fellows, that we can hardly sustain the pain of ostracism from our own groups. It is easy to see in addition that we do enjoy the approval and approbation of our fellows and that in most cases this is a large reward and one that we endeavor to earn by our conformity. But hope of reward and fear of punishment are not the only reasons we conform to the norms of one society. There are other basis for adherence which are as follows:

(1) Indoctrination: The first reason we adhere to these norms is that we have been indoctrined to do so. From our earliest childhood we are taught to observe the norms of one society. Like other aspects of culture they are ready for us when we arrive upon the human scene and we accept them, as we accept the ideas and the material, without conscious thought or reflection. We are taught, for example to take our meals at certain times of the day, to use certain kinds of utensils at the table, to address our elders with respect, to omit certain vulgarities from our speech and so on. The "Socialization" of the child, in effect, is the process of learning the norms of his own society. After a while, these norms seem to give him the right and proper way of doing things, and sometimes, indeed, the only way. In many cases, therefore, we adhere to the norms because we know no alternative - for the
same reason, in short, that we use English instead of Hindustani. This is the process of indoctrination, a process that is continuous and constant from the beginning of our lives.

(2) **Habituation**: is the second reason of adherence to the norms. What is customary in many cases becomes habitual. We are indoctrinated in the use of knife, fork and spoon, and after a while their use is a matter of habit. Repetition has thus made a habit, and a folkway comes to be rooted in a sense, in the organism. When one has become habituated to a practice, he observes it automatically, without reflection or effort. Thus, habituation reinforces the norms and guarantees the regularity of conformity.

(3) **Utility**: The third reason why we conform to the norms of one society is that frequently we can appreciate their utility. As reflective individuals we can see that norms are useful, that they enable us to interact with others in a way conducive to the best interests of all, that they contribute to the ease of social intercourse. It is apparent to us, for example, that the fair way of distributing tickets to a play for which only a limited number of seats are available is to sell them first to those who come first to purchase them. We see that rationality
in the expression "first come, first served". We recognize that an orderly line/que is a superior device, socially speaking, to a disorderly rush, in which someone, perhaps ourselves, might be trampled.

We recognize further that the flow of traffic at busy intersections is smoother and less dangerous when lights are installed. Thus, we stop at a red light and go on a green one, not only because we are indoctrinated and habituated to the practice, but because we recognize that this kind of regulation is useful to everyone, ourselves included.

4. *Group Identification*: is the fourth reason of why we adhere to the norms of our own social group norms, for example, rather than to those groups to which we do not belong, not because we regard our men as superior, and not because we are particularly indoctrinated or habituated to them, but because in conforming to them we express our identification with these groups.

Thus, a norm may not specify what kind of behaviour is expected by the group or society but it usually also specifies the degree of conformity to the norm that is expected by the group as reasonable adherence to the norm. They are generally conservative mechanisms. They serve as a rule to maintain the status-quo with in the group which the child respond to and
regards in a rather absolute fashion. Although he lapses from them under the grip of momentary desire or in the flux of fantasy, they tend to be regarded as final and inflexible, resting on the authority of father or mother. However, as a child matures and as he interacts with other children, he grasps the notion of reciprocity with others. Interaction in reciprocal relationships makes possible cooperative activities and coordination of individual efforts.

In the process of reciprocal interaction, the child comes to see rules or norms as based on mutual agreements. He finds that they can be changed and that new rules can be made. When he begins to take part in the process of changing and making rules himself, they truly become his own rules by which he abides through inner autonomy. Thus, the crucial condition for willing, autonomous and even enthusiastic internalization of social norms is the participation in reciprocal interactions with other people.

**Norm Formation**

The fact of conformity behaviour as well as the factors that enhance its occurrence have been demonstrated by laboratory and field studies. Muzaffer Sherif, (1935) conducted his classical study on the development of social norms. He developed the notion...
that norms emerge in response to ambiguity. He employed what is called the autokinetic effect in studying the process of norm formation. This is the phenomena that occurs when a pinpoint of light is viewed in an otherwise totally dark room: a totally stationary light will appear to move. In one of his experiments, Sherif brought a group of subjects into a dark room to observe a pinpoint of light and then asked them to estimate how far the light moved. Sherif created a totally ambiguous situation, in that there were no criteria for the subjects to use in estimating the movement of light. After a series of trials, Sherif observed a most interesting social-psychological phenomenon: the range of estimates by his respondents began to converge toward the mean. After the first trial, the range of estimated movements varied from two or three inches to 15 inches. After additional trials, the more extreme estimates tended to become less extreme and therefore move toward the mean. Eventually, the group came to establish a norm—in this case, a generally agreed-upon estimate of light movement. Respondents who helped to develop this group norm then tended to continue to use it in later trials when they were by themselves. In other words, a social norm developed to provide meaning to an ambiguous situation. In this experiment the patch of light remains stationary, but the pupil of eye does not remain stationary. The movement of
the pupil is directly related to the physical movement in terms of inches. So the patch of light will appear to move.

The power of group pressure to induce conformity of judgment in the individual is dramatically revealed in the widely known experiments of Ash (1951, 1952, 1956). In the experiments, subjects thought they were participating in a test of perceptual skills with a group of six other subjects. The subjects were shown one card with three lines of varying length and a second card which had a fourth line that matched one of the first three.

The task was seemingly straightforward. The subjects had to announce aloud which of the first three lines was identical in length to a "standard" line. Because there was always an obvious answer, the task seemed easy to the participants.

Indeed, since the subjects all agreed on the first few trials, the procedure was quite a simple one. But then something odd began to happen. From the perspective of the subject in the group who got to answer last, all of the first six subject's answers seemed to be wrong - in fact, unanimously wrong. And this continued. Over and over again, the first six subjects provided answers that contradicted what the last subject felt was the correct one. The dilemma that this situation posed for
the last subject was whether to follow the group and repeat the answer that everyone else was giving.

As one might guess, the situation in the experiment was more contrived than it first appeared. The first six subjects were actually confederates of the experimenter and had been instructed to give unanimously erroneous answers in many of the trials. And the study has nothing to do with perceptual skills. Instead, the issue under investigation was that of conformity through indirect social influence/pressure.

What Asch found was that in about one-third of the trials, subjects conformed to the unanimous, but erroneous group answer, with about 75% of all subjects conforming at least once. However, there were strong individual differences. Some subjects conformed nearly all the time, whereas others never did so.

Since Asch's pioneering work literally hundreds of studies have examined the factors affecting conformity, and we now know a great deal of phenomenon (Moscovics, 1985; Tanford and Penrod, 1984). Among the most important variables producing conformity are the following:

(a) The nature of the group: The more attractive the group, the greater its ability to produce conformity. The lower the status - the social rank held within the group - of a person and the greater the similarity of the individual
to the group, the greater is the power of the group over the individual's behaviour

(b) The nature of the individual's response: Conformity is considerably higher when people must make a response publicly than when they can respond privately, as our founding fathers noted when they authorized secret ballots in voting.

(c) The kind of task: People working on tasks or questions that are ambiguous (having no clear answer) are more susceptible to social pressure. Giving an opinion, such as on what type of clothing is fashionable, is more likely to produce conformity than answering a question of fact.

(d) Unanimity of the group: Conformity pressures are most pronounced in groups that are unanimous in their support of a position. But what of the case in which people with dissenting views have ally in the group who agrees with them. Having just one person present who shares the unpopular point of view is sufficient to reduce conformity pressures (Allen, 1975)

Another experiment that produced even more dramatic results on conformity was an obedience to authority. This experiment was done by Stanley Milgram (1963, 1965, 1974), in a laboratory of Yale. Milgram selected eighty men of various ages and occupational backgrounds and asked them to take part in what he said
was an important experiment in learning. Each subject was assigned to a group of four people - the other three of whom unknown to the subject were Milgram's assistants. One of the assistants was the "learner" in the make believer experiment. The other two assistants and the subject were the "teachers", and their job was to instruct the "learner" by punishing him with an electric shock when he made an error. The subject was put at the controls that regulated the amount of shock. Actually, no electricity was hooked up to the controls and no learning took place. The "learner" deliberately made errors and only pretended to feel pain when punished. Of the so (eight) subjects, half were placed in a control group. These subjects were not subjected to any pressure to raise the shock level and did not raise them very high. Thirty four of these forty control subjects stopped at shock levels listed as "slight" or "moderate". Only six went above 120 volts. But it was a far different story with the other forty subjects. These forty were strongly urged by their fellow "teacher" to raise the amount of electricity higher and higher and they did. Only six of them refused to go above 120 volts. The other thirty four went right on, even though the "learner" at first shouted that the shocks were becoming painful and later began to groan and finally scream in pain. Seven of the subjects went up to what they thought was maximum they could deliver - a
"highly dangerous shock of 450 volts. Many of the experimental subjects showed signs of doubt and stress about engaging in such a sadistic act, yet they conformed anyway to the pressures of their group (see figure 8).
Social Norms are Changing Rapidly

Social norms are changing rapidly (see figure 9) due to various reasons. The three major themes - power, social problems and conflict - are enormously complicated by the swift pace of change in social norms in modern societies. The following are the causes of these changes in norms:

(1) The Technology Explosion

Much of what we see every day - telephones, televisions, cards, electric lights, stereos, refrigerators - have been invented since 1900. In fact, if we took a count of all the inventions in mankind's history, more of them would have been invented in the last two generations than in all the generations of mankind before (Ogburn, 1955) (see figure 10).

Imagine that we took the last 10,000 years of man's existence and compressed them into one hour. The
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Figure: 10

Picking cotton by hand.

Technological innovations change man's occupations and his organizations.

Mechanical cotton picker.
startling conclusion, illustrated in figure 11, is that most of the technological inventions have been made in the last minute. The same rate of technological innovation may be seen in the rapid increase in patents for inventions used in the United States in 1790, there were three inventions patented; in 1835 there were 752; in 1900 there were 24,644; by 1973 the figure was over 65,000. Thus, technology is reshaping over whole social life by its fantastic growth. Thus, change is caused by improvements in technology and shifts in the economic structures. This theory is often called "technological determinism," since it argues that changes in the social system are produced by developments in technology.

(2) The Population Explosion & Demographic Changes

There are more people alive at this very second than there have been in all time before 1900, combined. Everything about modern social life is influenced by the sheer numbers of people - over 3.5 billion - who are living now and who are reproducing at a staggering rate. The quality of government, the possibility of war, the fear of mass starvation, the hope of modernizing underdeveloped nations, the dream of world cooperation - all of those precious dreams and nightmarish fears hinge
The technology Explosion

Figure 11: The inventionary Clock: 12000 years of inventions compressed into one hour
precarious on the tick-tock of the population bomb (see figure 12).

Figure: 12

The world population increased very slowly throughout the last 500,000 years, but all of a sudden, in the last few years, the population leaped upward at a staggering pace. Major social upheaval caused by shifts in the amount of population or in its physical distribution within society such as urbanization. Thus, population explosion gives rise to change in the social structure which ultimately gives rise to change in social norms.
(3) The Knowledge Explosion

In addition to the technology explosion and the population explosion, the contemporary world is experiencing a knowledge explosion. Take few examples:

Ninety percent of all the scientists who ever lived are alive right now. There are presently more books written in the world each day than were written in most centuries up until 1600; there are probably more students in colleges and universities at this moment than there have been in all history up to 1950; The United States now spends about 7½ percent of its Gross National Product (value all goods and services) on education, a staggering $75 to $80 billion a year; Government, Industry and Universities now spend huge sums of money on "Research and Development", on deliberately planning future change. Once change came accidentally at its own pace; now the society plans for it.

This knowledge explosion feeds the technology explosion, which in turn promotes social change and then to change in norms. Francis Bacon once said "Knowledge is power"; Alvin Toffler speaks more to our age: "Knowledge in change".

(4) The Urban Explosion

Three out of four Americans now live in an urban area. Before 1850 no society had a majority of its
population living in urban areas, and by 1900, only Great Britain was an urban society. Today, however, almost all industrialized nations are highly urbanized. While non industrial societies are still predominately rural, even they are rapidly becoming urban. Cities are growing quickly, but the sub-urban areas around the city are mushrooming even faster. All over the world the growth of cities is much faster than the growth of the general world population. It is estimated that more than 20 percent of the world's people now live in cities of 100,000 people or more and the trend is toward increasing urbanization as more countries industrialize (see figure 13).

Urban society is considerably different from the rural society man has known so long. In addition to the obvious physical differences (large concentration of people, high-rise buildings, tangled highway networks), there are important social consequences of urban living. Some of these consequences are negative: poverty, racial serration, pollution and ecological destruction, crowding intense social conflict. Other results of urbanization improve the human situation: better economic efficiency, a concentration of manpower and brainpower, expanded opportunities for many people in health care, occupation, recreation and art. Thus, it can be concluded from the aforesaid studies that urbanization is one of the major
Figure 13
The aerial view of Tokyo exemplifies the worldwide urban explosion caused by population growth and industrial development.
causes of social change and change in social norms. Urbanization leads to modernization which is a complex process involving many transformations shown in figure 14)

**Figure: 14**

**Traditional and Modern Societies:**

**Dimensions of Difference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Characteristics of Traditional societies</th>
<th>Characteristics of Modern societies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale of Life</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small scale; population</td>
<td>Small scale; population typically small and widely dispersed in rural villages and small towns</td>
<td>Large scale; population typically large and concentrated in cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Patterns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Homogeneous; scared character; few subcultures and countercultures</td>
<td>Heterogeneous; secular character; many subcultures and countercultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norms</td>
<td>High moral significance; little tolerance of diversity</td>
<td>Variable moral significance; high tolerance of diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Present linked to past</td>
<td>Present linked to future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Preindustrial; human and animal energy</td>
<td>Industrial; advanced energy sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status and role</td>
<td>Few statuses, most ascribed; few</td>
<td>Many statuses, some ascribed and some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of Literature</strong></td>
<td><strong>specialized roles</strong></td>
<td><strong>achieved; many specialized roles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>Typically primary;</td>
<td>Typically secondary;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>little anonymity and</td>
<td>considerable anonymity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>privacy</td>
<td>and privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Face-to-face communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supplemented by mass media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social control</strong></td>
<td>Informal gossip</td>
<td>Formal police and legal system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social stratification</strong></td>
<td>Rigid patterns of social inequality; little mobility</td>
<td>Fluid patterns of social inequality; considerable mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender patterns</strong></td>
<td>Pronounced patriarchy;</td>
<td>Declining patriarchy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>women's lives centered on the home</td>
<td>increasing number of women in the paid labor force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td>Extended family as the primary means of socialization and economic production</td>
<td>Nuclear family retains some socialization function but is more a unit of consumption than of production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td>Religion guides world view; little religious pluralism</td>
<td>Religion weakens with the rise of science; extensive religious pluralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Formal schooling limited to elites</td>
<td>Basic schooling becomes universal, with growing proportion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(5) *Strained Social Institutions*

What difference does all this change make for social life - the real point of concern for social psychologists? For one thing, our social systems are becoming outmoded, inefficient, and unresponsive. The
government is a prime example. At the local level most municipalities, town, and counties were established years ago, when transportation was slow, communication difficult, the population small, and problems essentially local. Now that network is falling apart, totally unable to cope with massive regional problems of pollution, population shifts, organized crime, and a withering tax base. At the national level, the monster bureaucracies seem unresponsive to the needs of the people, isolated, and hopelessly slow to act. The Watergate scandal of the early 1970s shook the public confidence in the basic integrity of the nation's leaders. At the international level, the prospect is even gloomier. Although the existence of atomic weapons necessitates increased cooperation among nations, there is little evidence of major countries working together to settle their differences.

The family is another social institution that feels the brunt of change. Children rebel against their parents; parents find that there mate choices are not satisfactory under changing situations, and the divorce rate shoots out of sight; aged grandfathers are shuffled out of "senior citizen's homes", instead of receiving the honour and dignity of their position. Young people live together instead of marrying, middle-aged people get married but feel a vacuum of meaningless partnerships,
and old people watch their painfully built beams shattered by social change.

Educational institutions are also changing as the society demands more from them than ever before. Not only must the schools do their traditional job of teaching the three R's - reading, 'riting, and 'rithmetic - but they must also train a labour force for the technological society, instill values and increase the world's knowledge through research.

Value changes

Social change happen when major shifts occur in the values, beliefs, ideologies and religions that support the culture of a society. Social change is caused when active sub-groups form social movements and try to overthrow the established order. Revolutions, political upheavals, and social reforms have nearly always depended on the deliberate efforts of social movements.

Thus, as the society changes many of the traditional values and processes of economic institutions are challenged (see figure 15).
The twentieth-century feminist movement has found most of its supporters among white, middle-class, college-educated women. This social base has recently expanded to include larger numbers of working-class and black women.

Conclusion

Thus, to conclude, much of what we engage in as individuals is idiosyncratic. Since every personality is unique, many actions and types of behaviour displayed by different people are also unique. Indeed existence would be dull if the social world were not invested with a high level of human diversity. However, in order for social organization to remain intact and for the humans as a
species to survive, we still must will to adhere to norms. Norms provide an important source of stability to society. Norms are of great importance to society. It is impossible to imagine a normless society because without norm, behaviour would be unpredictable. The standards of behaviour contained in the norms give order to social life (relations). Interactions go smoothly if the individuals follow the group norms (March, 1954). The normative order makes the factual order to human society possible. Man needs a normative order to live in society because human organism is not sufficiently comprehensive or integrated to give automatic responses that are functionally adequate for society. One can hardly think of a society apart from norms. A society without norms would be to use the words of Hobbes, "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short." The normative system gives to society a cohesion without which social life is not possible. They influence individual’s attitude and his motive. They impinge directly upon a person’s self conception. They are specific demands to act made by this society.
CONCEPT OF PERSONALITY

The term personality is derived from the Latin word "persona" which means the mask worn by Roman actors. In this sense personality means the individual as seen by others.

There is the other sense of the term personality which includes the whole individual, his physique, temperament, skills, interest, hopes, feelings, habits, intelligence and achievement. It includes what he is today and what he hopes to be in the future. It includes the way in which he relates himself to other people. In a broadway, it may be said that personality is affected by three major factors (i) hereditary potential and primary characteristics of reactivity, (ii) the environmental situation in which a person has been brought up and in which he finds himself, and (iii) the subjective meanings and interpretations he gives to his experiences and the way in which he want to shape them, in short, his aspirations.

Thus, personality is not a static concept but a dynamic concept which is changing constantly. It is the most distinctive feature of an individual. This is the overall integration of his structures, modes of behaviour, interests, attitudes, aptitudes and many other distinguishable characteristics. Thus, the personality
refers to the whole individual. It is an important variable in most behavioural responses, and study of human behaviour is incomplete without the variable of personality. Personality of each one is unique; each individual has a unique personality. Though the children are brought up by the same parents in one house, there is variation in heredity, in experience and in ideals; nor even the identical twins have the same personality.

Personality has dozens of meanings: popular, legal, grammatical, ethical, religious, economic and psychological (Allport, 1937). At the core of all these different meanings however, common feeling is: a person is both unique and important. Thus, the word gives direction and energy to the vague human desire for individuality. In psychology, the field of personality is concerned not only with the total individual but also with individual differences.

In the common man's language the term personality is used in many ways. For example, consider such statements as 'Raju has a good personality, Ashish has a poor personality' and 'Pankaj has no personality' may refer to attractiveness or handsomeness of appearance. The phrase a 'poor personality' may indicate that the person has certain characteristics which are not considered to be good. The term 'no personality' may indicate that the person does not make an impact on
others. But these statements are based on superficial observations and evaluation of people and do not represent a scientific interpretation of the term personality. The term personality refers to physical, mental, social and emotional characteristics of a person and their integration into a behavioural pattern which is characteristic of the individual. Personality, thus, has many components or dimensions and is affected by heredity, learning, motivation, emotion, intelligence, perception, thinking, creativity and many other factors that make an individual what he is at any particular moment. There are various definitions of personality given by various psychologists which may be grouped according to whether they lay emphasis on superficial outer observable objective appearance or whether they stress on the inner subjective essentials.

Kempf (1919) has defined personality as "the habitual mode of adjustment which the organism effects between its own egocentric drives, and the exigencies of the environment. As phrased, this would include practically all of human behaviour since the vast majority of our responses do consist of such habitual ways of thinking.

Prince (1924) defined personality as the sum total of all the biological innate dispositions, impulses, tendencies, appetites and instincts of the individual, and
the acquired disposition and tendencies. This definition emphasize subjective aspect of personality.

Warren (1924) defined personality as "the entire mental organization of a human being at any stage of his development." In this definition, an attempt has been made to treat the physical structure and psychological traits of two separate units.

J.F. Dashiell has defined personality as "His (man's) system of reaction possibilities as viewed by fellow members of society. It is the sum total of the behaviour traits manifested in his social adjustments." This definition shows that personality is the way of the reactions and the behaviour. It does not treat the personality as important and composite but in this definition, the factors of the environment that do not form part of the personality have also been included.

According to Kimball Young, "personality is the more or less integrated body of habits, traits, attitudes and ideas of an individual as these are organized externally into specific and general roles and as they relate internally earned self consciousness and the concept of the self and earned the ideas, values and purposes, which are related to roles, motives and status.

Allport (1924) states that "personality traits may be considered as so many important dimensions in which people may be found to differ." This seems too
inconclusive, for example: it includes physical dimensions, which are only indirectly of importance for personality. Watson (1924) has called attention to the fact that character is a part of personality. He says "personality includes not only these (character-conventional) reactions, but also the more individual personal adjustments and capacities as well as their life history."

Symonds (1928) has defined personality as "the portrait or landscape of the organism working together in all its phase" and May (1929) speaks of "the social stimulus values of the individual." Later Allport defined (1937) personality as "the dynamic organization with in the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment. The term dynamic in the definition of personality indicates that the different characteristics of a person interact with and modify one another. It also points out that changes can occur in the way a person behaves in a situation. The word 'organization' implies that personality is made up of a number of different traits, each one of them closely related to the other. The relationships between traits often undergo changes, with certain traits becoming more dominant than others because of changes in the individual and in his environment. The term psychophysical implies that personality has both mental and physical elements."
The psychophysical system include the habits, attitudes, values, emotional states, and motives of a person which are psychological in nature but have a physical basis in the neural glandular and general bodily states of an individual. Guthrie (1944) has defined personality as "those habits and habit systems of social importance that are stable and resistant to change." According to Cattell, (1950), personality is that which permit a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation.

Personality is the most adequate conceptualization of a person's behaviour in all its detail (McClelland, 1951). Guilford (1959) defined personality as a person's unique pattern of traits. According to Eysenck (1960) personality is more or less enduring organization of a person's character, temperament, intellect, physique which determine his unique adjustment to the environment. According to Allport (1961), personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his characteristic behaviour and thought. Personality is used to mean the configuration of individual characteristics and ways of behaving which determines individuals unique adjustment to his environment. Hence, personality includes any characteristics, that are important in the maintenance of self respect (Hilgard, 1962). Eysenck (1965) states that there is some agreement
that personality refers to some enduring disposition in the constitution of individuals and that it is the basic reality underlying individual differences in behaviour. Eyseneck's dimensional approach has ushered a new era in the psychological arena of experimental research in personality. According to Mischel (1976), Personality usually refers to the distinctive patterns of behaviour (including thoughts and emotions) that characterize each individual's adaptation to the situations of his or her life. According to Kleinmuntz (1967), Personality refers to unique organization of traits characterizing an individual and influencing his interaction with his environment, social and non-social.

According to Brody (1972), the study of personality rests ultimately on the fact of individual differences. The true search for the understanding of individual differences, temperamental peculiarities and other deviations from the strictly average behaviour i.e. personality can in the real sense said to have a beginning with Hippocrates and Galen. They identified four major temperamental types on the basis of humors: melancholic, choleric, sanguine and phlegmatic. These four types are supposed to be responsible for difference in behaviour. Their physiological theory is now regarded somewhat quaint, but the descriptive system is still used which has given birth to modern personality theory. However, most
agree that personality includes the behaviour patterns a person shows across situations or the psychological characteristics of the person that lead to those behaviour patterns.

Personality has been defined and studied in a number of different ways. Some have developed broad theories to explain the origins and makeup of personality. Others have focused only on one or two issues, such as the influence of heredity on personality.

The first approach, i.e. theory construction, was popular for many years. As a result, we have many broad personality theories. Most of these broad theories can be grouped into four categories.

(i) **Type and Trait Approaches**: which focus on people's characteristics - stubbornness, shyness and so forth - and how these characteristics are organized into systems. They emphasize the dimensions and organization of personality.

(ii) **Dynamic Approaches**: which emphasizes ongoing interactions among motives, impulses and psychological processes. They emphasize motivational factors and the lively interplay of various components of personality.

(iii) **Learning and Behavioural Approach**: which emphasize the ways the habits are acquired through basic conditioning or learning processes.
(iv) **Humanistic Approaches**: which emphasize the self and the importance of the individual's subjective view of the world. These various viewpoints are that of Watson, Allport, Cattell, McClelland, Murray, Maslow, Spence, Taylor and Guilford. They have tried to provide different frameworks of personality in order to explain behaviour which has led to a lot of disagreement regarding the structure of human personality.

However, as Eysenck's personality model in terms of extraversion/introversion has been used to see the development of norms and the performance differences among different personality groups i.e. introverts and extraverts vis-à-vis Sherif's autokinesis, Asch's visual line drawing test, serial learning and anagrams of problem solving tasks, it would be in the fitness of things to give a conceptual framework and review of studies.

**A Review of Eysenck's Personality Theory**

The personality theory as forwarded by Eysenck (1947) and as it stands now (Eysenck, 1952, 1957, 1960, 1963, 1966, 1971, 1981, 1985) has undergone a lot of modification to reach its present status. To begin with Siegal et.al. (1958 a, b) Hamilton (1959), Foulds (1961) and Bannister (1977) created much doubt regarding - Eysenck's theory of personality in general, and the way it has been validated especially the criterion
analysis in particular. But the theory has passed through the ordeal of time and criticism through great experimental evidence which has accumulated with the passage of time and has strongly supported and approved his concept of personality. Eysenck has given a dimensional approach to personality with descriptions at two levels. The major dimension being Extraversion - Introversion (E/I), Stability - Neuroticism (S/N), Psychoticism and Intelligence. These four dimensions were the resultant of hypothetico-deductive techniques and elaborate factor analyses (Eysenck, 1956, Eysenck and Eysenck, 1963). Apart from intelligence, extraversion/ introversion and neuroticism have been found to relate mostly to learning and performance. These two dimensions are independent of each other (Eysenck, 1947, 1952, 1957, Madan 1967, Child 1964, Bull and Strongman 1971, Mohan and Kumar 1973).

Similar to Eysenck's extraversion and neuroticism, Cattell (1956) and Guilford (1934, 1959), extracted factors which closely resemble them. On the other side, Taylor's (1953) Manifest Anxiety has been found to correlate with Neuroticism (Bending, 1957 and Eysenck 1963). The mutual independence of neuroticism and extraversion has been reviewed and supported by Carrigan (1960). Eysenck contends that these two factors contribute to the description of personality more than any
other set of factors in the non-cognitive field. As regards the study of Extraversion/Introversion and Neuroticism, Eysenck (1964) believes that it can be analyzed at the two levels i.e. causative and descriptive.

**Extraversion/Introversion**

Although the term introversion and extraversion are today often associated with the name of the Swiss psychiatrist C.G. Jung, they may be found in the earliest English dictionaries. Dr. Johnson’s dictionary, published in 1755 used the term in a physical sense, but by the late 19th century they were defined in ways very similar to current usage. Extraversion was described as a "turning outward of mind" on to people and objects in the external world; introversion as "inner directedness", a preference for abstract ideas rather than concrete objects. Today, the scope of these terms is rather broader; extraversion also refers to impulsive, sociable tendencies, and introversion implies controlled and responsible behaviour.

The following figure 16 shows how these two major dimensions of personality relate to the Greek typology. The advantage of the dimensional system over the categorical system is that an individual can be described more flexible by assigning him a point anywhere with in the space formed by the two factors. Most people
congregate in the middle range on these dimensions with fewer number falling toward the extremes.

Two major dimensions of personality revealed by Factor Analysis compared with the 4 Greek categories (from Eysenck, 1967)
Eysenck describes the dimensions of extraversion as measured by the Eysenck Personality Inventory as follows:

High E Scores are indicative of extraversion on the descriptive side. High scoring individuals tend to be outgoing, impulsive, and uninhibited having many social contacts and frequently taking part in group activities. Eysenck (1957, 1967) deduced the concept of E/I from nosological categories based on Jung’s (1923) views and supported by Hilderbrand’s study (1958). According to Eysenck and Eysenck (1968), 'the typical extravert is sociable, likes parties, has many friends, needs to have people to talk to, and does not like reading or studying by himself. He craves excitement, takes chances, often sticks his neck out acts on the spur of the moment and is generally an impulsive individual. He is fond of practical jokes, always has a ready answer and generally likes change. He is carefree, easygoing, optimistic, and likes to "laugh and be merry" (see figure 17). He
prefers to keep moving and doing things, tends to be aggressive and to lose his temper quickly. His feelings are not kept under tight control and he is not always a reliable person.

The typical introvert is a quiet, retiring sort of person, introspective, fond of books rather than people; he is reserved and distant except to intimate friends. He tends to plan ahead, "looks before he leaps", and distrusts the impulse of the moment. He does not like excitement, takes matters of everyday life with proper seriousness and likes a well-ordered mode of life. He keeps his feelings under close control, seldom behaves in an aggressive manner, and does not lose his temper easily. He is reliable, somewhat pessimistic, and places great value on ethical standards.

The Excitation Inhibition Theory of Introversion and Extraversion

On the causative side, Eysenck has attempted to relate individual differences in introversion-extraversion to hypothetical inherited differences in the functioning of the nervous system. For this purpose, Eysenck refers to the pavlovian concepts of excitation and inhibition (Pavlov, 1927) balance of central nervous system (CNS), Hull's concept of reactive inhibition (Ir) and Gray's (1965) level of arousal. In his review of
personality Eysenck (1963) gave evidence that difference in individuals on E/I were deeply embedded in the constitution of the individuals, especially in the ascending reticular formation of the central nervous system. Eysenck initially traced this differentiation in individuals to Pavlov's experiment 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.

Eysenck (1955) extended Pavlovian views to be the Jungian typology of Extraversion/Introversion. For doing this he took the help of Hullian concept of reactive inhibition based on Hull's (1943) first submolar principle "all responses leave in the physical structure a state which acts directly to inhibit the evocation of activity - this inhibitory substance manifest itself through reactive potentials. This negative action is called Reactive Inhibition (Ir) an increment of which is assumed to be generated by every repetition of the response whether reinforced or not and these increments are assumed to accumulate except as they spontaneously disintegrate with passage of time."

Eysenck (1957) has tried to derive most of the known differences between introverts and extraverts by the excitation inhibition theory. He states his fundamental assumptions as follows:
Individuals in whom excitatory potentials is generated slowly and in whom excitatory potentials so generated are relatively weak, are thereby predisposed to develop extraverted patterns of behaviour and to develop hysterical-psychopathic disorders in the case of neurotic breakdown; individuals in whom excitatory potential is generated quickly and in whom excitatory potentials so generated are strong, are thereby predisposed to develop introverted patterns of behaviour and to develop dysthymic disorders in case of nervous breakdown. Similarly, individuals in whom reactive inhibition is developed quickly, in whom strong reactive inhibition is dissipated slowly, are thereby predisposed to develop extraverted patterns of behaviour and to develop hysterical-psychopathic disorders in case of nervous breakdown; Conversely, individuals in whom reactive inhibition is developed slowly, in whom weak reactive inhibition are generated, and in whom reactive inhibition is dissipated quickly, are thereby predisposed to develop introverted patterns of behaviour and to develop dysthymic disorders in case of nervous breakdown. Eysenck postulates the existence of a ratio of inhibition to excitation (I/E). The value of this ratio is relatively low for introverts and relatively high for extraverts. Excitation is relatively a straightforward concept. It refers to the neural processes upon which the development
of learned associations between stimulus and responses depend. Thus, all other things being equal, individuals with strong excitation potentials would be more able to form learned connections between stimuli and responses than individuals in whom excitatory potentials are weak. Inhibition is rather a more complicated concept. The term reactive inhibition comes from Hull (1943). Eysenck's conception of inhibition involves a modification of views held by Hull and Paolov. Reactive inhibition may be conceived of as fatigue like neural state which occurs as an inevitable consequence of any excitatory process.

There is another important feature of Eysenck's physiological theory. Eysenck (1967) relates his conception of the physiological differences between Introverts and Extraverts to a distinction used by Russian Researchers especially Sokolov (1963) and Teplov (1963) of the organisms with "weak" nervous system (Gray, 1965). Soviet work on the dimensions of personality known as the "strength of the nervous system" and "equilibrium in dynamism" is compared with the Western work of Introversion - Extraversion, in the light of suggestions that each of these dimension is related to level of arousal (Gray, 1967). Organisms with "weak" nervous system are assumed to respond at lower levels of stimulation and are assumed to respond with greater intensity to stimuli than organisms with 'strong' nervous
system. However, the weak nervous system as a result of its extreme reactivity is more subject to protective or transmarginal inhibition than the strong nervous system. The concept of protective or transmarginal inhibition implied that when the levels of excitation are reached which are above some optional value, inhibition occurs, which serves to decrease such excitation. Eysenck (1967) believes that introverts are more subject to transmarginal inhibition than extraverts. Eysenck's theory thus assumes some upper level of arousal which is reached at lower level of stimulus intensity by introverts than by extraverts. Once this level is reached, new inhibitory processes occur which reduce excitation. As a result of the operation of this form of inhibition it is possible that at high levels of stimulus intensity cortical arousal should be lower for introverts than for extraverts.

Eysenck (1970) also believed Ascending Reticular Activating System (ARAS) to be responsible for producing arousal under identical stimulating conditions is higher for introverts than in extraverts, hence behavioural and experimental predictions are forwarded on the basis of differences in degree of arousal rather than in degree of reactive inhibition.
Eysenck's Arousal Theory of Introversion and Extraversion

The most highly developed theory of extraversion is that of Eysenck (1967). He believes that differences between extraverts and introverts are due to individual differences in the functioning of the reticular activating system. This structure in the brain stem is thought by neurophysiologists to be responsible for producing non-specific arousal in the cerebral cortex in response to external stimulation, and Eysenck hypothesizes that introverts are more highly aroused than extraverts given the same conditions of stimulation. Paradoxically, this results in the introverts showing more restrained or "inhibited" behaviour because the cortex is exercising control over the more primitive, impulsive, lower brain centers. The arousal concept is thought to explain most of the differences between extraverts and introverts, that have been observed in the laboratory and real life for example, introverts are supposed to acquire conditioned responses more readily than extraverts because their higher arousal facilitates the formation of connections. The difference in conditionability in turn accounts for the different types of abnormal behaviours to which introverts and extraverts are prone. The most direct way of testing the notion that introverts are higher in arousal than extraverts would seem to be to examine
EEG's (brain waves) of the two personality groups. The EEG consists of moment to moment fluctuations in voltage across two points on the scalp - 1000 amplitude and high frequency is believed to reflect high arousal.

Gray (1971), has tried to elaborate Eysenck's stand (1957, 1967) on the theory of personality with the more localized function. This theory is concerned both with physiological and psychological nature of extraversion, although the evidence supporting his contention comes from animal physiology. Gray offers a more elaborate system "consisting of ARAS together with orbital frontal cortex, medial septal area and hippocampal system which determines the degree of introversion. This system is able to carry out the essential psychological function believed by Eysenck to underlie Introversion/Extraversion. The more sensitive or active this system is the more introverted will the individual be."

While outlining the role played by the septal area and the hippocampus, Gray (1971) has stressed that hippocampus displays a theta rhythm at times as a result of neural input from the medial septal area. But there is good evidence that (Stumpf, 1965) the pacemaker cells in the medial septal area act to produce a theta rhythm as a result of neural input received from the midbrain reticular formation. As a voltage of the stimulating current applied to the midbrain reticular formation is gradually increased,
a theta rythm first appears in the hippocampus and then increases in frequency, until the same limiting stimulus voltage, the theta rythm is replaced by a fast, low voltage, desynchronized hippocampal EEG (Stumpf, 1965). As well as with this reticular septal-hippocampal circuit, there is a hippocampal-reticular formation connection, which is evidently of an inhibitory nature. As shown by Adey, Segundo and Livingston (1957) stimulus of the hippocampus causes an upstream conduction from the midbrain reticular formation to be thalamic portion of the ARAS; and this inhibition is disrupted by small doses of barbiturates, indicating the likelihood that it is normally exercised at times when the hippocampus displays a theta rythm. Thus, there is every reason to suppose that the ARAS and the septo hippocampal system whose operation is indicated by a theta rythm are coupled together to form a negative feedback loop. That is to say an increased activity in the ARAS results in an increase in hippocampal activity is to inhibit any further increase in the activity of the ARAS. In this way for a given sensory input and under given conditions, a temporary equilibrium between reticular activation and hippocampal is reached.

Gray's (1971,1972) has overemphasized inhibition while almost neglecting excitation and arousal, whereas, Eysenck has put forward the view that on the basis of experimental evidence and EEG studies extraverts
are characterized by low, and introverts by higher states of cortical arousal. These differences might be caused in turn by differential threshold levels in the reticular formation whose main function is control of arousal and inhibition level in the cortex. He also makes the assumption that individual differences on the threshold level of arousal of visceral brain were responsible for phenotypic differences in E/I. The dual nature of interaction in the cortex also gains support from neuroanatomical studies (Rhine and Magoun, 1946, 1947; Sprague, 1953; Sprague and Chambers, 1954; Grossman, 1967) which reveal excitation as not separate entities, but go hand in hand to determine differences in human behaviour. Gray's hypothesis regarding the physiological explanation of E/I emanates from electrophysiological studies. The set of interactions between the ARAS and the frontal cortex-septohippocampal system described by Gray is remarkably similar to the psychological relationship which Eysenck (1957) has already postulated as lying at the root of the dimension of introversion/extraversion.

Eysenck (1955, 1957) has emphasized time and again that learning and performance are related to each other because of individual difference in consolidation of the learned responses. Eysenck (1966a) proposed a consolidation theory according to which performance sets up cortical events which in order to become available to
organisms, require rest for consolidation. He also postulated that consolidation interfere with performance, along the lines of Walker's theory (1958). Walker (1958) has suggested that cortical arousal is related to strong consolidation and Eysenck has argued that introverts are characterized by higher level of arousability than extraverts (Eysenck, 1962a, 1963b, 1964, 1967, 1971). For the poor consolidation of extraverts, it can be argued that the cortical arousal might be playing an important role. To substantiate this, EEG studies have provided evidence that there is a lower level of cortical arousal in extraverts (Gale, Coles and Blaydon, 1969 and Shagas and Canter, 1971). On the basis of EEG studies, Eysenck concluded that introverts typically have low alpha amplitude and high alpha frequency while extraverts typically have high alpha amplitude and low alpha frequency. These are the EEG characteristics respectively of high and low arousal groups (Eysenck, 1970).

The relationship of Extraversion in relation to performance with conditioning, reminiscence, acquisition of efficiency and KR, academic attainment and intelligence like problem solving tasks has often been explored. The relationship of extraversion to that of socialization and criminal behaviour and antisocial behaviour has also been explored. So it would be relevant to observe the relationship of said factors in
Extraversion within the Eysenckian framework of inhibition excitation balance and level of arousability.

Franks (1954) conducted an experiment on eyeblink conditioning with matched groups of hysterics, dysthyrmics and normals and found that dysthyrmics condition better and more quickly than hysterics. This finding by no means left the other exponent of Hullian theory quiet who emphasized the role of Drive in conditioning. Spence and his colleagues (Spence, 1956, 1958, 1964; Spence and Beecroft, 1954; Spence and Taylor, 1951, 1953; Taylor, 1951) working with in the Hullian framework emphasized that response strength (R) in conditioning is a function of Drive and this total Drive is a part of level of internal anxiety of the subject. Franks (1956) conducted another experiment with PGR and eyeblink conditioning and found conditionability to be related to I/E and not to N. Franks (1956) explained the results of Iowa group on the ground that in a mixed group of neurotics the predominance of dysthyrmics can easily distort the results. Eysenck (1956b) has pointed out that the studies which compared the effects of I/E & N, used sometimes a UCS which was strong enough to evoke anxiety and as such distorted the results in favour of anxiety hypothesis. Madan (1967) has at length explained this apparent diversity of results in the following manner:
"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 was related to I/E and not to N. Bending (1957), Eysenck (1963a) and Child (1964) found that Anxiety is not only related to Neuroticism positively but also significantly negatively with extraversion. This implies that individuals with high score on extraversion will have less of anxiety, whereas, these low on Extraversion will have high anxiety. Eysenck (1963b) too maintains that anxiety is a conditioned fear and since Introverts are more conditionable, they would show more of Anxiety. Thus, more introverted subjects who condition better would at the same time be scoring high on Anxiety who according to Spence - Taylor hypothesis should also condition better.

Coming down to the relationship of I/E to conditioning some studies have reported that Extraverts condition better than Introverts. According to Brody (1972) "Levey found that Introverts showed more rapid conditioning than Extraverts under partial reinforcement conditions. Extraverts showed more rapid conditioning than Introverts under total (100%) reinforcement conditions. Levey reported that under both short CS-UCS interval and low UCS intensity. Introverts condition more
rapidly, whereas under both long CS-UCS interval and high UCS intensity, extraverts condition more rapidly. Eysenck (1966, 1967) argues that these findings are predicted by his theory and are in no way contradictory to his theory Eysenck (1965)." Thus, Eysenck (1970) explains the differences between introverts and extraverts in conditioning in terms of the differential build up of reactive inhibition, though he mentions the possibility that the differences might also be due to differences in excitatory potential. Reactive inhibition is conceptualized as a kind of "neural or cortical fatigue" which acts as a negative drive and subtracts from the positive drive under which the organism is working.

The relationship of Extraversion with reminiscence (memory) has been an established one. Eysenck (1967) proposes that extraverts should have higher reminiscence score on pursuit rotor learning tasks and was supported by Star (1957), Claridge (1960), Lynn (1960a), and Meier (1961), Feldman (1964) and Mohan, J (1966), whereas, Ray (1959), Rechtsaffen (1958) and Becker (1960) provide contrary evidence derived from experiments done with faulty designs" (Mohan, J. 1966). But later it was found that many other facts were difficult to reconcile with an inhibition theory of reminiscence for pursuit rotor learning (Eysenck, 1965). According to the consolidation theory of Eysenck (1966a) argues that
organisms require rest for consolidation and during the state of rest the extraverts dissipate the accumulated Ir.

In learning situations the effect of I/E on the acquisition of efficiency with KR has been invested in many studies. Mohan and Deol (1970) using time estimation, Mohan and Gupta using weight estimation found that Introverts were performing insignificantly better than extraverts. Mohan and Kumar (1973) studied the effect of I/E on performance of 'Backward Alphabet Writing' when 100% KR was administered. The results of the study showed that introverts were superior to extraverts from the beginning to end, but on time taken only in the beginning, extraverts were superior but later on, introverts were significantly superior. The result of the study can be attributed to Madan (1967) who in the review of Eysenckian personality theory had experimentally substantiated the Introvert's performance for accuracy over speed.

Relation of Extraversion/Introversion to Intelligence, Educational Attainment and Problem Solving.

Sufficient evidence has shown that academic attainment, problem solving and intelligence are related positively to Introversion.

Two individuals may possess the same native ability, yet one may set up very high standard of
expectations out of himself and another may set up very low one. This setting of goals has been called the level of aspiration (Lewin, Dembo, Festinger and Sears, 1944). A parallel phenomena is the achievement oriented behaviour called achievement motivation or need for achievement (Atkinson and Feather 1966). Both act as a motivating force to put in more effort in performing a task. Eysenck (1957, 1960) and Lynn, (1962) have deduced that introverts condition better due to which they would show a greater degree of socialization as they learn the social norms and expectations faster. An expectation may follow that since the introverts are more socially aware, they would be having a higher level of aspiration (Eysenck, 1947) and be high on achievement motivation (Eysenck, 1962). This was earlier borne out by Eysenck and Himmeliweit (1946) when they found that the dysthyemic subjects had definitely a much higher level of aspiration giving rise to a much greater goal discrepancy score (GDS) than the hysteric subjects. Broadbent (1958) reported that level of aspiration was positively related to Introversion.

Lowell (1952) found that individuals high on achievement motivation showed a higher level of performance on both arithmetic and verbal task than persons low on achievement motivation. Atkinson and Litwin (1960) also found that subjects high on
achievement motivation persisted 60% and performed 64% on examination as compared to the subjects low on achievement motivation, who persisted 32% and performed 32% on examinations. The differences in both the cases were significant. Hence the deduction may be permitted that introverts being high on achievement motivation and on level of aspiration, will show better performance in educational tasks than the extraverts. This setting of higher goal for a prolonged period of time is essential in any long term programme of academic achievement.

Sufficient evidence has shown that academic attainment is positively related to introversion. Himmelweit (1946) found that hysteric's have a bad vocabulary in relation to their intelligence. Broadbent (1958) and Furneaux (1956) observed that students who do well in the University examination have a lower score in extraversion. Lynn (1960b) and Lynn and Gordon (1961) found that university students were more introverted and there was positive relationship between introversion, persistence and vocabulary. Child (1964, 1966) too detected that promoted children were more introverted than demoted ones significantly. Madan (1967) has demonstrated that introverts perform better on both vocabulary and educational attainment in the age group of 20 to 25 years.
Overall, extraverts and introverts do not differ in intelligence. However, recent work has shown that performance on cognitive tasks such as those found in IQ tests may be broken down into at least three independent components: speed, accuracy, and persistence. When this is done, extraverts are found to be faster but less accurate and less persistent than introverts (e.g. Brierley, 1961). The extraverts are also inclined to start well but slip back progressively relative to introverts. An illustrative study is that of Mohan and Kumar (1976) who conducted a detailed analysis of the performance of introverts and extraverts on the Standard Progressive Matrices IQ test. The performance of 100 students, balanced for sex was examined in terms of items done correctly, wrongly, abandoned and not attempted. These four outcomes were related to the difficulty level of the problems and time spent on the test. As expected, the extraverts began with an edge over the introverts but showed a greater deterioration in performance, thus allowing the introverts to draw ahead by the end of the test.

The relationship of I/E with problem solving has also been the subject of investigation in many studies. Eysenck (1959) conducted a study on problem solving by administering Morris by Compound Series Test to 28 introverts and 19 extraverts. The results indicated
that extraverts show greater work decrement by taking longer to obtain correct solution towards the end of the test as compared with introverts and giving up more easily towards the end. At the beginning of the work extraverts were significantly faster than introverts. The introverts would also perform better on intelligence test because their cortical arousal is quicker, accumulation of Ir (reactive inhibition) slower and its dissipation faster, this standpoint was reaffirmed by Eysenck (1967) when he said that the introverts had a higher arousal and more efficient consolidation and hence performed better than extraverts who had lower arousal and less efficient consolidation. Farley (1966) reports that on stressed version of Nufferno intelligence test extraverts were significantly faster than introverts and ambiverts. Subjects with medium N performed significantly better than low on N and high on N subjects. Prior to Farley (1966), Furneaux (1956) conducted a study in which he compared the performance of introverts and extraverts Nufferno intelligence test and he observed that on time taken extraverts took proportionately longer time on later items of the test.

In a specific study of problems solving and extraversion, Kumar (1974) reported that on conceptual and insightful problems, introverts were significantly superior than extraverts on complex problems on a sample
of 326 subjects. Similarly, Kumar and Kapila (1987) found that on four insightful problem solving tasks with a time limit, introverts were significantly better than extraverts. On the problems of set, Kumar and Kumari (1988) reported that introverts outperformed the extraverts.

Extraversion/Introversion and Criminality

Extraverts condition badly (Eysenck, 1964) and socialization is mediated by conditioning. Therefore, extraverts will tend to be poorly socialized. Two predictions follow from this: (i) criminals will tend to be extraverted (ii) criminals will tend to condition badly. There is evidence that extraverts take more risks than introverts. Figuratively and literally they are greater gamblers. This is in line with Eysenck's description of the Extraverts as impulsive, and Gray's view of extraverts as reward seekers who are inclined to disregard the possible unpleasant consequences of their behaviour. Both writers see introverts as more controlled, responsible and fearful. Similar considerations would lead us to expect a greater amount of antisocial behaviour from extraverts than introverts. From Eysenck's theory such an association is predicted because extraverts are supposed to be less susceptible to the kinds of conditioning that constitute the socialization process, and
Gray's theory would predict that extraverts would be more prone to crime and antisocial behaviour because they are impulsive reward seekers. Whatever the reason, this has been found to be the case: a part from their violations on the road, extraverts break institutional rules of all kinds and find their way to prison more often than introverts (Eysenck, 1971). Extraverts are also more likely to become recidivists than introverts (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1974). Extraversion, however, is not the only temperamental predictor of delinquent behaviour and antisocial behaviour. The above relationships are usually stronger when high levels of N are also involved, and the psychoticism factor is a better predictor than either E or Neuroticism.

Eysenck (1961) found that extraverts tend to be "tough-minded" in their attitudes and introverts relatively "tenderminded". And as such tough-minded people (E) tend to favour euthanasia, easy divorce, compulsory sterilization, and capital punishment as against the religious and humanitarian values expressed by tenderminded people. They enjoy social and aggressive humor (preferably fairly explicit). Whereas, introverts prefer more cognitive styles of humor, such as puns and incongruity-jokes. As regards sexual behaviour, extraverts have intercourse more frequently, in more different ways,
and with more partners than introverts (Eysenck and Wilson, 1976).

**Extraversion/Introversion and Social Influence**

Studies in the areas of suggestibility, conformity and compliance have produced complex findings with respect to the differences between extraverts and introverts.

In some circumstances extraverts appear to be more open to social influence than introverts. They are more inclined to change their judgements under the influence of prestige suggestions (Sinha and Ojha, 1963) and to change their evaluation of paintings after discovering the name of the artists (Mohan and Mohan, 1965; Mohan and Kumar 1973). They are more field dependent as measured by the Rod and Frame Test (Fine and Danforth, 1975; Malhotra and Makkar, 1999), and extraverted children are more responsive to peer influences regarding antisocial behaviour (Rim and Seidenross, 1971).

On the other hand, introverts are more susceptible to the autokinetic effect, that is seeing a stationary light in the dark as moving when there is some social pressure to do so (Panek, 1962). Also, their judgements of taste intensity are more likely to change in parallel with manipulations in the intensity of ambient
light (Wilson and Gregson, 1967). Organ (1975) gave bonus points to business school students for performance on random quizzes which tested daily preparation. The introverts received (obtained) more bonus points throughout the program and maintained a steadier performance record over a period of time. Extreme extraverts actually showed a significant downward trend over time, which suggests that they were progressively losing interest.

When an introvert encounters an extravert with different views on a controversial topic, the Introvert is more likely to be persuaded to modify his position (Garment, Miles and Cerwin, 1965). It is not clear whether this is because extraverts are more stubborn, more assertive, more plausible, or simply more talkative. In a study of religious conversion, Roberts (1965) found virtually no difference between extraverts and introverts except for a slight tendency for the introverts to show more gradual change in religious conviction.

Results in the area of hypnotic susceptibility have been particularly complex and contradictory. Lang and Lazovik (1962) found that extraverts were easier to hypnotize than introverts and Hilgard and Bentler (1963) found that subjects in the neurotic-extravert (hysteric) quadrant were most readily hypnotizable. However, in the series of studies by H.B. Gibson and his associates
(Gibson and Corcoran, 1975; Gibson and Curran, 1974) there has emerged a consistent tendency for neurotic introverts and stable extraverts to be most suggestible. No adequate explanation of these inconsistencies has yet been suggested, though Gibson has put forward some interesting hypothesis for future research. One is that the type of hypnotic induction procedure might be critical; neurotic introverts might be more susceptible to an authoritarian procedure which emphasizes "taskmotivating instructions," while stable extraverts might respond to permissive procedures that maximize interpersonal reinforcement. A second suggestion is that an uncomplicated correlation between hypnotizability and extraversion might emerge if the effect of neuroticism was minimized by administration of a tranquilizer. When these experiments have been done, we might be close to an understanding of the connection between personality and hypnotic susceptibility.

In summary, it seems that either extraverts or introverts may appear as more open or susceptible to social influence, depending upon the particular conditions of motivation. When social rewards and excitement are offered as incentives, the extraverts appear more likely to comply and cooperate. In conscience arousing situations, and those that are relatively impersonal, the introverts are often more motivated to comply. In nut shell, the
organismic variables and most of other variables impinging upon the subject may be tenable while the suggestion is made.

**The Role of Socialization in the Development of Introversion**

Introverts are relatively highly susceptible to punishment (Gray, 1970). Chief among them is the fact that this hypothesis can help resolve an important difficulty in Eysenck's approach to the process of socialization. This process is of central importance in his general theory of introversion-extraversion.

It is easier to understand Eysenck's theory of introversion if we first consider the problem to which this theory is an attempted solution. The starting point for this theory lies in the relation of the dimensions of introversion and neuroticism to each other as well as to a cluster of psychiatric disorders called by Eysenck against society called "Psychopathic". The problems they posed for the student of personality are these (1) what are the psychological and/or physiological variables which differentiate neurotic individual along the dimensions of introversion-extraversion (which is quite independent of neuroticism) and which cause the introverted neurotic to be susceptible to the dysthymic disorder, but the introverted neurotic to display antisocial behaviour of a
psychopathic kind? (2) what are the psychological and or physiological variables which result in the high susceptibility of individuals with high degree of neuroticism both to dysthymic disorders and to the commission of psychopathic offences? Although there have been many changes, but Eysenck's solutions to these problems have remained fairly constant over the years; they are set out in a highly simplified manner in the following figure 18 showing the basic structure of Eysenck's theory of introversion-extraversion (see p. 149).

(1) The first link in Eysenck's chain of explanation is to describe the dysthymic neuroses as disorder of over-socialization and psychopathic behaviour as a disorder of under socialization (e.g. Eysenck and Rachman, 1965). In the Introverted neurotic the establishment of the conscience treated by Eysenck as a cluster of classically conditioned fear reactions has proceeded so effectively that the individual concerned is disabled in adulthood by a variety of manifestations of his conditioned fears in the form of phobias, obsessions and compulsions, frank anxiety states, reactive depression, etc. In the extraverted neurotic, by contrast, there has been a relative failure of socialization, resulting in the lack of a sense of responsibility towards society and the various forms of antisocial behaviour: juvenile
Figure: 18

1. Socio-Psychiatric
   - Introverts: Dysthymic disorder
   - Extraverts: Psychopathic disorder

2. Socialization
   - in Introverts: Good
   - in Extraverts: Poor

3. Conditioning of fear
   - in Introverts: Good
   - in Extraverts: Poor

4. Conditionability
   - in Introverts: Good
   - in Extraverts: Poor

5. Arousability
   - in Introverts: High
   - in Extraverts: Low

6. Physiological
   - in Introverts: High activity
   - in Extraverts: Low activity
delinquency, sexual delinquency, lying, careless or drunken driving or more serious breaches of the law displayed by the psychopath.

(2) Introverts from the conditioned reflexes comprising the conscience with greater ease than Extraverts because they are in general more highly conditionable.

(3) The greater conditionability of the introverts is attributed by Eysenck (e.g. 1967) to a relatively high level of arousal at this pole of the introversion-extraversion dimension.

(4) The higher level of arousal in the introverts is due to a higher level of activity in the ARA (ascending reticular activating system).

As Gray (1970b) discussed, the evidence mainly derived from experiments in Eyeblink Conditioning (Eysenck, 1965, 1967; Spence, 1964; Levy, 1967; Ominsky and Kimble, 1966, Eysenck and Levy, 1967) gives support to the following conclusions:

(1) Introverts are better than extraverts at eyeblink conditioning under some conditions but not all.

(2) These conditions can be predicted on the hypothesis that introverts are relatively more highly aroused than extraverts.
The superior conditioning of the introverts appears in experiments which involve at least some degree of threat. Introverts condition better than extraverts only under some conditions. It appears that these conditions are, in general, relatively under arousing ones (Eysenck, 1967, Gray, 1970). But there is no reason to suppose that the parental conditioning technique presumably involved in the formation of the conscience are more often underarousing than overarousing, so that there is no longer any reason to predict the over socialization of the introverts which is critical to Eysenck's theoretical edifice. Therefore, it may be suggested that the introvert is more susceptible to punishment.

Earlier, Eysenck (1947) had proposed on the basis of his observations that not only introverts are more socialized but also follow social norms and expectations faster due to their sensitivity of the situation and hence show outward agreement and inward disagreement in situation warranting compliance and make all possible adjustments in day to day activities in order to smoothen the process of routine affairs than extraverts who can easily flout the norms.