

Etiquette, Conformity, Social Norms

Etiquette

etiquette, system of rules and conventions that regulate social and professional behaviour. In any social unit there are accepted rules of behaviour upheld and enforced by legal codes; there are also norms of behaviour mandated by custom and enforced by group pressure. An offender faces no formal trial or sentence for breach of etiquette; the penalty lies in the disapproval of other members of the group. Regardless of its level of material culture, any highly stratified society will possess an etiquette in which every person knows the behaviour expected from him toward others and from others toward himself.

The royal court was the natural home of etiquette, because it centred upon a monarch around whom niceties of behaviour spread in expanding circles. The author of Beowulf, writing of Anglo-Saxon society, describes Wealtheow the queen, “mindful of etiquette,” carrying the goblet first to the king, then to the courtiers, in a clearly defined order of precedence.

The Middle Ages was a golden period for Western etiquette, since the feudal system was strictly stratified. Jean Froissart in his Chronicle speaks of the Black Prince waiting at table upon the captive king John of France, after the Battle of Poitiers.

*In Britain standards of conduct were greatly affected by the publication in the 16th century of certain Italian works known as courtesy books. Probably the most influential of these was Baldassare Castiglione’s *Il libro del cortegiano* (1528; *The Book of Courtesy*, 1561). Further elaborations by English authorities—e.g., Richard Brathwaite’s *The English Gentleman and Description of a Good Wife*—arrived in colonial America with passengers of the “Mayflower.” These British imports were soon followed by such indigenous products as the manual for parents entitled *School of Good Manners* (attributed to Eleazar Moody, 1715).*

The late 18th and early 19th centuries showed another great flowering of etiquette in Britain when exquisites like Beau Nash and Beau Brummell imposed their whims as rules upon polite society; even the Prince Regent would not leave his waistcoat unbuttoned to a greater degree than Brummell prescribed. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries those in the upper strata of society regarded the observance of the most trivial demands of etiquette as at once a diversion and, for the women, an occupation. More and more elaborate rituals were designed to create a sense of exclusiveness for the initiates and to keep the unworthy, ignorant of them, at a distance.

*By mid-20th century, however, concern about polite conduct was no longer confined to a social elite. Good manners for ordinary people in everyday situations were set forth in the United States by two prominent and influential arbiters of taste, Emily Post and Amy Vanderbilt. Drawing on her own wide experience in social, political, and diplomatic situations, no less a personage than Eleanor Roosevelt published her own typically practical *Book of Common Sense Etiquette* (1962).*

World wars and increasing social equality resulted in a simpler code, appropriate to the faster tempo and less pampered conditions of life in society. Nonetheless, etiquette remains active on royal or ceremonial occasions and in the more formal aspects of professional or communal life. No rule of law or principle of morality decrees that a soup plate should be tilted away from, never toward, the diner, or that (in Great Britain) a surgeon shall be known as “Mr.” while a physician is addressed as “Dr.,” but etiquette ordains it. Since the framework and content of the communities of which society is formed are constantly changing, the habits of etiquette can and do change with them.

norm

society

Also known as: social norm

norm, rule or standard of behaviour shared by members of a social group. Norms may be internalized—i.e., incorporated within the individual so that there is conformity without external rewards or punishments, or they may be enforced by positive or negative sanctions from without. The social unit sharing particular norms may be small (e.g., a clique of friends) or may include all adult members of a society. Norms are more specific than values or ideals: honesty is a general value, but the rules defining what is honest behaviour in a particular situation are norms.

There are two schools of thought regarding why people conform to norms. The functionalist school of sociology maintains that norms reflect a consensus, a common value system developed through socialization, the process by which an individual learns the culture of his group. Norms contribute to the functioning of the social system and are said to develop to meet certain assumed “needs” of the system. The conflict school holds that norms are a mechanism for dealing with recurring social problems. The Marxian variety of conflict theory states that norms reflect the power of one section of a society over the other sections and that coercion and sanctions maintain these rules. Norms are thought to originate as a means by which one class or caste dominates or exploits others. Neither school adequately explains differences between and within societies.

Norm is also used to mean a statistically determined standard or the average behaviour, attitude, or opinion of a social group. In this sense it means actual, rather than expected, behaviour.

business etiquette

an overview of the conduct typically expected of business professionals.

netiquette

social behavior

Also known as: Internet etiquette, network etiquette. (Abbreviation of: Internet etiquette or network etiquette)

netiquette, guidelines for courteous communication in the online environment. It includes proper manners for sending e-mail, conversing online, and so on. Much like traditional etiquette, which provides rules of conduct in social situations, the purpose of netiquette is to help construct and maintain a pleasant, comfortable, and efficient environment for online communication, as well as to avoid placing strain on the system and generating conflict among users.

Netiquette includes rules that provide guidance for appropriate social interaction and technical performance online. What constitutes good netiquette varies among the many subcultures of the Internet, and, of course, netiquette issues change with time and technology. Nevertheless, some general principles of proper online manners can be outlined. They include:

- ***Lurking.*** *Lurking means that one reads the posts of a group without participating in the conversation—that is, one assumes the role of a silent reader/observer. Proper netiquette requires some knowledge of the culture of a group in which one chooses to participate; therefore, preliminary knowledge of the group, gained from lurking, is beneficial.*
- ***Reading the FAQs.*** *FAQ stands for Frequently Asked Questions; FAQs also provide answers to these questions. A FAQ is a list of questions that are commonly asked among newcomers. Reading a FAQ before posting helps a new group member to avoid committing the faux pas of asking questions that have already been answered, an act that often generates negative responses from other users.*
- ***Remember the Human.*** *Communicating via computers tends to lead people to lose sight of the feelings of, or to be insensitive to, others; consequently, users tend to be more blunt in stating their views than they probably would be face-to-face. Users need to be reminded that although*

they are communicating online, they are nevertheless dealing with real people who have real emotions.

- **Avoid Flames.** *A flame is a message that contains strong personal criticism or attack. Users are advised not to engage in flaming or participate in flame wars. One should treat others the same way that one would like to be treated, and profanity is not good netiquette. A rational tone and a polite manner are preferred.*
- **Avoid Shouting.** *Typing in ALL UPPER CASE is considered shouting, which is not good netiquette. To emphasize a point, instead of typing in all upper case, one can use underlining or **asterisks** around the text needing emphasis.*
- **Not a Homework Center.** *Online groups are resourceful arenas; however, users should not use groups as a first resort for information-gathering or as a “quick” source for homework or class assignments. Before going online to ask questions, users should have completed preliminary research by visiting the library or doing a Web search.*
- **Composition Protocols.** *Users should observe correct grammar and be careful about punctuation and spelling when composing their messages. Online messages should be clear, concise, and organized; an articulate and thoughtful message generates more responses.*

Netiquette is enforced by the community at large, as the Internet does not have a policing entity. Users may openly object to breaches of netiquette; if the breach is severe, they may even contact a perpetrator's Internet service provider for recourse.

conformity, the process whereby people change their beliefs, attitudes, actions, or perceptions to more closely match those held by groups to which they belong or want to belong or by groups whose approval they desire. Conformity has important social implications and continues to be actively researched.

Classic studies

Two lines of research have had a great impact on views of conformity. In one set of studies (1935), the Turkish-born social psychologist Muzafer Sherif demonstrated the power of social influence to change people's perceptions of highly ambiguous stimuli. Sherif made use of the autokinetic effect, a perceptual illusion that occurs when people are asked to concentrate on a stationary point of light in a dark room. Under those circumstances, people perceive movement in the light. Some think it moves only a little; others think it moves a lot.

Sherif found that when groups of three people were brought together and asked to say out loud how far a light moved, their judgments gradually converged. In other words, they developed a group norm about the distance the light moved. And that norm had a lasting impact on participants' perceptions. Conformity to the group norm was still evident a year later. Participants created a norm through mutual social influence, which then influenced their private responses.

In another series of experiments, the American psychologist Solomon Asch assembled groups of seven to nine people for a study on visual perception. The experimental task, which involved matching the length of a standard line against three comparison lines, was easy. Each group contained one naive participant who answered next to last. The remaining “members” were confederates of the experimenter and gave unanimously incorrect answers on 12 of 18 trials.

Asch found that conformity occurred even in a situation where the majority gave clearly erroneous answers. Participants' responses agreed with the erroneous majority approximately one-third of the time, and 27 percent of participants conformed on at least eight trials. Control participants (who made judgments privately) gave incorrect answers less than 1 percent of the time. Although the level of conformity that Asch obtained may seem surprising, it is worth noting that participants' responses were correct approximately two-thirds of the time, and 24 percent of participants never conformed.

Types of conformity

Two categories of conformity have been distinguished: public agreement (compliance) and private agreement (acceptance). If conformity is defined as movement toward a group norm, then compliance refers to overt behavioral change in the direction of that norm, whereas acceptance refers to covert attitudinal or perceptual change. For example, if an individual initially refused to sign a petition advocating abortion rights, learned that a group advocated those rights, and then signed a petition favouring those rights, the person would be showing compliance. In contrast, if an individual privately believed that abortion should be outlawed, learned that a group advocated abortion rights, and then changed his private opinion about those rights, the person would be showing acceptance.

Several forms of nonconformity have been distinguished, but two of the most important are independence and anticonformity. Independence occurs when a person initially disagrees with a group and exhibits neither compliance nor acceptance after being exposed to group pressure. In other words, the person stands fast when faced with disagreement. In contrast, anticonformity occurs when a person initially disagrees with a group and moves even farther away from its position (at the public or private level) after being exposed to pressure. (Ironically, anticonformers are just as responsive to group pressure as conformers, but they manifest their susceptibility by moving away from the group.)

The role of motivation

People conform to group pressure because they are dependent on the group for satisfying two important desires: the desire to have an accurate perception of reality and the desire to be accepted by other people.

People want to hold accurate beliefs about the world because such beliefs usually lead to rewarding outcomes. Some beliefs about the world can be verified by using objective tests; others cannot be verified by using objective standards and hence must be verified by using social tests, namely comparing one's beliefs to those of other people whose judgment one respects. If those others agree with one's beliefs, one gains confidence in them; if they disagree, one loses confidence. Because disagreement is disturbing, people are motivated to eliminate it, and one way to do so is to conform to group norms.

According to that analysis, people sometimes conform to groups because they are uncertain about the correctness of their beliefs and believe the group is more likely to be correct than they are. That kind of conformity reflects what the American researchers Morton Deutsch and Harold Gerard labeled informational influence. Informational influence generally produces private acceptance as well as public compliance. This is illustrated in Sherif's work, which indicated that people judging an ambiguous stimulus exhibited both compliance (when they made judgments in others' presence) and acceptance (when they later responded privately).

Because informational influence is based on insecurity about one's beliefs, one would expect it to be more common when an individual feels dependent on others for information. Consistently with that assumption, people exhibit more conformity when they are working on ambiguous tasks than on unambiguous tasks. In addition, they conform more when they have doubts about their own task competence and when they think other group members are highly competent in the task.

Normative influence

In addition to wanting to hold correct beliefs about the world, people are motivated to be accepted by other group members. The desire for social acceptance is very powerful in a wide range of situations and explains why people are typically quite uncomfortable if they think others currently reject them or are likely to do so in the future.

People sometimes conform to groups because they are motivated to be liked (or at least not disliked) and believe that other members will feel more kindly toward them if they conform to rather than deviate from group norms. That kind of conformity reflects what Deutsch and Gerard labeled normative influence. In general, normative influence produces public compliance but not private acceptance. That is illustrated in the work of Asch, as discussed above.

Group members exhibit more conformity when working toward a common goal rather than toward individual goals, presumably because they believe that deviance on their part will be punished more severely in the former case. As might be expected, however, conformity in common-goal groups is substantially reduced if members believe that such behaviour will lower the group's probability of attaining a positive outcome. Another factor that increases normative influence is surveillance by other group members. People who are concerned about others' evaluations ought to conform more when their behaviour is public than when it is private, and conformity is in fact higher in the former condition.

It should be noted that group members do reject people who deviate from the group consensus. Factors influencing the likelihood of rejection include the extremity and content of the deviate's position, the presumed reason for the deviate's behaviour, and the deviate's status in the group.

Mixed cases

Although informational and normative influences have been discussed here as though they are mutually exclusive, they occur simultaneously in at least some group situations. That is a major premise of social-identity theory, which examines how the self-concept is influenced by social-group membership. Social-identity theory assumes that disagreement with others produces uncertainty only when one expects to agree with those people. For that reason, disagreement with in-group members produces more uncertainty than disagreement with out-group members. In addition, the theory assumes that some in-group members are more influential than others.

More specifically, a member's influence depends on how much that member's position embodies what is unique about the group—the norm that differentiates the in-group from out-groups. Members who are closer to that norm are more influential than those who are farther from it. Finally, the theory assumes that conformity involves private acceptance as well as public compliance, because people believe that in-group norms provide valid evidence about reality. A substantial amount of research is consistent with the social-identity explanation of conformity.

Individual differences

Every conformity experiment has found that some people conform more than others. By using analytic techniques that combined the results of many studies, the American psychologists Alice Eagly and Linda Carli found that women were more influenceable than men, particularly in conformity experiments that did not involve surveillance and in attitude-change studies where participants listened to persuasive communications. The most plausible explanation is that most men are socialized to be more dominant and assertive than are most women, and most people of both sexes are more likely to exhibit such gender-consistent behaviour in public (group-pressure) settings than in private settings.

The psychologists Michael Bond and Peter Smith examined cultural differences in conformity by analyzing the results of studies involving participants from 17 countries. They measured the relationship between the extent of individualism or collectivism in the countries involved and the amount of conformity that residents displayed on Asch's line-judgment task. Individualism is a cultural orientation that emphasizes independence, autonomy, and self-reliance. Collectivism is a cultural orientation that emphasizes interdependence, cooperation, and social harmony.

Bond and Smith found that cultural values were indeed related to conformity: people in collectivist cultures displayed more conformity than did people in individualist cultures. Although the interpretation of those results is not completely clear, it is plausible that collectivists conform more than individualists because they give greater weight to collective goals and are more concerned about how other people view their behaviour and are affected by it.

comedy of manners

narrative genre

comedy of manners, witty, cerebral form of dramatic comedy that depicts and often satirizes the manners and affectations of a contemporary society. A comedy of manners is concerned with social usage and the question of whether or not characters meet certain social standards. Often the governing social standard is morally trivial but exacting. The plot of such a comedy, usually concerned with an illicit love affair or similarly scandalous matter, is subordinate to the play's brittle atmosphere, witty dialogue, and pungent commentary on human foibles.

The comedy of manners, which was usually written by sophisticated authors for members of their own coterie or social class, has historically thrived in periods and societies that combined material prosperity and moral latitude. Such was the case in ancient Greece when Menander (c. 342–c. 292 bc) inaugurated New Comedy, the forerunner of comedy of manners. Menander's smooth style, elaborate plots, and stock characters were imitated by the Roman poets Plautus (c. 254–184 bc) and Terence (186/185–159 bc), whose comedies were widely known and copied during the Renaissance.

One of the greatest exponents of the comedy of manners was Molière, who satirized the hypocrisy and pretension of 17th-century French society in such plays as *L'École des femmes* (1662; *The School for Wives*) and *Le Misanthrope* (1666; *The Misanthrope*).

In England the comedy of manners had its great day during the Restoration period. Although influenced by Ben Jonson's comedy of humours, the Restoration comedy of manners was lighter, defter, and more vivacious in tone. Playwrights declared themselves against affected wit and acquired follies and satirized these qualities in caricature characters with label-like names such as Sir Fopling Flutter (in Sir George Etherege's *Man of Mode*, 1676) and Tattle (in William Congreve's *The Old Batchelour*, 1693). The masterpieces of the genre were the witty, cynical, and epigrammatic plays of William Wycherley (*The Country-Wife*, 1675) and William Congreve (*The Way of the World*, 1700). In the late 18th century Oliver Goldsmith (*She Stoops to Conquer*, 1773) and Richard Brinsley Sheridan (*The Rivals*, 1775; *The School for Scandal*, 1777) revived the form.

The tradition of elaborate, artificial plotting and epigrammatic dialogue was carried on by the Anglo-Irish playwright Oscar Wilde in *Lady Windermere's Fan* (1892) and *The Importance of Being Earnest* (1895). In the 20th century the comedy of manners reappeared in the witty, sophisticated drawing-room plays of the British dramatists Noël Coward and Somerset Maugham and the Americans Philip Barry and S.N. Behrman.

cultural anthropology

Also known as: ethnology

cultural anthropology, a major division of anthropology that deals with the study of culture in all of its aspects and that uses the methods, concepts, and data of archaeology, ethnography and ethnology, folklore, and linguistics in its descriptions and analyses of the diverse peoples of the world.

Definition and scope

Etymologically, anthropology is the science of humans. In fact, however, it is only one of the sciences of humans, bringing together those disciplines the common aims of which are to describe human beings and explain them on the basis of the biological and cultural characteristics of the populations among which they are distributed and to emphasize, through time, the differences and variations of these populations. The concept of race, on the one hand, and that of culture, on the other, have received special attention; and although their meaning is still subject to debate, these terms are doubtless the most common of those in the anthropologist's vocabulary.

Anthropology, which is concerned with the study of human differences, was born after the Age of Discovery had opened up societies that had remained outside the technological civilization of the modern West. In fact, the field of research was at first restricted to those societies that had been given one unsatisfactory label after another: "savage," "primitive," "tribal," "traditional," or even "preliterate," "prehistorical," and so on. What such societies had in common, above all, was being the most "different" or the most foreign to the anthropologist; and in the early phases of anthropology, the anthropologists were always European or North American. The distance between the researcher and the object of his study has been a characteristic of anthropological research; it has been said of the anthropologist that he was the "astronomer of the sciences of man."

Anthropologists today study more than just primitive societies. Their research extends not only to village communities within modern societies but also to cities, even to industrial enterprises. Nevertheless, anthropology's first field of research, and the one that perhaps remains the most important, shaped its specific point of view with regard to the other sciences of man and defined its theme. If, in particular, it is concerned with generalizing about patterns of human behaviour seen in all their dimensions and with achieving a total description of social and cultural phenomena, this is because anthropology has observed small-scale societies, which are simpler or at least more homogeneous than modern societies and which change at a slower pace. Thus they are easier to see whole.

What has just been said refers especially to the branch of anthropology concerned with the cultural characteristics of man. Anthropology has, in fact, gradually divided itself into two major spheres: the study of man's biological characteristics and the study of his cultural characteristics. The reasons for this split are manifold, one being the rejection of the initial mistakes regarding correlations between race and culture. More generally speaking, the vast field of 19th-century anthropology was subdivided into a series of increasingly specialized disciplines, using their own methods and techniques, that were given different labels according to national traditions.

Distinction between physical anthropology and cultural anthropology

Thus two large disciplines—physical anthropology and cultural anthropology—and such related disciplines as prehistory and linguistics now cover the program that originally was set up for a single study of anthropology. The two fields are largely autonomous, having their own relations with disciplines outside anthropology; and it is unlikely that any researchers today work simultaneously in the fields of physical and cultural anthropology. The generalist has become rare. On the other hand, the fields have not been cut off from one another. Specialists in the two fields still cooperate in specific genetic or demographic problems and other matters.

Prehistoric archaeology and linguistics also have notable links with cultural anthropology. In posing the problem of the evolution of mankind in an inductive way, archaeology contributed to the creation of the first concepts of anthropology, and archaeology is still indispensable in uncovering the past of societies under observation. In many areas, when it is a question of interpreting the use of rudimentary tools or of certain elementary religious phenomena, prehistory and cultural anthropology are mutually helpful.

"Primitive" societies that have not yet reached the metal age are still in existence.

Relations between linguistics and cultural anthropology are numerous. On a purely practical level the cultural anthropologist has to serve a linguistic apprenticeship. He cannot do without a knowledge of the language of the people he is studying, and often he has had to make the first survey of it. One of his essential tasks, moreover, has been to collect the various forms of oral expression, including myths, folk tales, proverbs, and so forth. On the theoretical level, cultural anthropology has often used concepts developed in the field of linguistics: in studying society as a system of communication, in defining the notion of structure, and in analyzing the way in which man organizes and classifies his whole experience of the world.

Cultural anthropology maintains relations with a great number of other sciences. It has been said of sociology, for instance, that it was almost the twin sister of anthropology. The two are presumably differentiated by their field of study (modern societies versus traditional societies). But the contrast is forced. These two social sciences often meet. Thus, the study of colonial societies borrows as much from sociology as from cultural anthropology. And it has already been remarked how cultural anthropology intervenes more and more frequently in urban and industrial fields classically the domain of sociology.

There have also been fruitful exchanges with other disciplines quite distinct from cultural anthropology. In political science the discussion of the concept of the state and of its origin has been nourished by cultural anthropology. Economists, too, have depended on cultural anthropology to see concepts in a more comparative light and even to challenge the very notion of an “economic man” (suspiciously similar to the 19th-century capitalist revered by the classical economists). Cultural anthropology has brought to psychology new bases on which to reflect on concepts of personality and the formation of personality. It has permitted psychology to develop a system of cross-cultural psychiatry, or so-called ethnopsychiatry. Conversely, the psychological sciences, particularly psychoanalysis, have offered cultural anthropology new hypotheses for an interpretation of the concept of culture.

The link with history has long been a vital one because cultural anthropology was originally based on an evolutionist point of view and because it has striven to reconstruct the cultural history of societies about which, for lack of written documents, no historical record could be determined. Cultural anthropology has more recently suggested to historians new techniques of research based on the analysis and criticism of oral tradition. And so “ethnohistory” is beginning to emerge. Finally, cultural anthropology has close links with human geography. Both of them place great importance on man either as he uses space or acts to transform the natural environment. It is not without significance that some early anthropologists were originally geographers.

Historical development of cultural anthropology

All human societies have been curious about how their customs originated and what the differences between their own culture and that of neighbouring societies might mean. Thus, in a sense they have all constructed their own anthropologies. But the interpretations put forward, even when they were founded partly on accurate observation, most often remained on the level of myth. Embryonic scientific thought began to appear in only a limited number of centres of civilization: in the classical Mediterranean world, in China, in the medieval Arab world, and in the modern Western world. Only in the West, however, did various ideas converge to bring about the birth of scientific anthropology in the 19th century.

A characteristic common to all these centres of civilization was the control that they exercised over vast areas and the opportunity that they enjoyed—through their soldiers, merchants, pilgrims, and missionaries—to gather observations on a wide variety of populations. Such a gathering of data was necessary in order even to begin to understand how men adapted to their environments, how they used their various economic, social, and political institutions, and how mankind evolved from simple to complex societies. Historians and philosophers among the ancient Greeks, Arabs, and Chinese all asked such questions. To take only the example of western Europe, many pertinent questions were posed by the

French philosophers Jean Bodin and Michel de Montaigne as early as the 16th century, by the English philosophers Thomas Hobbes and John Locke in the 17th, and by the French philosophers Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Voltaire in the 18th, to mention only those who are often placed among the precursors of modern anthropology.

19th-century beginnings

Modern anthropology began to take shape before the middle of the 19th century because of a series of innovations in the Western world. The last great phase of the discovery of the world had begun at the end of the 18th century. At the same time, political and intellectual revolutions had facilitated the questioning of certain religious dogmas, thus opening the way to the discussion of hitherto half-forbidden subjects. The 19th century, therefore, soon saw a revival of interest in and study of the origin of man, the unity or plurality of the human species, and the fixity or mutability of animal species.

*Thus, the science of anthropology developed as an outgrowth of contemporary studies of the classification of human races; of the comparative characteristics of human anatomy; of the history of human settlements; of the classification of languages and the comparison of grammars; of the comparison between primitive and ancient societies; and of the historical development of man's economy and industry. Finally, about 1840, a principle for the study of human facts was proposed: the concept of evolution. This was even before Charles Darwin had published his celebrated *Origin of Species* (1859). This concept, arising in strong debates, provided the starting point for anthropology.*

Evolutionism

Almost to the end of the 19th century, evolutionism determined the complexion of the new science. A major task of cultural anthropology was thought to be that of classifying different societies and cultures and defining the phases and states through which all human groups pass—the linear interpretation of history. Some groups progress more slowly, some faster, as they advance from the simple to the complex, from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, from the irrational to the rational. It suffices to quote an American anthropologist, Lewis Henry Morgan:

*As it is undeniable that portions of the human family have existed in a state of savagery, other portions in a state of barbarism, and still other portions in a state of civilization, it seems equally so that these three distinct conditions are connected with each other in a natural as well as necessary sequence of progress (*Ancient Society*, 1877).*

Other quotations from a Scotsman, John F. MacLennan, or an Englishman, Edward B. Tylor, would take the same position.

Cultural anthropology, then, set out to analyze the totality of human culture in time and space. But by assuming a linear conception of history, it too often neglected the discontinuities and interferences of concrete history. Morgan, and particularly Tylor, however, sometimes felt the necessity of introducing the concept of the “diffusion,” or spread, of cultural characteristics from one people to another—thus suggesting that characteristics could develop independently and converge and that a people could leap over “stages” of evolution by borrowing knowledge from others. Moreover, because it based itself on a theory that all mankind had a similar psychic outlook or that something called “human nature” was universal, anthropology also failed to take into account the fact that the same cultural trait can mean different things depending on the society in which it is found.

Marxism and the collectors

*At the same time, in the second half of the 19th century another kind of evolutionism developed, that of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Partly independent of anthropological evolutionism (Marx's *Critique of Political Economy* dates from 1859), partly linked to it (Engels' most important work appeared after*

Morgan's Ancient Society and made use of it), the Marxist theory laid stress on the causes of human evolution. A society was defined by its mode of production, on which its political, juridical, and ideological superstructures were allegedly based. These superstructures continued to exist after the mode of production had changed; and in the conflict that followed, this contradiction opened the way to a new type of society. Numerous anthropologists have taken the Marxist analysis into account, even if only to retain its historical view and to reject its economic determinism.

During this same period, especially toward the end of the 19th century, the tales of missionaries, traders, and travelling adventurers included an abundance of miscellaneous information that was collected in such works as Sir James Frazer's Golden Bough (1890) and Ernest Crawley's Mystic Rose (1902). These rather encyclopaedic collections of customs, religious and magical practices, and other curious data were read with relish by the intellectual community; the theories that accompanied the collections were equally appreciated by evolutionary-minded anthropologists, as the theories were meant to establish an evolutionary sequence of magical, religious, and scientific thought, using the data as evidence.

20th-century trends

By the beginning of the 20th century, many cultural anthropologists had already begun to turn toward what might be called a more pluralistic viewpoint. To account for the variety of societies and cultures and the broadening of the differences that separated them, they suggested taking the total circumstances of each human group into account by considering the whole of its history, the contacts that it had had with other groups, and the favourable or unfavourable circumstances that had weighed on its development. Such a view was distinguished by a marked relativism: each culture represented an original development, conditioned as much by its social as by its geographical environment and by the manner in which it used and enriched the cultural materials that came to it from neighbours or others (through "diffusion") or from its own creativity (through "invention" and "adaptation").

Boas and the culture history school

Cultural anthropology was also diversifying its concepts and its areas of research without losing its unity. Franz Boas, a German-born American, for example, was one of the first to scorn the evolutionist's search for selected facts to grace abstract evolutionary theories; he inspired a number of students—Ruth Benedict, Alfred L. Kroeber, Margaret Mead, and Edward Sapir—to go out and seek evidence of human behaviour among people in their natural environs, to venture into the field to gather facts and artifacts and record observable cultural processes. Consequently he is known as the founder of the so-called culture history school, which for much of the 20th century dominated American cultural anthropology.

Beyond this emphasis on field work and first-hand observation, it may also be said that Boas inclined toward what was called functionalism or the functional approach—an approach based on sociological theories of the late 19th and early 20th centuries that tended to liken societies to living organisms or machines, with interdependent parts. In the words of Melville J. Herskovits, one of Boas' students,

the functional view, attempts to study the interrelation between the various elements, small and large, in a culture. Its object is essentially to achieve some expression of the unities in culture by indicating how trait and complex and pattern, however separable they may be, intermesh, as the gears of some machine, to constitute a smoothly running, effectively functioning whole (from Man and His Works, 1948).

Boas insisted upon this method of considering any single culture as a whole. Finally, by emphasizing the importance of collecting life histories, he drew attention to the problems posed by connections between culture and personality.

Mauss and the "sociological" school

In a similar way, Marcel Mauss, in France, influenced the characteristic tendencies of a whole generation of European sociologists and cultural anthropologists, including Alfred Métraux and Claude Lévi-Strauss, and founded the Institute of Ethnology of the University of Paris; he also influenced such men as the noted British cultural (or social) anthropologists Bronisław Malinowski and Alfred R. Radcliffe-Brown. In general it may be said that Mauss, like Boas, was insistent upon studying social phenomena as a system—but in a slightly different fashion. Like many others of his time he conceived of systems as self-regulating or equilibrium-seeking, composed of elements that operate to maintain the integration or adaptation of the system. Mauss gave impetus, in fact, to what was called structuralism or the structural approach, which focussed more on society as an indivisible social organism than on society as an interrelation of individuals (the functionalist's emphasis). Like Boas, Mauss also tried to twin culture and personality—that is, cultural anthropology and psychology.

The “grand diffusionists”

The large and influential American school of “culture history” anthropologists led by Boas should not be confused with a distinct and smaller group of Austro-German diffusionists, led by Fritz Graebner and Wilhelm Schmidt, who constituted what has been called the “culture-historical” school in Europe. These latter, too, rejected classical 19th-century evolutionism, but they were nevertheless inclined toward painting grand theories—principally the theory that out of a few ancient cultural centres or civilizations, born quite separately, there had developed the array of cultures existing today. Diffusion, or the spreading of culture traits, in their view, was the prime force of human development, and all cultural development could be traced to a few inventive centres. Because they termed these original centres Kulturkreise, (or “cultural clusters”), they were also known as the Kulturkreise school of cultural anthropology. This kind of pseudo-history was carried to even greater lengths by a British group of diffusionists, led by Grafton Elliot Smith and William J. Perry, who even named a single fountainhead of all cultural development—Egypt.

Functionalism and structuralism

Some schools of research that began to develop between the two world wars more or less vigorously rejected the historical approaches, sometimes denying any interest in them whatever. According to the cultural functionalists, including the followers of Malinowski, the only way to explain facts was to define the function that they performed currently in a given culture. The aim of all cultural anthropological research, they held, should be to perceive the totality of a culture and the organic connection of all its parts. Consequently, comparison did not make sense: each culture was a unique reality. History, moreover, made no more sense; a culture was to be interpreted at one point in time, as if the age and the origin of the elements composing it were without importance. The only thing that counted was the function the elements performed now. Earlier cultural anthropologists had talked of “survivals,” customs or other cultural traits that survived from out of the past though no longer with any real function or meaning. But Malinowski would say, “There are no survivals”; everything current, according to the functionalists, has some function.

Whereas the name of Malinowski is supremely associated with the school of functionalism, the name of Radcliffe-Brown is known as one of the most important proponents of present-day structuralism. Relying on the concepts of formal mathematics and linguistics, Radcliffe-Brown and other structuralists tried to determine whether in cultural anthropology it was possible to reveal that which “suggests the character of a system” beyond empirical reality and which “alone is the true object of science” (Lévi-Strauss). A structure is not a sum of social relations, which are only the primary material from which the observer extracts “structural models.” A structure is a system of which the members of the society being studied are not aware or only partly so. The model that the cultural anthropologist constructs from the system is valid when the model's operation can account for all the observed facts. This exacting approach has proved particularly useful in studying kinship and marriage relations as well as myths. The difficulties of

using this approach in other fields, as well as the fact that historical changes are difficult to include in this sort of static analysis, strengthen the objections that many workers in the field have raised against it.

Cultural psychology

Benedict, Ruth. American anthropologist Ruth Benedict, c. 1937.

One development of the interwar period led certain cultural anthropologists to speak of a new subdiscipline, cultural psychology, or ethnopsychology, which is based on the idea that culture conditions the very psychological makeup of individuals (as opposed to the older notion of a universal psyche or human nature). In the 1930s, for instance, in her studies of the American Southwest, Ruth Benedict found that the ways in which the Pueblo Indians thought and reasoned were strikingly different from the ways in which their immediate neighbours thought and reasoned, even though their geographical environment was virtually identical. Her conclusion was that each culture over the ages had evolved and given to its members a unique “psychological set” or orientation toward reality and that this set actually determined how the members saw and processed information from the environment. Culture, in effect, affects the ways in which the mind works.

Studies in culture and personality have developed in many directions. Research into forms of child rearing, for instance, have called in question the universality of Freudian propositions concerning parent-child relationships. There have been many studies of value systems, which give a culture what has been called its “configuration,” or of the personality types prized or rejected by each culture, or of the “national characteristics” of certain modern societies. The results of these studies have, however, been uneven in quality.

Neo-Marxism and neo-evolutionism

Finally, certain theoretical tendencies of the 19th century came back into favour. For political reasons, Soviet cultural anthropologists conducted their research in the tradition both of Marxist analysis and of a fairly rigid evolutionism. Even their choice of subjects was sometimes linked to official ideology—as, for example, a program of religious anthropology aimed expressly at the “elimination of religious prejudice in the Russian population.” Elsewhere, in France, for example, a brand of neo-Marxism has influenced a new generation of cultural anthropologists to concentrate on analyses of primitive economies. Classical evolutionism, meanwhile, has been revived in the United States by some cultural anthropologists who speak of “multilinear evolutionism” or many paths to modernization.

Status of contemporary cultural anthropology

It is true that cultural anthropology has not reached a state of complete coherence. This is clear from the persistence of divergent national traditions and from the way in which research can be impregnated with explicit or implicit ideologies. It is also true that different schools of thought coexist in the same country and that cultural anthropology is not therefore based on a unified body of concepts, whereas a science is defined above all as a homogeneous language for interpreting a specific level of reality. A “science” of culture would seem possible only if anthropologists could free themselves of ethnocentrism and produce concepts and other elements that were universal, objective, and theoretically significant. The functionalists think they have fulfilled these conditions. The structuralists challenge this and, in their turn, try to fulfill the conditions. Thus cultural anthropology—as opposed, for example, to linguistics—has developed only very partially a terminology independent of a national or private language. These limitations are still encountered by most of the social sciences. But cultural anthropology’s primary aim—to permit cross-cultural comparability—makes the problem even more serious.

The new research and fieldwork

Cultural anthropology is undergoing a crucial test of another kind. Its traditional objects of study—“primitive” or “traditional” cultures—seem to be disappearing. Either they are dying out because they find it impossible to adapt themselves to a modern world or they are transforming under the direct or

indirect influence of modern industrial societies. Moreover, those that do remain at a folk level often take exception to being placed among societies that are the subject of anthropological study, seeing this as a manifestation of condescension and a vestige of domination.

Much cultural anthropological research and study has entered the library or laboratory. One of the criticisms of Boas and others engaged in pure fieldwork was that they were collectors rather than systematizers. There is thus a considerable wealth of ethnographic data to be analyzed, collated, classified, and interpreted in order to be made useful. Files of information are being arranged in what are called Human Relations Area Files. More and more typologies are being constructed, typologies based on political systems or technology, or systems of kinship. In addition, new readings of the material are being attempted in the hope that mathematical formulations or models might be obtained. Also emerging is the study of insufficiently known societies by techniques of simulation.

Many cultural anthropologists refuse to turn to the laboratory and continue to do fieldwork, either among Western populations or among modernizing, formerly colonial populations. They are joined in this task by researchers native to those populations. For some anthropologists these field studies provide an opportunity for a true anthropological experiment, determining how people respond to modernizing influences and how elements of the old culture evolve into those of the new. Such anthropologists tend to reject the concept that social systems seek integration and “equilibrium.” Instead they propose a more “dynamic” interpretation of traditional societies and emphasize the role played therein by tensions and conflicts.

In any case, at a time when the problems of development are among the primary cares of the world, a growing number of anthropologists are devoting themselves to research the results of which can be used in political policy and decision making—whether they are employed directly by interested governments, or lent by foreign governments or international organizations, or recruited by foundations for study and development.

Non-Western cultural anthropologists

A significant development in the latter half of the 20th century has been the emergence of more and more non-Western cultural anthropologists. Originally, cultural anthropology was a Western interest and endeavour, and it has continued to be dominated by Westerners. Even in non-Western countries where anthropology institutes and university departments have begun to multiply somewhat—as in Japan, India, and some Latin-American nations—cultural anthropologists have remained rather constricted. Japan is a good example. Cultural anthropology as an independent science there is still young, having arisen largely only since World War II; and most Japanese cultural anthropologists in the schools have had to be hybrid teachers, attaching themselves to sociology or social science departments and teaching sociology or some other related discipline in addition to cultural anthropology. Not only have cultural anthropology courses been few but also funds for field studies have been limited, so that there have been few lengthy and intensive studies; what research there has been has focussed largely on Japanese or other East or Southeast Asian communities.

Furthermore, *Japanese cultural anthropologists have shared a problem faced by many non-Western researchers, in that the native language in which they write has not been as readily accessible to foreigners as have been western European languages. “International communication,” the Japanese cultural anthropologist Takao Sofue has noted, “has [thus] been seriously restricted with the result that Japanese scientists have been isolated from effective criticism from abroad” (“Social Anthropology in Japan,” *American Behavioral Scientist*, 12:15–17, Jan.–Feb. 1969). It has also meant, of course, that they have not been sufficiently widely read abroad to make their influence felt. This problem, though, is not so serious in non-Western countries like India, where a European language constitutes a major language of scholarly communication.*

Etiquette

Customary code of polite behaviour

Etiquette (/ˈetɪkət, -kɪt/) can be defined as a set of norms of personal behavior in polite society, usually occurring in the form of an ethical code of the expected and accepted social behaviors that accord with the conventions and norms observed and practiced by a society, a social class, or a social group. In modern English usage, the French word *étiquette* (label and tag) dates from the year 1750 and also originates from the French word for "ticket," possibly symbolizing a person's entry into society through proper behavior. There are many important historical figures that have helped to shape the meaning of the term as well as provide varying perspectives.

In Company Shocked at a Lady Getting up to Ring the Bell (1805) James Gillray caricatured "A widow and her suitors, who seem to have forgotten their manners in the intensity of their admiration."

History

At the Palace of Versailles, King Louis XIV used complicated *étiquette* to manage and control his courtiers and their politicking.

In the third millennium BCE, the Ancient Egyptian vizier Ptahhotep wrote *The Maxims of Ptahhotep* (2375–2350 BCE), a didactic book of precepts extolling civil virtues such as truthfulness, self-control, and kindness towards other people. Recurrent thematic motifs in the maxims include learning by listening to other people, being mindful of the imperfection of human knowledge, that avoiding open conflict whenever possible should not be considered weakness, and that the pursuit of justice should be foremost. Yet, in human affairs, the command of a god ultimately prevails in all matters. Some of Ptahhotep's maxims indicate a person's correct behaviours in the presence of great personages (political, military, religious), and instructions on how to choose the right master and how to serve him. Other maxims teach the correct way to be a leader through openness and kindness, that greed is the base of all evil and should be guarded against, and that generosity towards family and friends is praiseworthy.

Confucius (551–479 BCE) was a Chinese intellectual and philosopher whose works emphasized personal and governmental morality, correctness of social relationships, the pursuit of justice in personal dealings, and sincerity in all personal relations.

Baldassare Castiglione (1478–1529 CE), count of Casatigo, was an Italian courtier and diplomat, soldier, and author of *The Book of the Courtier* (1528), an exemplar courtesy book dealing with questions of the etiquette and morality of the courtier during the Italian Renaissance.

Louis XIV (1638–1715), King of France, used a codified etiquette to tame the French nobility and assert his supremacy as the absolute monarch of France. In consequence, the ceremonious royal court favourably impressed foreign dignitaries whom the king received at the seat of French government, the Palace of Versailles, to the south-west of Paris.

Benjamin Franklin (1706–1790), an American inventor and Founding Father, contributed to the American understanding of etiquette through his emphasis on practical morality and social harmony. In his autobiography published in 1791, Franklin outlined a personal system of self-improvement centered

around thirteen virtues, including sincerity, humility, and temperance. He viewed etiquette as a means of fostering effective communication, avoiding unnecessary conflict, and promoting cooperation in both personal and public life. Franklin distrusted ostentatious formality and believed manners should serve a purpose rooted in usefulness, sincerity, and democratic ideals.

George Washington (1732–1799), the first President of the United States and commander of the Continental Army during the American Revolutionary War, was heavily influenced in his youth by a set of social maxims titled *Rules of Civility & Decent Behaviour in Company and Conversation*. Adapted from an earlier French text, these 110 rules emphasized humility, respect for others, restraint, and the importance of maintaining decorum in public life. Though Washington did not write the rules himself, copying them by hand served as early moral training and significantly shaped his public persona. The maxims promoted the idea that civil behavior was a reflection of personal virtue and that etiquette could serve as a tool for cultivating leadership and moral character. Despite George Washington's strong public support for education, many of his contemporaries criticized his intellect, labeling him as poorly educated and lacking eloquence. Figures like Aaron Burr, Thomas Jefferson, and John Adams described him as unrefined, grammatically weak, and intellectually limited. Due to Washington's personal sensitivity to the level of his academic exposure, these critiques only increased the motivation to copy the 110 rules.[7] Although there may not be any evidence of George Washington verbally passing on the maxims, his actions and character served as a physical example of these beliefs.

Politeness

In the 18th century, Philip Stanhope, the 4th Earl of Chesterfield, first used the word etiquette to mean "the conventional rules of personal behaviour in polite society." (William Hoare)

In the 18th century, during the Age of Enlightenment, the adoption of etiquette was a self-conscious process for acquiring the conventions of politeness and the normative behaviours (charm, manners, demeanour) which symbolically identified the person as a genteel member of the upper class. To identify with the social élite, the upwardly mobile middle class and the bourgeoisie adopted the behaviours and the artistic preferences of the upper class. To that end, socially ambitious people of the middle classes occupied themselves with learning, knowing, and practising the rules of social etiquette, such as the arts of elegant dress and gracious conversation, when to show emotion, and courtesy with and towards women.

In the early 18th century, Anthony Ashley-Cooper, 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury, wrote influential essays that defined politeness as the art of being pleasing in company; and discussed the function and nature of politeness in the social discourse of a commercial society:

'Politeness' may be defined as dext'rous management of our words and actions, whereby we make other people have better opinion of us and ourselves.

Periodicals, such as *The Spectator*, a daily publication founded in 1711 by Joseph Addison and Richard Steele, regularly advised their readers on the etiquette required of a gentleman, a man of good and courteous conduct; their stated editorial goal was "to enliven morality with wit, and to temper wit with morality... to bring philosophy out of the closets and libraries, schools and colleges, to dwell in clubs and assemblies, at tea-tables and coffeehouses"; to which end, the editors published articles written by educated authors, which provided topics for civil conversation, and advice on the requisite manners for carrying a polite conversation, and for managing social interactions.

Conceptually allied to etiquette is the notion of civility (social interaction characterised by sober and reasoned debate) which for socially ambitious men and women also became an important personal

quality to possess for social advancement. In the event, gentlemen's clubs, such as Harrington's Rota Club, published an in-house etiquette that codified the civility expected of the members. Besides *The Spectator*, other periodicals sought to infuse politeness into English coffeehouse conversation, the editors of *The Tatler* were explicit that their purpose was the reformation of English manners and morals; to those ends, etiquette was presented as the virtue of morality and a code of behaviour.

In the mid-18th century, the first, modern English usage of etiquette (the conventional rules of personal behaviour in polite society) was by Philip Stanhope, 4th Earl of Chesterfield, in the book *Letters to His Son on the Art of Becoming a Man of the World and a Gentleman* (1774), a correspondence of more than 400 letters written from 1737 until the death of his son, in 1768; most of the letters were instructive, concerning varied subjects that a worldly gentleman should know. The letters were first published in 1774, by Eugenia Stanhope, the widow of the diplomat Philip Stanhope, Chesterfield's bastard son. Throughout the correspondence, Chesterfield endeavoured to decouple the matter of social manners from conventional morality, with perceptive observations that pragmatically argue to Philip that mastery of etiquette was an important means for social advancement, for a man such as he. Chesterfield's elegant, literary style of writing epitomised the emotional restraint characteristic of polite social intercourse in 18th-century society:

I would heartily wish that you may often be seen to smile, but never heard to laugh while you live. Frequent and loud laughter is the characteristic of folly and ill-manners; it is the manner in which the mob express their silly joy at silly things; and they call it being merry. In my mind there is nothing so illiberal, and so ill-bred, as audible laughter. I am neither of a melancholy nor a cynical disposition, and am as willing and as apt to be pleased as anybody; but I am sure that since I have had the full use of my reason nobody has ever heard me laugh.

In the 19th century, Victorian era (1837–1901) etiquette developed into a complicated system of codified behaviours, which governed the range of manners in society—from the proper language, style, and method for writing letters, to correctly using cutlery at table, and to the minute regulation of social relations and personal interactions between men and women and among the social classes.

In the 21st century, specifically in the early 2020s as digital communication became more readily available and used in everyday life, the notion of digital etiquette, or netiquette, evolved into a flexible, socially negotiated code of conduct guiding behavior in online spaces. Unlike traditional etiquette, which often revolved around visible symbols of status and formal conduct, digital etiquette today is platform-dependent, highly situational, and subtly influenced by unspoken social norms. For instance, a video call may press for visible presence (“camera on”) and active engagement such as contributing ideas or giving visual cues of attention, while sending an email might demand carefully crafted language, formal greetings, and rapid response times to signal competence and respect. An essential aspect of today’s netiquette is the management of presence and attention. The expectation to be responsive has become a symbol of respect, while behaviors such as multitasking during meetings or disabling cameras may be interpreted as disrespect or disengagement.

Manners

In *High-Change in Bond Street, – ou – la Politesse du Grande Monde* (1796), James Gillray caricatured the lack of etiquette in a group of men who are depicted leering at women and crowding them off the sidewalk.

Sociological perspectives

In a society, manners are described as either good manners or as bad manners to indicate whether a person's behaviour is acceptable to the cultural group. As such, manners enable ultrasociality and are integral to the functioning of the social norms and conventions that are informally enforced through

self-regulation. The perspectives of sociology indicate that manners are a means for people to display their social status, and a means of demarcating, observing, and maintaining the boundaries of social identity and of social class.

*In *The Civilizing Process* (1939), sociologist Norbert Elias said that manners arose as a product of group living, and persist as a way of maintaining social order. Manners proliferated during the Renaissance in response to the development of the 'absolute state'—the progression from small-group living to large-group living characterised by the centralized power of the State. The rituals and manners associated with the royal court of England during that period were closely bound to a person's social status. Manners demonstrate a person's position within a social network, and a person's manners are a means of negotiation from that social position.*

*From the perspective of public health, in *The Healthy Citizen* (1995), Alana R. Petersen and Deborah Lupton said that manners assisted the diminishment of the social boundaries that existed between the public sphere and the private sphere of a person's life, and so gave rise to "a highly reflective self, a self who monitors his or her behavior with due regard for others with whom he or she interacts, socially"; and that "the public behavior of individuals came to signify their social standing; a means of presenting the self and of evaluating others, and thus the control of the outward self was vital."*

Sociologist Pierre Bourdieu applied the concept of habitus to define the societal functions of manners. The habitus is the set of mental attitudes, personal habits, and skills that a person possesses—his or her dispositions of character that are neither self-determined, nor pre-determined by the external environment, but which are produced and reproduced by social interactions—and are "inculcated through experience and explicit teaching", yet tend to function at the subconscious level. Manners are likely to be a central part of the dispositions that guide a person's ability to decide upon socially-compliant behaviours.

Anthropologic perspective

*In *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (2003) the anthropologist Mary Douglas said that manners, social behaviors, and group rituals enable the local cosmology to remain ordered and free from those things that may pollute or defile the integrity of the culture. Ideas of pollution, defilement, and disgust are attached to the margins of socially acceptable behaviour in order to curtail unacceptable behaviour; and so maintain "the assumptions by which experience is controlled" within the culture.*

Evolutionary perspectives

In studying the expression of emotion by humans and animals, naturalist Charles Darwin noted the universality of facial expressions of disgust and shame among infants and blind people, and concluded that the emotional responses of shame and disgust are innate behaviours.

Public health specialist Valerie Curtis said that the development of facial responses was concomitant with the development of manners, which are behaviours with an evolutionary role in preventing the transmission of diseases, thus, people who practise personal hygiene and politeness will most benefit from membership in their social group, and so stand the best chance of biological survival, by way of opportunities for reproduction.

From the study of the evolutionary bases of prejudice, social psychologists Catherine Cottrell and Steven Neuberg said that human behavioural responses to 'otherness' might enable the preservation of manners and social norms. The feeling of "foreignness"—which people experience in their first social interaction with someone from another culture—might partly serve an evolutionary function: 'Group living surrounds one with individuals [who are] able to physically harm fellow group members, to spread contagious

disease, or to "free ride" on their efforts'; therefore, a commitment to sociality is a risk: 'If threats, such as these, are left unchecked, the costs of sociality will quickly exceed its benefits. Thus, to maximize the returns on group "living", individual group members should be attuned to others' features or behaviors.'

Therefore, people who possess the social traits common to the cultural group are to be trusted, and people without the common social traits are to be distrusted as 'others', and thus treated with suspicion or excluded from the group. That pressure of social exclusivity, born from the shift towards communal living, excluded uncooperative people and persons with poor personal hygiene. The threat of social exclusion led people to avoid personal behaviours that might embarrass the group or that might provoke revulsion among the group.

To demonstrate the transmission of social conformity, anthropologists Joseph Henrich and Robert Boyd developed a behavioural model in which manners are a means of mitigating social differences, curbing undesirable personal behaviours, and fostering co-operation within the social group. Natural selection favoured the acquisition of genetically transmitted mechanisms for learning, thereby increasing a person's chances for acquiring locally adaptive behaviours: "Humans possess a reliably developing neural encoding that compels them both to punish individuals who violate group norms (common beliefs or practices) and [to] punish individuals who do not punish norm-violators."

Categories

Social manners are in three categories:

- (i) manners of hygiene,**
- (ii) manners of courtesy, and**
- (iii) manners of cultural norm.**

Each category accounts for an aspect of the functional role that manners play in a society. The categories of manners are based upon the social outcome of behaviour, rather than upon the personal motivation of the behaviour. As a means of social management, the rules of etiquette encompass most aspects of human social interaction; thus, a rule of etiquette reflects an underlying ethical code and a person's fashion and social status.

Manners of hygiene

concern avoiding the transmission of disease, and usually are taught by the parent to the child by way of parental discipline, positive behavioural enforcement of body-fluid continence (toilet training), and the avoidance of and removal of disease vectors that risk the health of children. Society expects that by adulthood the manners for personal hygiene have become a second-nature behaviour, violations of which shall provoke physical and moral disgust. Hygiene etiquette during the COVID-19 pandemic included social distancing and warnings against public spitting.

Manners of courtesy

concern self-control and good-faith behaviour, by which a person gives priority to the interests of another person, and priority to the interests of a socio-cultural group, in order to be a trusted member of that group. Courtesy manners maximize the benefits of group-living by regulating the nature of social interactions; however, the performance of courtesy manners occasionally interferes with the avoidance of communicable disease. Generally, parents teach courtesy manners in the same way they teach hygiene manners, but the child also learns manners directly (by observing the behaviour of other people in their social interactions) and by imagined social interactions (through the executive functions of the brain). A child usually learns courtesy manners at an older age than when he or she was toilet trained (taught hygiene manners), because learning the manners of courtesy requires that the child be self-aware and conscious of

social position, which then facilitate understanding that violations (accidental or deliberate) of social courtesy will provoke peer disapproval within the social group.

Manners of cultural norms

concern the social rules by which a person establishes his or her identity and membership in a given socio-cultural group. In abiding the manners of cultural norm, a person demarcates socio-cultural identity and establishes social boundaries, which then identify whom to trust and whom to distrust as 'the other'. Cultural norm manners are learnt through the enculturation with and the routinisation of 'the familiar', and through social exposure to the 'cultural otherness' of people identified as foreign to the group. Transgressions and flouting of the manners of cultural norm usually result in the social alienation of the transgressor. The nature of culture-norm manners allows a high level of intra-group variability, but the manners usually are common to the people who identify with the given socio-cultural group.

Courtesy books

16th century

The Book of the Courtier (1528), by Baldassare Castiglione, identified the manners and the morals required by socially ambitious men and women for success in a royal court of the Italian Renaissance (14th–17th c.); as an etiquette text, The Courtier was an influential courtesy book in 16th-century Europe.

On Civility in Children (1530), by Erasmus of Rotterdam, instructs boys in the means of becoming a young man; how to walk and talk, speak and act in the company of adults. The practical advice for acquiring adult self-awareness includes explanations of the symbolic meanings—for adults—of a boy's body language when he is fidgeting and yawning, scratching and bickering. On completing Erasmus's curriculum of etiquette, the boy has learnt that civility is the point of good manners: the adult ability to 'readily ignore the faults of others, but avoid falling short, yourself,' in being civilised.

20th century

Etiquette in Society, in Business, in Politics, and at Home (1922), by Emily Post documents the "trivialities" of desirable conduct in daily life, and provided pragmatic approaches to the practice of good manners—the social conduct expected and appropriate for the events of life, such as a baptism, a wedding, and a funeral.

As didactic texts, books of etiquette (the conventional rules of personal behaviour in polite society) usually feature explanatory titles, such as :-

- ***The Ladies' Book of Etiquette, and Manual of Politeness: A Complete Hand Book for the Use of the Lady in Polite Society (1860)**, by Florence Hartley; Amy Vanderbilt's **Complete Book of Etiquette (1957)**;*
- ***Miss Manners' Guide to Excruciatingly Correct Behavior (1979)**, by Judith Martin; and Peas & Queues:*
- ***The Minefield of Modern Manners (2013)**, by Sandi Toksvig.*

*Such books present ranges of civility, socially acceptable behaviours for their respective times. Each author cautions the reader that **to be a well-mannered person they must practise good manners in their public and private lives.***

The How Rude! comic-book series addresses and discusses adolescent perspectives and questions of etiquette, social manners, and civility.

Business

In commerce, the purpose of etiquette is to facilitate the social relations necessary for realising business transactions; in particular, social interactions among workers, and between labour and management. Business etiquette varies by culture, such as the Chinese and Australian approaches to conflict resolution. The Chinese business philosophy is based upon guanxi (personal connections), whereby person-to-person negotiation resolves difficult matters, whereas Australian business philosophy relies upon attorneys-at-law to resolve business conflicts through legal mediation; thus, adjusting to the etiquette and professional ethics of another culture is an element of culture shock for businesspeople.

In 2011, etiquette trainers formed the Institute of Image Training and Testing International (IITTI) a non-profit organisation to train personnel departments in measuring and developing and teaching social skills to employees, by way of education in the rules of personal and business etiquette, in order to produce business workers who possess standardised manners for successfully conducting business with people from other cultures.

In the retail branch of commerce, the saying "the customer is always right" summarises the profit-orientation of good manners, between the buyer and the seller of goods and services:

There are always two sides to the case, of course, and it is a credit to good manners that there is scarcely ever any friction in stores and shops of the first class. Salesmen and women are usually persons who are both patient and polite, and their customers are most often ladies in fact as well as "by courtesy." Between those before and those behind the counters, there has sprung up in many instances a relationship of mutual goodwill and friendliness. It is, in fact, only the woman who is afraid that someone may encroach upon her exceedingly insecure dignity, who shows neither courtesy nor consideration to any except those whom she considers it to her advantage to please.

—*Emily Post Etiquette 1922*

Related Extensions

Etiquette and language

1. **Acrolect** :- A post-creole continuum is a dialect continuum of varieties of a creole language between those most and least similar to the superstrate language. Due to social, political, and economic factors, a creole language can decreolize towards one of the languages from which it is descended, aligning its morphology, phonology, and syntax to the local standard of the dominant language but to different degrees depending on a speaker's status.
2. **Aizuchi** :- In the Japanese language, aizuchi are interjections during a conversation that indicate the listener is paying attention or understands the speaker (backchanneling). In linguistic terms, these are a form of phatic expression. Aizuchi are considered reassuring to the speaker, indicating that the listener is active and involved in the discussion.
3. **Basilect** :- A post-creole continuum is a dialect continuum of varieties of a creole language between those most and least similar to the superstrate language. Due to social, political, and economic factors, a creole language can decreolize towards one of the languages from which it is descended, aligning its morphology, phonology, and syntax to the local standard of the dominant language but to different degrees depending on a speaker's status.

4. **Honorific title :-** *An honorific is a title that conveys esteem, courtesy, or respect for position or rank when used in addressing or referring to a person. Sometimes, the term "honorific" is used in a more specific sense to refer to an honorary academic title. It is also often conflated with systems of honorific speech in linguistics, which are grammatical or morphological ways of encoding the relative social status of speakers. Honorifics can be used as prefixes or suffixes depending on the appropriate occasion and presentation in accordance with style and customs.*
5. **Honorifics (linguistics) - politeness markers :-** *In linguistics, an honorific is a grammatical or morphosyntactic form that encodes the relative social status of the participants of the conversation. Distinct from honorific titles, linguistic honorifics convey formality FORM, social distance, politeness POL, humility HBL, deference, or respect through the choice of an alternate form such as an affix, clitic, grammatical case, change in person or number, or an entirely different lexical item. A key feature of an honorific system is that one can convey the same message in both honorific and familiar forms—i.e., it is possible to say something like "The soup is hot" in a way that confers honor or deference on one of the participants of the conversation.*
6. **Insult :-** *An insult is an expression, statement, or behavior that is often deliberately disrespectful, offensive, scornful, or derogatory towards an individual or a group. Insults can be intentional or unintentional, and they often aim to belittle, offend, or humiliate the target. While insults may sometimes include factual information, such information is typically presented in a pejorative manner; intended to provoke a negative emotional response or to socially undermine or discredit the target. Insults can also be made unintentionally or in a playful way, but these can, in some cases, also have unintended negative impacts and effects.*
7. **Netiquette :-** *Etiquette in technology, colloquially referred to as netiquette, is a term used to refer to the unofficial code of policies that encourage good behavior on the Internet which is used to regulate respect and polite behavior on social media platforms, online chatting sites, web forums, and other online engagement websites. The rules of etiquette that apply when communicating over the Internet are different from those applied when communicating in person or by audio or video call. It is a social code that is used in all places where one can interact with other human beings via the Internet, including text messaging, email, online games, Internet forums, chat rooms, and many more. Although social etiquette in real life is ingrained into our social life, netiquette is a fairly recent concept.*
8. **Polite fiction :-** *A polite fiction is a social scenario in which all participants are aware of a truth, but pretend to believe in some alternative version of events to avoid conflict or embarrassment. Polite fictions are closely related to euphemism, in which a word or phrase that might be impolite, disagreeable, or offensive is replaced by another word or phrase that both speaker and listener understand to have the same meaning. In scholarly usage, "polite fiction" can be traced to at least 1953.*
9. **Prescription and description :-** *Linguistic prescription is the establishment of rules defining publicly preferred usage of language, including rules of spelling, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, etc. Linguistic prescriptivism may aim to establish a standard language, teach what a particular society or sector of a society perceives as a correct or proper form, or advise on effective and stylistically apt communication. If usage preferences are conservative, prescription might appear resistant to language change; if radical, it may produce neologisms. Such prescriptions may be motivated by consistency ; rhetorical effectiveness; tradition; aesthetics or personal preferences; linguistic purism or nationalism ; or to avoid causing offense.*

10. **Profanity** :- Profanity, also known as **swearing, cursing, or cussing**, is the usage of notionally offensive words for a variety of purposes, including to demonstrate disrespect or negativity, to relieve pain, to express a strong emotion, as a grammatical intensifier or emphasis, or to express informality or conversational intimacy. In many formal or polite social situations, it is considered impolite, and in some religious groups it is considered a sin. Profanity includes slurs, but most profanities are not slurs, and there are many insults that do not use swear words.
11. **Semantics** :- Semantics is the study of linguistic meaning. It examines what meaning is, how words get their meaning, and how the meaning of a complex expression depends on its parts. Part of this process involves the distinction between sense and reference. Sense is given by the ideas and concepts associated with an expression while reference is the object to which an expression points. Semantics contrasts with syntax, which studies the rules that dictate how to create grammatically correct sentences, and pragmatics, which investigates how people use language in communication. Semantics, together with syntactics and pragmatics, is a part of semiotics.
12. **Slang** :- A slang is a vocabulary of an informal register, common in everyday conversation but avoided in formal writing and speech. It also often refers to the language exclusively used by the members of particular in-groups in order to establish group identity, exclude outsiders, or both. The word itself came about in the 18th century and has been defined in multiple ways since its conception, with no single technical usage in linguistics.
13. **Slang dictionary** :- A slang dictionary is a reference book containing an alphabetical list of slang, which is vernacular vocabulary not generally acceptable in formal usage, usually including information given for each word, including meaning, pronunciation, and etymology. It can provide definitions on a range of slang from more mundane terms to obscure sexual practices. Such works also can include words and phrases arising from different dialects and argots, which may or may not have passed into more common usage. They can also track the changing meaning of the terms over time and space, as they migrate and mutate.
14. **Standard language** :- A standard language is any language variety that has undergone substantial codification in its grammar, lexicon, writing system, or other features and that stands out among related varieties in a community as the one with the highest status or prestige. Often, it is the prestige language variety of a whole country.
15. **Style of address** :- A style of office, also called **manner of reference**, or form of address when someone is spoken to directly, is an official or legally recognized form of reference for a person or other entity, and may often be used in conjunction with a personal title. A style, by tradition or law, precedes a reference to a person who holds a post or political office and is sometimes used to refer to the office itself. An honorific can also be awarded to an individual in a personal capacity. Such styles are particularly associated with monarchies, where they may be used by a wife of an office holder or of a prince of the blood, for the duration of their marriage. They are also almost universally used for presidents in republics and in many countries for members of legislative bodies, higher-ranking judges, and senior constitutional office holders. Leading religious figures also have styles.
16. **T-V distinction** :- The T-V distinction is the contextual use of different pronouns that exists in some languages and serves to convey formality or familiarity. Its name comes from the Latin pronouns *tu* and *vos*. The distinction takes a number of forms and indicates varying levels of politeness, familiarity, courtesy, age or even insult toward the addressee. The field that studies and describes this phenomenon is sociolinguistics.

17. **What happens on tour, stays on tour** :- "What happens on tour, stays on tour" is a phrase or saying agreed to by persons who get together and travel either domestically or overseas for sporting tours. In essence, the phrase means that all exploits during the tour must be kept strictly confidential, never to be discussed with anyone outside the group. In more recent years, the phrase has also been applied to persons attending music gigs, going on business trips and fishing holidays. The term is commonly used in the United Kingdom, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Canada and the United States and is also known as "what goes on tour stays on tour", "**what happens on the road stays on the road**", and among members of the United States military, speaking of temporary duty assignment, "what happens TDY stays TDY".

Etiquette and letters

- **Airmail etiquette** :- An airmail etiquette, often shortened to just etiquette, is a label used to indicate that a letter is to be sent by airmail.
- **Email etiquettes** :- A **shotgun email** is one that requests information or action that only requires the efforts of one person but is sent to multiple people in an effort to guarantee that at least one person will respond. The shotgun email often results in multiple people responding to something already accomplished, and therefore results in a loss of overall productivity. Shotgun emailing is considered poor internet etiquette.
- **Missed call # Social usage** :- A missed call is a telephone call that is deliberately terminated by the caller before being answered by its intended recipient, in order to communicate a pre-agreed message. It is a form of one-bit messaging.

Etiquette and society

1. **Aliénor de Poitiers** early documentor of French etiquette
Aliénor de Poitiers or Eleanor de Poitiers (1444/1446–1509) was a Burgundian courtier and writer, noted for writing *Les Honneurs de la Cour*, an account of precedence and ceremony at Burgundian Court, and based on her own experiences of court-life.
2. **Code of conduct**
A code of conduct is a set of rules outlining the norms, rules, and responsibilities or proper practices of an individual party or an organization.
3. **Church etiquette**
Church etiquette varies greatly between the different nations and cultural groups among whom Christianity is found. In Western Culture, in common with most social situations, church etiquette has generally changed greatly over the last half-century or more, becoming much less formal. Church etiquette might be seen to mirror other social changes, with the use of given names for leaders, informal dress.
4. **Cigar etiquette**
Cigar etiquette is polite behaviour when smoking a cigar. For example, in 19th century Havana, it was considered an insult to give another smoker a light from your cigar without first knocking off the ash from the cigar.
5. **Cinema etiquette**
Cinema etiquette is a set of social norms observed by patrons of a movie theater. There are a wide variety of distractions that can hinder other patrons' enjoyment of a film, such as cell phone

usage, patrons talking to one another, the rustling of food packaging, the behavior of children in the audience, and patrons entering and leaving during a screening.

6. Civics

*In the field of political science, civics is the study of the civil and political rights and obligations of citizens in a society. The term civics derives from the Latin word *civicus*, meaning "relating to a citizen". In U.S. politics, in the context of urban planning, the term civics comprehends the city politics that affect the political decisions of the citizenry of a city.*

7. Concert etiquette

Concert etiquette refers to a set of social norms observed by those attending musical performances. These norms vary depending upon the type of music performance and can be stringent, with dress codes and conduct rules, or relaxed and informal. The rules or expectations for concert etiquette may be informally communicated by word-of-mouth by attendees or participants or they may be printed on tickets or signs.

8. Dance etiquette

Dance etiquette is the set of conventional rules which govern the social behavior of social dance by its participants. Such rules include the way in which the participants should look and the way in which they approach, dance with and leave their partner. Etiquette can vary in its specification and stringency between different styles of dance.

9. Debrett's

*Debrett's is a British professional coaching company and publisher and authority on etiquette and behaviour, founded in 1769 with the publication of the first edition of *The New Peerage*. The company takes its name from its founder, John Debrett.*

10. Diplomacy

Diplomacy is the communication by representatives of state, intergovernmental, or non-governmental institutions intended to influence events in the international system.

11. Drinking etiquette

Drinking culture is the set of traditions, rituals, and social behaviors associated with the consumption of alcoholic beverages. Although alcoholic beverages and social attitudes toward drinking vary around the world, nearly every civilization has independently discovered the processes of brewing beer, fermenting wine, and distilling spirits, among other practices.

12. Driving etiquette

Driving etiquette refers to the unwritten or unspoken rules that drivers follow. The term dates back to the early 1900's and the use of horse-drawn carriages. Driving etiquette typically involves being courteous and staying alert, which varies by vehicle, situation and location. Failure to adhere to this behavior can cause an increased risk of legal consequences, road collisions, trauma and road rage.

13. Escalator etiquette

Escalator etiquette is the etiquette of using escalators. In many places, there is a convention that people should stand on a particular side to allow other people to walk on the other side. Standing on the right is the most common convention, following early escalator design in London. In the 21st century, there have been campaigns for standing on both sides for reasons of safety or to increase capacity.

14. *Faux pas, Faux pas derived from Chinese pronunciation*

The following faux pas are derived from homonyms in Mandarin and Cantonese. While originating in Greater China, they may also apply to Chinese-speaking people around the world. However, most homonymic pairs listed work only in some varieties of Chinese, and may appear bewildering even to speakers of other varieties of Chinese.

Certain customs regarding good and bad luck are important to many Chinese people. Although these might be regarded as superstitions by people from other cultures, these customs are often tied to religious traditions and are an important part of many people's belief systems, even among well-educated people and affluent sectors of society.

Clocks

Giving a clock (Chinese: 送鐘/送钟; pinyin: sòng zhōng) is often taboo, especially to the elderly as the term for this act is a homophone with the term for the act of attending another's funeral, "to send off for one's end" (Chinese: 送終/送终; pinyin: sòngzhōng). In 2015, a UK government official, Susan Kramer, gave a watch to Taipei Mayor Ko Wen-je and was unaware of the taboo, which resulted in some professional embarrassment and a pursuant apology. Cantonese people consider such a gift as a curse.

However, should such a gift be given, the "unluckiness" of the gift can be countered by exacting a small monetary payment so that the recipient is buying the clock and thereby counteracting the '送' ("to gift") expression of the phrase.

Fans and umbrellas

It is undesirable to give someone a fan or an umbrella as a gift. The words for 'fan' (Chinese: 扇; pinyin: shàn) and 'umbrella' (simplified Chinese: 伞; traditional Chinese: 傘; pinyin: sǎn) sound like the word sǎn/sàn (散), meaning to scatter, or to part company, to separate, to break up with someone, to split.

Books

As a book (simplified Chinese: 书; traditional Chinese: 書; pinyin: shū) is a homophone of "loss, to lose" (simplified Chinese: 输; traditional Chinese: 輸; pinyin: shū) in many areas, carrying or looking at a book (simplified Chinese: 带书, 看书; traditional Chinese: 帶書, 看書; pinyin: dài shū, kàn shū) where people are taking a risk, such as gambling or investing in stocks, may be considered to invite bad luck and loss (simplified Chinese: 带输, 看输; traditional Chinese: 帶輸, 看輸; pinyin: dài shū, kàn shū). This bad luck does not apply to carrying or reading newspapers (simplified Chinese: 带报, 看报; traditional Chinese: 帶報, 看報; pinyin: dài bào, kàn bào) as newspapers (simplified Chinese: 报纸; traditional Chinese: 報紙; pinyin: bàozhǐ) are not books.

15. *Golf etiquette*

Golf etiquette refers to a set of rules and practices designed to make the game of golf safer and more enjoyable for golfers and to minimize possible damage to golf equipment and courses. Although many of these practices are not part of the formal rules of golf, golfers are customarily expected to observe them. The R&A rule book states that "[t]he overriding principle is that consideration should be shown to others on the course at all times."

16. *Intercultural competence*

Cultural competence, also known as intercultural competence, is a range of cognitive, affective, behavioral, and linguistic skills that lead to effective and appropriate communication with people of other cultures. Intercultural or cross-cultural education are terms used for the training to achieve cultural competence.

17. **Levée**, the English version of **Louis XIV's morning rising etiquette** (lever) at **Versailles**.

The levee was traditionally a daily moment of intimacy and accessibility to a monarch or leader, as he **got up in the morning**. It started out as a **royal custom**, but in **British America** it came to refer to a **reception by the sovereign's representative**, which continues to be a tradition in Canada with the New Year's levee; in the United States a similar gathering was held by several presidents.

Abraham Lincoln held a **levee** on New Year's Eve 1862

- **Louis XIV's lever**

The ceremony at Versailles has been described in detail by Louis de Rouvroy, duc de Saint-Simon. Louis XIV was a creature of habit and the inflexible routine that tired or irritated his heirs served him well. Wherever the king had actually slept, he was discovered sleeping in the close-curtained state bed standing in its alcove, which was separated from the rest of the chambre du roi by a gilded balustrade. He was woken at eight o'clock by his head valet de chambre—Alexandre Bontemps held this post for most of the reign—who alone had slept in the bedchamber. The chief physician, the chief surgeon and Louis' childhood nurse, as long as she lived, all entered at the same time, and the nurse kissed him. The night chamberpot was removed.

- **Grande entrée**

Then the curtains of the bed were drawn once again and, at a quarter past eight, the Grand Chamberlain was called, bringing with him the nobles who had the privilege of the grande entrée, a privilege that could be purchased, subject to the king's approval, but which was restricted in Louis' time to the nobles. The King remained in bed, in his nightshirt and a short wig. The Grand Chamberlain of France or, in his absence, the Chief Gentleman of the Bedchamber presented holy water to the king from a vase that stood at the head of the bed and the king's morning clothes were laid out. First, the Master of the Bedchamber and the First Servant, both high nobles, pulled the king's nightshirt over his head, one grasping each sleeve. The Grand Chamberlain presented the day shirt which, according to Saint-Simon, had been shaken out and sometimes changed, because the king perspired freely. This was a moment for any of those with the privilege of the grande entrée to have a swift private word with the king, which would have been carefully rehearsed beforehand to express a request as deferentially as possible while also being as brief as possible. The King was given a missal and the gentlemen retired into the adjoining chambre du conseil (the "council chamber") while there was a brief private prayer for the King.

- **Première entrée**

When the King had them recalled, now accompanied by those who had the lesser privilege of the première entrée, his process of dressing began. Louis preferred to dress himself "for he did almost everything himself, with address and grace", Saint-Simon remarked. The King was handed a dressing-gown, and a mirror was held for him, for he had no toilet table like ordinary gentlemen. Every other day the King shaved himself. Now, other privileged courtiers were admitted, a few at a time, at each stage, so that, as the King was putting on his shoes and stockings, "everyone" – in Saint-Simon's view – was there. This was the entrée de la chambre, which included the king's readers and the director of the Menus Plaisirs, that part of the royal establishment in charge of all preparations for ceremonies, events and festivities, to the last detail of design and order. At the entrée de la chambre were admitted the Grand Aumônier and the Marshal of France and the king's ministers and secretaries. A fifth entrée now admitted ladies for the first time, and a sixth entrée admitted, from a privileged position at a cramped backdoor,

the king's children, legitimate and illegitimate indiscriminately – in scandalous fashion Saint-Simon thought – and their spouses.

The crowd in the chambre du Roi can be estimated from Saint-Simon's remark of the King's devotions, which followed: the King knelt at his bedside "where all the clergy present knelt, the cardinals without cushions, all the laity remaining standing".

The King then passed into the cabinet where all those who possessed any court office attended him. He then announced what he expected to do that day and was left alone with those among his favourites of the royal children born illegitimately (whom he had publicly recognised and legitimated) and a few favourites, with the valets. These were less pressing moments to discuss projects with the King, who parcelled out his attention with strict regard for the current standing of those closest to him.

- **Grand lever**

- *With the entry of the King into the Grande Galerie, where the rest of the court awaited him, the petit lever was finished, and with the grand lever the day was properly begun, as the king proceeded to daily Mass, sharing brief words as he progressed and even receiving some petitions. It was of these occasions that the King habitually remarked, in refusing a favour asked for some noble, "We never see him", meaning that he did not spend enough time at Versailles, where Louis wanted to keep the nobility penned up, to prevent them interesting themselves in politics.*

- **For the aristocracy**

Among the aristocracy, the levée could also become a crowded and social occasion, especially for women, who liked to put off the donning of their uncomfortable formal clothes, and whose hair and perhaps make-up needed prolonged attention. There is a famous depiction of the levée of an 18th-century Viennese lady of the court in Richard Strauss's later opera Der Rosenkavalier, where she has her hair dressed while surrounded by a disorderly crowd of tradesmen touting for work or payment, and other petitioners, followed by a visit from a cousin. The second scene of William Hogarth's A Rake's Progress shows a male equivalent in 1730s London.

In the French engraving Le Lever after Freudenberg, of the 1780s, gentle social criticism is levelled at the lady of the court; that she slept without unlacing her stays, apparently, perhaps can be seen as artistic licence. Her maids dress her with deference, while the wallclock under the hangings of her lit à la polonoise appears to read noon.

18. Military courtesy

Military courtesy is one of the defining features of a military force. The courtesies form a strict and sometimes elaborate code of conduct. It is an extension and a formalization of courtesies practiced in a culture's everyday life. It is intended to reinforce military discipline and the chain of command by defining how soldiers will treat their superiors and vice versa. They are also thought to enhance esprit de corps.

19. Order of precedence

An order of precedence is a sequential hierarchy of importance applied to individuals, groups, or organizations. For individuals, it is most often used for diplomats in attendance at very formal occasions. It can also be used in the context of medals, decorations, and awards.

20. Protocol

In international politics, protocol is the etiquette of diplomacy and affairs of state. It may also refer to an international agreement that supplements or amends a treaty. A protocol is a rule which describes how an activity should be performed, especially in the field of diplomacy. In diplomatic services and governmental fields of endeavor protocols are often unwritten guidelines. Protocols specify the proper and generally accepted behavior in matters of state and diplomacy, such as showing appropriate respect to a head of state, ranking diplomats in chronological order of their accreditation at court, and so on. One definition is:

***Protocol** is commonly described as **a set of international courtesy rules**. These well-established and time-honored rules have made it easier for nations and people to live and work together. Part of protocol has always been the acknowledgment of the hierarchical standing of all present. Protocol rules are based on the principles of civility.—Dr. P.M. Forni on behalf of the International Association of Protocol Consultants and Officers.*

21. Respect

*Respect, also called **esteem**, is a positive feeling or deferential action shown towards someone or something considered important or held in high esteem or regard. It conveys a sense of admiration for good or valuable qualities. It is also the process of honoring someone by exhibiting care, concern, or consideration for their needs or feelings.*

22. Rules of Civility and Decent Behaviour In Company and Conversation by George Washington

Rules of Civility & Decent Behaviour In Company and Conversation is the name of a list best known as a school writing exercise of George Washington, who became the first president of the United States of America. Most of the rules have been traced to a French etiquette manual written by Jesuits in 1595 entitled "Bienséance de la conversation entre les hommes". As a handwriting exercise in around 1744, Washington merely copied word-for-word Francis Hawkins' translation which was published in England in about 1640.

23. Rudeness

Rudeness is a display of actual or perceived disrespect by not complying with the social norms or etiquette expected within a relationship, social group, or culture. Social norms are established as the essential guidelines of normally accepted behavior within a given context, and individuals often establish personal boundaries to meet their own needs and desires within smaller settings, such as friendships. To be unwilling to align one's behavior with these norms known to the general population of what is socially acceptable is to be rude. These norms may resemble a sort of "unspoken law", with social repercussions or rewards for violators or advocates, respectively.

24. Social grace

Social grace is the ability to interact politely in social situations by using good manners, etiquette, and a considerate demeanor. It includes a set of skills like saying "please" and "thank you," making eye contact, avoiding interruptions, and showing empathy and respect for others. Social grace helps build confidence and fosters positive relationships in both personal and professional settings.

1. **Manners and etiquette:** These are the unwritten rules of polite conduct, such as saying thank you when someone holds a door for you or showing proper table manners.
2. **Communication skills:** This includes active listening, maintaining eye contact, and engaging in meaningful conversation without interrupting others.

3. **Consideration and empathy:** Being mindful of others' feelings, showing respect for their perspectives, and using a courteous tone are all key aspects of social grace.
 4. **Professional and personal application:** Mastering social graces can lead to professional success by improving teamwork and relationships, while also being crucial for personal confidence and social connection.
25. **Social Norms :-** A social norm is a shared standard of acceptable behavior by a group. Social norms can both be informal understandings that govern the behavior of members of a society, as well as be codified into rules and laws. Social normative influences or social norms, are deemed to be powerful drivers of human behavioural changes and well organized and incorporated by major theories which explain human behaviour. Institutions are composed of multiple norms. Norms are shared social beliefs about behavior; thus, they are distinct from "ideas", "attitudes", and "values", which can be held privately, and which do not necessarily concern behavior. Norms are contingent on context, social group, and historical circumstances.

26. Table manners

Table manners are the social customs or rituals used while eating and drinking in a group setting. While different cultures have established different eating rituals, in general the rules pursue similar goals, with focus on cleanliness, consideration for other diners, and the unity of the group sharing the meal. Each gathering may vary in how strictly these customs are insisted upon.

Fork etiquette

When used in conjunction with a knife to cut and consume food in Western social settings, two forms of fork etiquette are common. In the European style, which is not uniform across Europe, the diner keeps the fork in the left hand, in the American style, the fork is shifted between the left and right hands. Prior to the adoption of the fork, the custom in Europe was for all food to be conveyed to the mouth by the right hand (using a spoon, a knife, or fingers). When the fork was adopted, it followed this rule; it was held in the left hand while cutting and then transferred to the right to eat. This custom was brought to America by British colonists and became the American style. Most of Europe adopted the more rapid style of leaving the fork in the left hand in relatively modern times.

The difference between the American and European styles has been used as plot point in fictional works, including the 1946 film *O.S.S.* and the 2014 series *Turn: Washington's Spies*. In both works, using the wrong fork etiquette threatens to expose undercover agents.

The Montreal–Philippines cutlery controversy

The Montreal–Philippines cutlery controversy was an incident in 2006 in which a Filipino-born Canadian boy was punished by his school in Roxboro, Montreal, for following traditional Filipino etiquette and eating his lunch with a fork and a spoon, rather than the Canadian tradition of a knife and fork

a. **Eating utensil etiquette :-**

● **French and British style**

The French table setting involves placing the fork tines pointing down on the table on the left hand side of the plate. This was done to show the coat of arms that was traditionally on that side contrary to Germany or the United Kingdom. In the United Kingdom, the fork tines face upward while sitting on the table.

The knife should be in the right hand and the fork in the left. However, if a knife is not needed – such as when eating pasta – the fork can be held in the right hand.[8] Bread is always served and can be placed on the table cloth itself. It is considered unacceptable to use one's fingers to taste the food. To taste a sauce before serving oneself, however, it is permissible to place a small piece of bread at the end of the fork for dipping.

- **American style**

In the American style, also called the zig-zag method or fork switching, the knife is initially held in the right hand and the fork in the left. Holding food in place with the fork tines-down, a single bite-sized piece is cut with the knife. The knife is then set down on the plate, the fork transferred from the left hand to the right hand, and the food is brought to the mouth for consumption. The fork is then transferred back to the left hand and the knife is picked up with the right. In contrast to the European hidden handle grip, in the American style the fork is held much like a spoon or a pen once it is transferred to the right hand to convey food to the mouth.

*One commentator has asserted that the American style of fork-handling is in decline, with the increased use of a hybrid of the traditional **American and European styles**. In this new style, the fork is not switched between hands between cutting and eating and may also be deployed "tines-up" as a scoop when convenient.*

In defense of the traditional American style, Judith Martin wrote, "Those who point out that the European manner is more efficient are right. Those who claim it is older or more sophisticated—etiquette has never considered getting food into the mouth faster a mark of refinement— are wrong."

27. Technology

*Etiquette in technology, colloquially referred to as **netiquette**, is a term used to refer to the unofficial code of policies that encourage good behavior on the Internet which is used to regulate respect and polite behavior on social media platforms, online chatting sites, web forums, and other online engagement websites. The rules of etiquette that apply when communicating over the Internet are different from these applied when communicating in person or by audio or video call. It is a social code that is used in all places where one can interact with other human beings via the Internet, including text messaging, email, online games, Internet forums, chat rooms, and many more. Although social etiquette in real life is ingrained into our social life, netiquette is a fairly recent concept.*

a. **Cell phone :- Netiquette vs. cell phone etiquette**

Cell phone etiquette is largely dependent on the cultural context and what is deemed to be socially acceptable. For instance, in certain cultures using your handheld devices while interacting in a group environment is considered bad manners, whereas, in other cultures around the world it may be viewed differently. In addition, cell phone etiquette also encompasses the various types of activities which are occurring and the nature of the messages which are being sent. More importantly, messages of an inappropriate nature can be sent to an individual and this could potentially orchestrate problems such as verbal/cyber abuse.

- **Restrictions on cell phone use by U.S. drivers :-** Various laws in the United States regulate the use of mobile phones and other electronics by motorists. Different states take different approaches. Some laws affect only novice drivers or commercial drivers, while some laws affect all drivers. Some laws target

handheld devices only, while other laws affect both handheld and handsfree devices.

- b. **Gaming** :- Gaming etiquette refers to the norms adopted while playing multiplayer video games. While specific genres and games have their own accepted rules of conduct, some of these rules are universal across almost all games.
- c. **Digital citizen** :- The term digital citizen is used with different meanings. According to the definition provided by Karen Mossberger, one of the authors of *Digital Citizenship: The Internet, Society, and Participation*, digital citizens are "those who use the internet regularly and effectively." In this sense, a digital citizen is a person using information technology (IT) in order to engage in society, politics, and government.
- d. **Eternal September** :- *Eternal September* or **the September that never ended** was a cultural phenomenon during a period beginning around late 1993 and early 1994, when Internet service providers began offering Usenet access to many new users. Prior to this, the only sudden changes in the volume of new users of Usenet occurred each September, when cohorts of university students would gain access to it for the first time, in sync with the academic calendar.

28. Work Etiquette

Work etiquette is a code that governs the expectations of social behavior in a workplace. This code is put in place to "respect and protect time, people, and processes." There is no universal agreement about a standard work etiquette, which may vary from one environment to another. Work etiquette includes a wide range of aspects such as body language, good behavior, appropriate use of technology, etc. Part of office etiquette is working well with others and communicating effectively.

29. Zigzag method

Various customary etiquette practices exist regarding the placement and use of eating utensils in social settings. These practices vary from culture to culture. Fork etiquette, for example, differs in Europe, the United States, and Southeast Asia, and continues to change. In East Asian cultures, a variety of etiquette practices govern the use of chopsticks.

Worldwide etiquette

1. Africa :-

As expectations regarding good manners differ from person to person and vary according to each situation, no treatise on the rules of etiquette nor any list of faux pas can ever be complete. As the perception of behaviors and actions vary, intercultural competence is essential. However, a lack of knowledge about customs and expectations within African cultures can make even the best intentioned person seem rude, selfish, or worse.

2. Asia

Etiquette in Asia varies from country to country even though certain actions may seem to be common. No article on the rules of etiquette, nor any list of faux pas, can ever be complete. As the perception of behaviors and actions vary, intercultural competence is essential. A lack of knowledge about the customs and expectations of Asian people can make even those with good intentions seem rude, foolish, and disrespectful.

- a. **Chinese dining** :- Customs and etiquette in Chinese dining are the traditional behaviors observed while eating in Greater China. Traditional Han customs have spread throughout East Asia to varying degrees, with some regions sharing a few aspects of formal dining, which has ranged from guest seating to paying the bill.
 - b. **Indian dining** :- The etiquette of Indian dining and socializing varies with the region in India.
 - c. **Indonesia** :- Various codes of etiquette in Indonesia govern the expectations of social behavior in the country and are considered very important. Etiquette demonstrates respect and is a key factor in social interactions. Like many social cultures, etiquette varies greatly depending on one's status relative to the person in question. Some conventions may be region-specific, and thus may not exist in all regions of Indonesia. The following are generally accepted contemporary customs in Indonesia.
 - d. **Japan** :- Etiquette in Japan forms common societal expectations of social behavior practiced throughout the nation of Japan. The etiquette of Japan has changed greatly over the millennia as different civilizations influenced its culture. Modern Japanese etiquette has a strong influence from that of China and the Western world, but retains many of its unique traditional elements.
 - e. **Jewish customs of etiquette** :- Minhag is an accepted tradition or group of traditions in Judaism. A related concept, Nusach (נוסח), refers to the traditional order and form of the prayers.
 - f. **Myanmar** :- The code of etiquette in Myanmar, or the code of social behavior that governs human interactions, is largely derived from Theravada Buddhism and focuses on the core values of this religion. Like many social cultures, etiquette varies greatly depending on one's status relative to the person in question. Some conventions may be very regional practices, and thus may not exist in all regions of Myanmar. Some customs have changed over the course of Burmese history. The following are generally accepted modern customs in Myanmar.
 - g. **Pakistan** :- In Pakistan, etiquette, or the code of social behavior that governs human interactions, is largely derived from Islam and focuses on the values commanded by the religion, and has its own cultural etiquette based mainly on South Asian influences.
 - h. **South Korea** :- In South Korea, etiquette, or the code of social behavior that governs human interactions, is largely derived from Korean Confucianism and focuses on the core values of this religion. In addition to general behaviour, etiquette in South Korea also determines how to behave with responsibility and social status. Although most aspects of etiquette are accepted by the country at large, customs can be localized to specific regions or influenced by other cultures, namely China, Japan, and the United States.
3. **Australia and New Zealand**
 Expectations regarding good manners differ from person to person and vary according to each situation. As the perception of behaviors and actions vary, intercultural

competence is essential. However, a lack of knowledge about the customs and expectations of people in Australia and New Zealand can make even the best intentioned person seem ignorant, inconsiderate or even rude. Given the historic roots, it's very similar to British culture, specifically the United Kingdom, terms such as 'fanny' as well as the emphasis on politeness in queuing are observed in both cultures.

4. **Europe**

Etiquette in Europe is not uniform. Even within the regions of Europe, etiquette may not be uniform: within a single country there may be differences in customs, especially where there are different linguistic groups, as in Switzerland where there are French, German and Italian speakers.

- a. **Dutch customs and etiquette :-** *The Dutch have a code of etiquette which governs social behaviour and is considered important. Because of the international position of the Netherlands, many books have been written on the subject. Some customs may not be true in all regions and they are never absolute. In addition to those specific to the Dutch, many general points of European etiquette apply to the Dutch as well, as the Dutch generally view themselves as "taking the lead" in Europe but also part of it and the wider world as a whole.*

5. **Latin America**

Etiquette in Latin America varies by country and by region within a given country.

6. **Middle East**

Many matters of etiquette in the Middle East are connected to Islam as it is written in the Qur'an and how it has been traditionally understood and practiced throughout the centuries. Prescribed Islamic etiquette is referred to as Adab, and described as "refinement, good manners, morals, ethics, decorum, decency, humaneness and righteousness".

7. **North America**

Etiquette in North America is the set of norms for behavior in the United States and Canada. These generally apply to all individuals, unlike cultures with more formal class structures, such as those with nobility and royalty. Both Canada and the United States have shared cultural and linguistic heritage originating in Europe, and as such some points of traditional European etiquette apply to both, especially in more formal settings; however, each have formed their own etiquette as well.

8. **Islamic etiquette**

Adab in the context of behavior, refers to prescribed Islamic etiquette: "refinement, good manners, morals, decorum, decency, humaneness". Al-Adab has been defined as "decency, morals".

- a. **Islamic toilet etiquette :-** *Islamic toilet etiquette is a set of personal hygiene rules in Islam that concerns going to the toilet. This code of Islamic hygienical jurisprudence is called Qaḍā' al-Ḥāḡa.*

Social norm

Informal understanding of acceptable conduct

A social norm or norm is a shared standard of acceptable behavior by a group. Social norms can both be informal understandings that govern the behavior of members of a society, as well as be codified into rules and laws. Social normative influences or social norms, are deemed to be powerful drivers of human behavioural changes and well organized and incorporated by major theories which explain human behaviour. Institutions are composed of multiple norms. Norms are shared social beliefs about behavior; thus, they are distinct from "ideas", "attitudes", and "values", which can be held privately, and which do not necessarily concern behavior. Norms are contingent on context, social group, and historical circumstances.

Scholars distinguish between regulative norms (which constrain behavior), constitutive norms (which shape interests), and prescriptive norms (which prescribe what actors ought to do). The effects of norms can be determined by a logic of appropriateness and logic of consequences; the former entails that actors follow norms because it is socially appropriate, and the latter entails that actors follow norms because of cost-benefit calculations. Others see social norms emerging as part of an evolutionarily stable strategy, where they stabilize through third-party punishment.

Three stages have been identified in the **life cycle of a norm**:

- (1) **Norm emergence** – norm entrepreneurs seek to persuade others of the desirability and appropriateness of certain behaviors;*
- (2) **Norm cascade** – when a norm obtains broad acceptance; and*
- (3) **Norm internalization** – when a norm acquires a "taken-for-granted" quality.*

Norms are robust to various degrees: some norms are often violated whereas other norms are so deeply internalized that norm violations are infrequent. Evidence for the existence of norms can be detected in the patterns of behavior within and across groups, as well as the articulation of norms in group discourse.

Definition

Shaking hands after a sports match is an example of a social norm.

There are varied definitions of social norms, but there is agreement among scholars that norms are:

- 1. social and shared among members of a group,*
- 2. related to behaviors and shape decision-making,*
- 3. proscriptive or prescriptive*
- 4. socially acceptable way of living by a group of people in a society.*

In 1965, Jack P. Gibbs identified three basic normative dimensions that all concepts of norms could be subsumed under:

- 1. "a collective evaluation of behavior in terms of what it ought to be"*

2. *"a collective expectation as to what behavior will be"*
3. *"particular reactions to behavior" (including attempts sanction or induce certain conduct)*

According to Ronald Jepperson, Peter Katzenstein and Alexander Wendt, "norms are collective expectations about proper behavior for a given identity." Wayne Sandholtz argues against this definition, as he writes that shared expectations are an effect of norms, not an intrinsic quality of norms. Sandholtz, Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink define norms instead as "standards of appropriate behavior for actors with a given identity." In this definition, norms have an "oughtness" quality to them.

Michael Hechter and Karl-Dieter Opp define norms as "cultural phenomena that prescribe and proscribe behavior in specific circumstances." Sociologists Christine Horne and Stefanie Mollborn define norms as "group-level evaluations of behavior." This entails that norms are widespread expectations of social approval or disapproval of behavior. Scholars debate whether social norms are individual constructs or collective constructs.

Economist and game theorist Peyton Young defines norms as "patterns of behavior that are self-enforcing within a group." He emphasizes that norms are driven by shared expectations: "Everyone conforms, everyone is expected to conform, and everyone wants to conform when they expect everyone else to conform." He characterizes norms as devices that "coordinate people's expectations in interactions that possess multiple equilibria."

Concepts such as "conventions", "customs", "morals", "mores", "rules", and "laws" have been characterized as equivalent to norms. Institutions can be considered collections or clusters of multiple norms. Rules and norms are not necessarily distinct phenomena: both are standards of conduct that can have varying levels of specificity and formality. Laws are a highly formal version of norms. Laws, rules and norms may be at odds; for example, a law may prohibit something but norms still allow it. Norms are not the equivalent of an aggregation of individual attitudes. Ideas, attitudes and values are not necessarily norms, as these concepts do not necessarily concern behavior and may be held privately. "Prevalent behaviors" and behavioral regularities are not necessarily norms. Instinctual or biological reactions, personal tastes, and personal habits are not necessarily norms.

Emergence and transmission

Groups may adopt norms in a variety of ways.

Some stable and self-reinforcing norms may emerge spontaneously without conscious human design. Peyton Young goes as far as to say that "norms typically evolve without top-down direction... through interactions of individuals rather than by design." Norms may develop informally, emerging gradually as a result of repeated use of discretionary stimuli to control behavior. Not necessarily laws set in writing, informal norms represent generally accepted and widely sanctioned routines that people follow in everyday life. These informal norms, if broken, may not invite formal legal punishments or sanctions, but instead encourage reprimands, warnings, or othering; incest, for example, is generally thought of as wrong in society, but many jurisdictions do not legally prohibit it.

Norms may also be created and advanced through conscious human design by norm entrepreneurs. Norms can arise formally, where groups explicitly outline and implement behavioral expectations. Legal norms typically arise from design. A large number of these norms we follow 'naturally' such as driving on the right side of the road in the US and on the left side in the UK, or not speeding in order to avoid a ticket.

Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink identify three stages in the life cycle of a norm:

1. **Norm emergence:** Norm entrepreneurs seek to persuade others to adopt their ideas about what is desirable and appropriate.
2. **Norm cascade:** When a norm has broad acceptance and reaches a tipping point, with norm leaders pressuring others to adopt and adhere to the norm.
3. **Norm internalization:** When the norm has acquired a "taken-for-granted" quality where compliance with the norm is nearly automatic.

They argue that several factors may raise the influence of certain norms:

1. **Legitimation:** Actors that feel insecure about their status and reputation may be more likely to embrace norms.
2. **Prominence:** Norms that are held by actors seen as desirable and successful are more likely to diffuse to others.
3. **Intrinsic qualities of the norm:** Norms that are specific, long-lasting, and universal are more likely to become prominent.
4. **Path dependency:** Norms that are related to preexisting norms are more likely to be widely accepted.
5. **World time-context:** Systemic shocks (such as wars, revolutions and economic crises) may motivate a search for new norms.

Christina Horne and Stefanie Mollborn have identified two broad categories of arguments for the emergence of norms:

1. **Consequentialism:** norms are created when an individual's behavior has consequences and externalities for other members of the group.
2. **Relationalism:** norms are created because people want to attract positive social reactions. In other words, norms do not necessarily contribute to the collective good.

Per consequentialism, norms contribute to the collective good. However, per relationalism, norms do not necessarily contribute to the collective good; norms may even be harmful to the collective.

Some scholars have characterized norms as essentially unstable, thus creating possibilities for norm change. According to Wayne Sandholtz, actors are more likely to persuade others to modify existing norms if they possess power, can reference existing foundational meta-norms, and can reference precedents. Social closeness between actors has been characterized as a key component in sustaining social norms.

Transfer of norms between groups

Individuals may also import norms from a previous organization to their new group, which can get adopted over time. Without a clear indication of how to act, people typically rely on their history to determine the best course forward; what was successful before may serve them well again. In a group, individuals may all import different histories or scripts about appropriate behaviors; common experience

over time will lead the group to define as a whole its take on the right action, usually with the integration of several members' schemas. Under the importation paradigm, norm formation occurs subtly and swiftly whereas with formal or informal development of norms may take longer.

Groups internalize norms by accepting them as reasonable and proper standards for behavior within the group. Once firmly established, a norm becomes a part of the group's operational structure and hence more difficult to change. While possible for newcomers to a group to change its norms, it is much more likely that the new individual will adopt the group's norms, values, and perspectives, rather than the other way around.

Deviance from social norms

"Normal = bad word", a graffiti in Ljubljana, Slovenia

Deviance is defined as "nonconformity to a set of norms that are accepted by a significant number of people in a community or society" More simply put, if group members do not follow a norm, they become tagged as a deviant. In the sociological literature, this can often lead to them being considered outcasts of society. Yet, deviant behavior amongst children is somewhat expected. Except the idea of this deviance manifesting as a criminal action, the social tolerance given in the example of the child is quickly withdrawn against the criminal. Crime is considered one of the most extreme forms of deviancy according to scholar Clifford R. Shaw.

What is considered "normal" is relative to the location of the culture in which the social interaction is taking place. In psychology, an individual who routinely disobeys group norms runs the risk of turning into the "institutionalized deviant." Similar to the sociological definition, institutionalized deviants may be judged by other group members for their failure to adhere to norms. At first, group members may increase pressure on a non-conformist, attempting to engage the individual in conversation or explicate why he or she should follow their behavioral expectations. The role in which one decides on whether or not to behave is largely determined on how their actions will affect others. Especially with new members who perhaps do not know any better, groups may use discretionary stimuli to bring an individual's behavior back into line. Over time, however, if members continue to disobey, the group will give-up on them as a lost cause; while the group may not necessarily revoke their membership, they may give them only superficial consideration. If a worker is late to a meeting, for example, violating the office norm of punctuality, a supervisor or other co-worker may wait for the individual to arrive and pull him aside later to ask what happened. If the behavior continues, eventually the group may begin meetings without him since the individual "is always late." The group generalizes the individual's disobedience and promptly dismisses it, thereby reducing the member's influence and footing in future group disagreements.

Group tolerance for deviation varies across membership; not all group members receive the same treatment for norm violations. Individuals may build up a "reserve" of good behavior through conformity, which they can borrow against later. These idiosyncrasy credits provide a theoretical currency for understanding variations in group behavioral expectations. A teacher, for example, may more easily forgive a straight-A student for misbehaving—who has past "good credit" saved up—than a repeatedly disruptive student. While past performance can help build idiosyncrasy credits, some group members have a higher balance to start with. Individuals can import idiosyncrasy credits from another group; childhood movie stars, for example, who enroll in college, may experience more leeway in adopting school norms than other incoming freshmen. Finally, leaders or individuals in other high-status positions may begin with more credits and appear to be "above the rules" at times. Even their idiosyncrasy credits are not bottomless, however; while held to a more lenient standard than the average member, leaders may still face group rejection if their disobedience becomes too extreme.

Deviance also causes multiple emotions one experiences when going against a norm. One of those emotions widely attributed to deviance is guilt. Guilt is connected to the ethics of duty which in turn

becomes a primary object of moral obligation. Guilt is followed by an action that is questioned after its doing. It can be described as something negative to the self as well as a negative state of feeling. Used in both instances, it is both an unpleasant feeling as well as a form of self-punishment. Using the metaphor of "dirty hands", it is the staining or tainting of oneself and therefore having to self cleanse away the filth. It is a form of reparation that confronts oneself as well as submitting to the possibility of anger and punishment from others. Guilt is a point in both action and feeling that acts as a stimulus for further "honorable" actions.

A 2023 study found that non-industrial societies varied in their punishments of norm violations. Punishment varied based on the types of norm violations and the socio-economic system of the society. The study "found evidence that reputational punishment was associated with egalitarianism and the absence of food storage; material punishment was associated with the presence of food storage; physical punishment was moderately associated with greater dependence on hunting; and execution punishment was moderately associated with social stratification."

Behavior

Whereas ideas in general do not necessarily have behavioral implications, Martha Finnemore notes that "norms by definition concern behavior. One could say that they are collectively held ideas about behavior."

Norms running counter to the behaviors of the overarching society or culture may be transmitted and maintained within small subgroups of society. For example, Crandall (1988) noted that certain groups (e.g., cheerleading squads, dance troupes, sports teams, sororities) have a rate of bulimia, a publicly recognized life-threatening disease, that is much higher than society as a whole. Social norms have a way of maintaining order and organizing groups.

In the field of social psychology, the roles of norms are emphasized—which can guide behavior in a certain situation or environment as "mental representations of appropriate behavior". It has been shown that normative messages can promote pro-social behavior, including decreasing alcohol use, increasing voter turnout, and reducing energy use. According to the psychological definition of social norms' behavioral component, norms have two dimensions: how much a behavior is exhibited, and how much the group approves of that behavior.

Social control

Although not considered to be formal laws within society, norms still work to promote a great deal of social control. They are statements that regulate conduct. The cultural phenomenon that is the norm is the prescriber of acceptable behavior in specific instances. Ranging in variations depending on culture, race, religion, and geographical location, it is the foundation of the terms some know as acceptable as not to injure others, the golden rule, and to keep promises that have been pledged. Without them, there would be a world without consensus, common ground, or restrictions. Even though the law and a state's legislation is not intended to control social norms, society and the law are inherently linked and one dictates the other. This is why it has been said that the language used in some legislation is controlling and dictating for what should or should not be accepted. For example, the criminalization of familial sexual relations is said to protect those that are vulnerable, however even consenting adults cannot have sexual relationships with their relatives. The language surrounding these laws conveys the message that such acts are supposedly immoral and should be condemned, even though there is no actual victim in these consenting relationships.

Social norms can be enforced formally (e.g., through sanctions) or informally (e.g., through body language and non-verbal communication cues). Because individuals often derive physical or psychological resources from group membership, groups are said to control discretionary stimuli; groups

can withhold or give out more resources in response to members' adherence to group norms, effectively controlling member behavior through rewards and operant conditioning. Social psychology research has found the more an individual values group-controlled resources or the more an individual sees group membership as central to his definition of self, the more likely he is to conform. Social norms also allow an individual to assess what behaviors the group deems important to its existence or survival, since they represent a codification of belief; groups generally do not punish members or create norms over actions which they care little about. Norms in every culture create conformity that allows for people to become socialized to the culture in which they live.

As social beings, individuals learn when and where it is appropriate to say certain things, to use certain words, to discuss certain topics or wear certain clothes, and when it is not. Thus, knowledge about cultural norms is important for impressions, which is an individual's regulation of their nonverbal behavior. One also comes to know through experience what types of people he/she can and cannot discuss certain topics with or wear certain types of dress around. Typically, this knowledge is derived through experience (i.e. social norms are learned through social interaction). Wearing a suit to a job interview in order to give a great first impression represents a common example of a social norm in the white collar work force.

In his work "Order without Law: How Neighbors Settle Disputes", Robert Ellickson studies various interactions between members of neighbourhoods and communities to show how societal norms create order within a small group of people. He argues that, in a small community or neighborhood, many rules and disputes can be settled without a central governing body simply by the interactions within these communities.

Sociology

In sociology, norms are seen as rules that bind an individual's actions to a specific sanction in one of two forms: a punishment or a reward. Through regulation of behavior, social norms create unique patterns that allow for distinguishing characteristics to be made between social systems. This creates a boundary that allows for a differentiation between those that belong in a specific social setting and those that do not.

For Talcott Parsons of the functionalist school, norms dictate the interactions of people in all social encounters. On the other hand, Karl Marx believed that norms are used to promote the creation of roles in society which allows for people of different levels of social class structure to be able to function properly. Marx claims that this power dynamic creates social order. James Coleman used both micro and macro conditions for his theory. For Coleman, norms start out as goal oriented actions by actors on the micro level. If the benefits do not outweigh the costs of the action for the actors, then a social norm would emerge. The norm's effectiveness is then determined by its ability to enforce its sanctions against those who would not contribute to the "optimal social order."

Heinrich Popitz is convinced that the establishment of social norms, that make the future actions of alter foreseeable for ego, solves the problem of contingency (Niklas Luhmann). In this way, ego can count on those actions as if they would already have been performed and does not have to wait for their actual execution; social interaction is thus accelerated. Important factors in the standardization of behavior are sanctions and social roles.

Operant conditioning

The probability of these behaviours occurring again is discussed in the theories of B. F. Skinner, who states that operant conditioning plays a role in the process of social norm development. Operant conditioning is the process by which behaviours are changed as a function of their consequences. The

probability that a behaviour will occur can be increased or decreased depending on the consequences of said behaviour.

In the case of social deviance, an individual who has gone against a norm will contact the negative contingencies associated with deviance, this may take the form of formal or informal rebuke, social isolation or censure, or more concrete punishments such as fines or imprisonment. If one reduces the deviant behavior after receiving a negative consequence, then they have learned via punishment. If they have engaged in a behavior consistent with a social norm after having an aversive stimulus reduced, then they have learned via negative reinforcement. Reinforcement increases behavior, while punishment decreases behavior.

As an example of this, consider a child who has painted on the walls of her house, if she has never done this before she may immediately seek a reaction from her mother or father. The form of reaction taken by the mother or father will affect whether the behaviour is likely to occur again in the future. If her parent is positive and approving of the behaviour it will likely reoccur (reinforcement) however, if the parent offers an aversive consequence (physical punishment, time-out, anger etc...) then the child is less likely to repeat the behaviour in future (punishment).

Skinner also states that humans are conditioned from a very young age on how to behave and how to act with those around us considering the outside influences of the society and location one is in. Built to blend into the ambiance and attitude around us, deviance is a frowned upon action.

Focus theory of normative conduct

Cialdini, Reno, and Kallgren developed the focus theory of normative conduct to describe how individuals implicitly juggle multiple behavioral expectations at once. Expanding on conflicting prior beliefs about whether cultural, situational or personal norms motivate action, the researchers suggested the focus of an individual's attention will dictate what behavioral expectation they follow.

Types

There is no clear consensus on how the term norm should be used.

Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink distinguish between three types of norms:[

- 1. **Regulative norms:** they "order and constrain behavior"*
- 2. **Constitutive norms:** they "create new actors, interests, or categories of action"*
- 3. **Evaluative and prescriptive norms:** they have an "oughtness" quality to them*

Finnemore, Sikkink, Jeffrey W. Legro and others have argued that the robustness (or effectiveness) of norms can be measured by factors such as:

- 1. **The specificity of the norm:** norms that are clear and specific are more likely to be effective*
- 2. **The longevity of the norm:** norms with a history are more likely to be effective*
- 3. **The universality of the norm:** norms that make general claims (rather than localized and particularistic claims) are more likely to be effective*

4. **The prominence of the norm:** norms that are widely accepted among powerful actors are more likely to be effective

Christine Horne argues that the robustness of a norm is shaped by the degree of support for the actors who sanction deviant behaviors; she refers to norms regulating how to enforce norms as "metanorms." According to Beth G. Simmons and Hyeran Jo, diversity of support for a norm can be a strong indicator of robustness. They add that institutionalization of a norm raises its robustness. It has also been posited that norms that exist within broader clusters of distinct but mutually reinforcing norms may be more robust.

Jeffrey Checkel argues that there are two common types of explanations for the efficacy of norms:

- **Rationalism:** actors comply with norms due to coercion, cost-benefit calculations, and material incentives
- **Constructivism:** actors comply with norms due to social learning and socialization

According to Peyton Young, mechanisms that support normative behavior include:

- **Coordination :-**
A coordination game is a type of simultaneous game found in game theory. It describes the situation where a player will earn a higher payoff when they select the same course of action as another player. The game is not one of pure conflict, which results in multiple pure strategy Nash equilibria in which players choose matching strategies. Figure 1 shows a 2-player example.
- **Social pressure :-**
Peer pressure is a direct or indirect influence on peers, i.e., members of social groups with similar interests and experiences, or social statuses. Members of a peer group are more likely to influence a person's beliefs, values, religion and behavior. A group or individual may be encouraged and want to follow their peers by changing their attitudes, values or behaviors to conform to those of the influencing group or individual. For the individual affected by peer pressure, this can have both a positive or negative effect on them.
- **Signaling :-**
Signalling (economics) contract theory is the idea that one party credibly conveys some information about itself to another party. Signalling was briefly introduced and discussed in the seminal *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*, which is considered to be the text that created the research field of game theory.
- **Focal points :-**
In game theory, a focal point is a solution that people tend to choose by default in the absence of communication in order to avoid coordination failure. The concept was introduced by the American economist Thomas Schelling in his book *The Strategy of Conflict* (1960). Schelling states that "[p]eople can often concert their intentions or expectations with others if each knows that the other is trying to do the same" in a cooperative situation, so their action would converge on a focal point which has some kind of prominence compared with the environment. However, the conspicuousness of the focal point depends on time, place and people themselves. It may not be a definite solution.

Descriptive versus injunctive

Descriptive norms depict what happens, while injunctive norms describe what should happen. Cialdini, Reno, and Kallgren (1990) define a descriptive norm as people's perceptions of what is commonly done in specific situations; it signifies what most people do, without assigning judgment. The absence of trash on the ground in a parking lot, for example, transmits the descriptive norm that most people there do not litter. An Injunctive norm, on the other hand, transmits group approval about a particular behavior; it dictates how an individual should behave. Watching another person pick up trash off the ground and throw it out, a group member may pick up on the injunctive norm that he ought not to litter.

Prescriptive and proscriptive norms

Prescriptive norms are unwritten rules that are understood and followed by society and indicate what we should do. Expressing gratitude or writing a Thank You card when someone gives you a gift represents a prescriptive norm in American culture. Proscriptive norms, in contrast, comprise the other end of the same spectrum; they are similarly society's unwritten rules about what one should not do. These norms can vary between cultures; while kissing someone you just met on the cheek is an acceptable greeting in some European countries, this is not acceptable, and thus represents a proscriptive norm in the United States.

Subjective norms

Subjective norms are determined by beliefs about the extent to which important others want a person to perform a behavior. When combined with attitude toward behavior, subjective norms shape an individual's intentions. Social influences are conceptualized in terms of the pressure that people perceive from important others to perform, or not to perform, a behavior. Social Psychologist Icek Azjen theorized that subjective norms are determined by the strength of a given normative belief and further weighted by the significance of a social referent, as represented in the following equation: $SN \propto \sum n_i m_i$, where (n) is a normative belief and (m) is the motivation to comply with said belief.

Mathematical representations

Over the last few decades, several theorists have attempted to explain social norms from a more theoretical point of view. By quantifying behavioral expectations graphically or attempting to plot the logic behind adherence, theorists hoped to be able to predict whether or not individuals would conform. The return potential model and game theory provide a slightly more economic conceptualization of norms, suggesting individuals can calculate the cost or benefit behind possible behavioral outcomes. Under these theoretical frameworks, choosing to obey or violate norms becomes a more deliberate, quantifiable decision.

Return potential model

(reproduced from Jackson, 1965).

Developed in the 1960s, the return potential model provides a method for plotting and visualizing group norms. In the regular coordinate plane, the amount of behavior exhibited is plotted on the X-axis (label a in Figure 1) while the amount of group acceptance or approval gets plotted on the Y-axis (b in Figure 1). The graph represents the potential return or positive outcome to an individual for a given behavioral norm. Theoretically, one could plot a point for each increment of behavior how much the group likes or dislikes that action. For example, it may be the case that among first-year graduate students, strong social norms exist around how many daily cups of coffee a student drinks. If the return curve in Figure 1 correctly displays the example social norm, we can see that if someone drinks 0 cups of coffee a day, the group strongly disapproves. The group disapproves of the behavior of any member who drinks fewer than four cups of coffee a day; the group disapproves of drinking more than seven cups, shown by the approval curve dipping back below zero. As seen in this example, the return potential model displays how much group approval one can expect for each increment of behavior.

1. **Point of maximum return.** The point with the greatest y-coordinate is called the point of maximum return, as it represents the amount of behavior the group likes the best. While *c* in Figure 1 is labeling the return curve in general, the highlighted point just above it at $X=6$, represents the point of maximum return. Extending our above example, the point of maximum return for first-year graduate students would be 6 cups of coffee; they receive the most social approval for drinking exactly that many cups. Any more or any fewer cups would decrease the approval.
2. **Range of tolerable behavior.** Label *d* represents the range of tolerable behavior, or the amount of action the group finds acceptable. It encompasses all the positive area under the curve. In Figure 1, the range of tolerable behavior extends is 3, as the group approves of all behavior from 4 to 7 and $7-4=3$. Carrying over our coffee example again, we can see that first-years only approve of having a limited number of cups of coffee (between 4 and 7); more than 7 cups or fewer than 4 would fall outside the range of tolerable behavior. Norms can have a narrower or wider range of tolerable behavior. Typically, a narrower range of behavior indicates a behavior with greater consequences to the group.
3. **Intensity.** The intensity of the norm tells how much the group cares about the norm, or how much group affect is at stake to be won or lost. It is represented in the return potential model by the total amount of area subsumed by the curve, regardless of whether the area is positive or negative. A norm with low intensity would not vary far from the x-axis; the amount of approval or disapproval for given behaviors would be closer to zero. A high-intensity norm, however, would have more extreme approval ratings. In Figure 1, the intensity of the norm appears high, as few behaviors invoke a rating of indifference.
4. **Crystallization.** Finally, norm crystallization refers to how much variance exists within the curve; translated from the theoretical back to the actual norm, it shows how much agreement exists between group members about the approval for a given amount of behavior.[46] It may be that some members believe the norm more central to group functioning than others. A group norm like how many cups of coffee first years should drink would probably have low crystallization since a lot of individuals have varying beliefs about the appropriate amount of caffeine to imbibe; in contrast, the norm of not plagiarizing another student's work would likely have high crystallization, as people uniformly agree on the behavior's unacceptability. Showing the overall group norm, the return potential model in Figure 1 does not indicate the crystallization. However, a return potential model that plotted individual data points alongside the cumulative norm could demonstrate the variance and allow us to deduce crystallization.

Game theory

Another general formal framework that can be used to represent the essential elements of the social situation surrounding a norm is the repeated game of game theory. Rational choice, a branch of game theory, deals with the relations and actions socially committed among rational agents. A norm gives a person a rule of thumb for how they should behave. However, a rational person acts according to the rule only if it is beneficial for them. The situation can be described as follows. A norm gives an expectation of how other people act in a given situation (macro). A person acts optimally given the expectation (micro). For a norm to be stable, people's actions must reconstitute the expectation without change (micro-macro feedback loop). A set of such correct stable expectations is known as a Nash equilibrium. Thus, a stable norm must constitute a Nash equilibrium. In the Nash equilibrium, no one actor has any positive incentive in individually deviating from a certain action. Social norms will be implemented if the actions of that specific norm come into agreement by the support of the Nash equilibrium in the majority of the game theoretical approaches.

From a game-theoretical point of view, there are two explanations for the vast variety of norms that exist throughout the world. One is the difference in games. Different parts of the world may give different environmental contexts and different people may have different values, which may result in a difference in games. The other is equilibrium selection not explicable by the game itself. Equilibrium selection is closely related to coordination. For a simple example, driving is common throughout the world, but in some countries people drive on the right and in other countries people drive on the left (see coordination game). A framework called comparative institutional analysis is proposed to deal with the game theoretical structural understanding of the variety of social norms.

Related Extensions

I. Anomie

In sociology, anomie or anomy is a social condition defined by an uprooting or breakdown of any moral values, standards or guidance for individuals to follow. Anomie is believed to possibly evolve from conflict of belief systems and causes breakdown of social bonds between an individual and the community.

II. Breaching experiment

In the fields of sociology and social psychology, a breaching experiment is an experiment that seeks to examine people's reactions to violations of commonly accepted social rules or norms. Breaching experiments are most commonly associated with ethnomethodology, and in particular the work of Harold Garfinkel. Breaching experiments involve the conscious exhibition of "unexpected" behavior/violation of social norms, an observation of the types of social reactions such behavioral violations engender, and an analysis of the social structure that makes these social reactions possible. The idea of studying the violation of social norms and the accompanying reactions has bridged across social science disciplines, and is today used in both sociology and psychology.

III. Conformity

Conformity or conformism is the act of matching attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors to group norms, politics or being like-minded. Norms are implicit, specific rules, guidance shared by a group of individuals, that guide their interactions with others. People often choose to conform to society rather than to pursue personal desires – because it is often easier to follow the path others have made already, rather than forging a new one. Thus, conformity is sometimes a product of group communication. This tendency to conform occurs in small groups and/or in society as a whole and may result from subtle unconscious influences, or from direct and overt social pressure. Conformity can occur in the presence of others, or when an individual is alone. For example, people tend to follow social norms when eating or when watching television, even if alone.

IV. Convention (norm)

A convention influences a set of agreed, stipulated, or generally accepted standards, social norms, or other criteria, often taking the form of a custom.

V. Cool (aesthetic)

Coolness, or being cool, is the aesthetic quality of something being compatible with admirable social norms of society or a group of people. Because of the varied and changing interpretation of what is considered cool, as well as its subjective nature, the word has no single meaning. For most, coolness is associated with exemplifying composure and self-control. When used in conversation, it is often as an expression of admiration or approval, and can be used when referencing both people and items of

interest. Although commonly regarded as slang, cool is widely used among disparate social groups and has endured in usage for generations.

VI. Dress code

A dress code is a set of rules, often written, with regard to what clothing groups of people must wear. Dress codes are created out of social perceptions and norms, and vary based on purpose, circumstances, and occasions. Different societies and cultures are likely to have different dress codes, Western dress codes being a prominent example.

VII. Enculturation

Enculturation is the process by which people learn the dynamics of their surrounding culture and acquire values and norms appropriate or necessary to that culture and its worldviews.

VIII. Etiquette

*Etiquette can be defined as a set of norms of personal behavior in polite society, usually occurring in the form of an ethical code of the expected and accepted social behaviors that accord with the conventions and norms observed and practiced by a society, a social class, or a social group. In modern English usage, the French word *étiquette* dates from the year 1750 and also originates from the French word for "ticket," possibly symbolizing a person's entry into society through proper behavior. There are many important historical figures that have helped to shape the meaning of the term as well as provide varying perspectives.*

IX. Heteronormativity

Heteronormativity is the definition of heterosexuality as the normative human sexuality. It assumes the gender binary and that sexual and marital relations are most fitting between people of the opposite sex.

X. Ideal (ethics)

An ideal is a principle or value that one actively pursues as a goal, usually in the context of ethics, and one's prioritization of ideals can serve to indicate the extent of one's dedication to each. The belief in ideals is called ethical idealism, and the history of ethical idealism includes a variety of philosophers.

XI. Ideology

An ideology is a set of beliefs or values attributed to a person or group of persons, especially those held for reasons that are not purely about belief in certain knowledge, in which "practical elements are as prominent as theoretical ones". Formerly applied primarily to economic, political, or religious theories and policies, in a tradition going back to Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, more recent use treats the term as mainly condemnatory.

XII. Morality

Morality is the categorization of intentions, decisions and actions into those that are proper, or right, and those that are improper, or wrong. Morality can be a body of standards or principles derived from a code of conduct from a particular philosophy, religion or culture, or it can derive from a standard that is understood to be universal. Morality may also be specifically synonymous with "goodness", "appropriateness" or "rightness".

XIII. Mores

Mores are social norms that are widely observed within a particular society or culture. Mores determine what is considered morally acceptable or unacceptable within any given culture. A folkway is what is created through interaction and that process is what organizes interactions through routine, repetition, habit and consistency.

XIV. Norm (philosophy)

Norms, in philosophy, are concepts (sentences) of practical import, oriented to affecting an action, rather than conceptual abstractions that describe, explain, and express. Normative sentences imply "ought-to" types of statements and assertions, in distinction to sentences that provide "is" types of statements and assertions. Common normative sentences include commands, permissions, and prohibitions; common normative abstract concepts include sincerity, justification, and honesty. A popular account of norms describes them as reasons to take action, to believe, and to feel.

XV. Norm of reciprocity

The norm of reciprocity requires that people repay in kind what others have done for them. It can be understood as the expectation that people will respond to each other by returning benefits for benefits, and with either indifference or hostility to harms. The social norm of reciprocity may take different forms in different areas of social life, or in different societies. This is distinct from related ideas such as gratitude, the Golden Rule, or mutual goodwill. See reciprocity for an analysis of the concepts involved.

XVI. Normality (behavior)

Normality is a behavior that can be normal for an individual when it is consistent with the most common behavior for that person. Normal is also used to describe individual behavior that conforms to the most common behavior in society. However, normal behavior is often only recognized in contrast to abnormality. In many cases normality is used to make moral judgements, such that normality is seen as good while abnormality is seen as bad, or conversely normality can be seen as boring and uninteresting. Someone being seen as normal or not normal can have social ramifications, such as being included, excluded or stigmatized by wider society.

XVII. Normalization (sociology)

Normalization refers to social processes through which ideas and actions come to be seen as 'normal' and become taken-for-granted or 'natural' in everyday life. There are different behavioral attitudes that humans accept as normal, such as grief for a loved one's suffering or death, avoiding danger, and not participating in cannibalism.

XVIII. Other (philosophy)

In philosophy, the Other is a fundamental concept referring to anyone or anything perceived as distinct or different from oneself. This distinction is crucial for understanding how individuals construct their own identities, as the encounter with "otherness" helps define the boundaries of the self. In phenomenology, the Other plays an important role in this self-formation, acting as a kind of mirror against which the self is reflected and understood.

XIX. Philosophical value

In ethics and social sciences, value denotes the degree of importance of some thing or action, with the aim of determining which actions are best to do or what way is best to live, or to describe the significance of different actions. Value systems are proscriptive

and prescriptive beliefs; they affect the ethical behavior of a person or are the basis of their intentional activities. Often primary values are strong and secondary values are suitable for changes. What makes an action valuable may in turn depend on the ethical values of the objects it increases, decreases, or alters. An object with "ethic value" may be termed an "ethic or philosophic good".

XX. Peer pressure

Peer pressure is a direct or indirect influence on peers, i.e., members of social groups with similar interests and experiences, or social statuses. Members of a peer group are more likely to influence a person's beliefs, values, religion and behavior. A group or individual may be encouraged and want to follow their peers by changing their attitudes, values or behaviors to conform to those of the influencing group or individual. For the individual affected by peer pressure, this can have both a positive or negative effect on them.

XXI. Rule complex

Thomas Rearden Burns was a Swedish-American sociologist and academic, who was professor emeritus of sociology at the University of Uppsala in Sweden and founder of the Uppsala Theory Circle.

XXII. Social norms marketing

The social norms approach, or social norms marketing, is an environmental strategy gaining ground in health campaigns. While conducting research in the mid-1980s, two researchers, H.W. Perkins and A.D. Berkowitz, reported that students at a small U.S. college held exaggerated beliefs about the normal frequency and consumption habits of other students with regard to alcohol. These inflated perceptions have been found in many educational institutions, with varying populations and locations. Despite the fact that college drinking is at elevated levels, the perceived amount almost always exceeds actual behavior. The social norms approach has shown signs of countering misperceptions, however research on changes in behavior resulting from changed perceptions varies between mixed to conclusively nonexistent.

XXIII. Social structure

In the social sciences, social structure is the aggregate of patterned social arrangements in society that are both emergent from and determinant of the actions of individuals. Likewise, society is believed to be grouped into structurally related groups or sets of roles, with different functions, meanings, or purposes. Examples of social structure include family, religion, law, economy, and class. It contrasts with "social system", which refers to the parent structure in which these various structures are embedded. Thus, social structures significantly influence larger systems, such as economic systems, legal systems, political systems, cultural systems, etc. Social structure can also be said to be the framework upon which a society is established. It determines the norms and patterns of relations between the various institutions of the society.

XXIV. Taboo

A taboo is a social group's ban, prohibition or avoidance of something based on the group's sense that it is excessively repulsive, offensive, sacred or allowed only for certain people. Such prohibitions are present in virtually all societies. Taboos may be prohibited explicitly, for example within a legal system or religion, or implicitly, for example by social norms or conventions followed by a particular culture or organization.

Highlighters**logic of appropriateness**

The logic of appropriateness is a theoretical perspective to explain human decision-making. It proposes that decisions and behavior follow from rules of appropriate behavior for a given role or identity. These rules are institutionalized in social practices and sustained over time through learning. People adhere to them because they see them as natural, rightful, expected, and legitimate. In other words, the logic of appropriateness assumes that actors decide on the basis of what social norms deem right rather than what cost-benefit calculations suggest best. The term was coined by organization theorists James G. March and Johan Olsen. They presented the argument in two prominent articles published by the journals Governance in 1996 and International Organization in 1998.

logic of consequences

Cost–benefit analysis (CBA), sometimes also called **benefit–cost analysis**, is a systematic approach to estimating the strengths and weaknesses of alternatives. It is used to determine options which provide the best approach to achieving benefits while preserving savings in, for example, transactions, activities, and functional business requirements. A CBA may be used to compare completed or potential courses of action, and to estimate or evaluate the value against the cost of a decision, project, or policy. It is commonly used to evaluate business or policy decisions, commercial transactions, and project investments. For example, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission must conduct cost–benefit analyses before instituting regulations or deregulations.

Evolutionarily stable strategy

An evolutionarily stable strategy (ESS) is a strategy that is impermeable when adopted by a population in adaptation to a specific environment, that is to say it cannot be displaced by an alternative strategy which may be novel or initially rare. Introduced by John Maynard Smith and George R. Price in 1972/3, it is an important concept in behavioural ecology, evolutionary psychology, mathematical game theory and economics, with applications in other fields such as anthropology, philosophy and political science.

Third-party punishment

Third-party punishment is punishment of a transgressor which is administered, not by a victim of the transgression, but rather by a third party not directly affected by the transgression. It has been argued that third-party punishments are the essence of social norms, as they are an evolutionarily stable strategy, unlike second-party punishments. It has also been shown that third-party punishments are exhibited in all examined populations, though the magnitude of the punishments varies greatly, and that costly punishment co-varies with altruistic behavior. Differences between within-group and inter-group altruistic punishments have also been observed.

Norm entrepreneur

A norm entrepreneur or moral entrepreneur is an individual, group, or formal organization that seeks to influence a group to adopt or maintain a social norm on the basis of assumed boundaries of altruism, deviance, duty, or compassion. A moral entrepreneur is someone who actively works to influence a group or society to adopt a particular moral stance or behavior, often by labeling certain actions as right or wrong and advocating for specific rules or norms.

Othering

In philosophy, the Other is a fundamental concept referring to anyone or anything perceived as distinct or different from oneself. This distinction is crucial for understanding how individuals construct their own identities, as the encounter with "otherness" helps define the boundaries of the self. In phenomenology, the Other plays an important role in this self-formation, acting as a kind of mirror against which the self is reflected and understood.

Incest is sex between close relatives, for example a brother, sister, or parent. This typically includes any kind of sexual activity between people in consanguinity, and sometimes those related by lineage. It is condemned and considered immoral in many societies. It can lead to an increased risk of genetic disorders in children in case of pregnancy from incestuous sex.

Tipping point

In sociology, a tipping point is a point in time when a group—or many group members—rapidly and dramatically changes its behavior by widely adopting a previously rare practice.

Nonconformity (quality)

In quality management, a nonconformity is a deviation from a specification, a standard, or an expectation. Nonconformities or nonconformance can be classified in seriousness multiple ways, though a typical classification scheme may have three to four levels, including critical, serious, major, and minor.

Outcast (person)

An outcast is someone who is rejected or cast out, as from home or from society or in some way excluded, looked down upon, or ignored. In common English speech, an outcast may be anyone who does not fit in with normal society, which can contribute to a sense of isolation.

Deviance (sociology)

Deviance or the sociology of deviance explores the actions or behaviors that violate social norms across formally enacted rules as well as informal violations of social norms. Although deviance may have a negative connotation, the violation of social norms is not always a negative action; positive deviation exists in some situations. Although a norm is violated, a behavior can still be classified as positive or acceptable.

Toleration

Toleration is when one allows or permits an action, idea, object, or person that they dislike or disagree with. Political scientist Andrew R. Murphy explains that "We can improve our understanding by defining 'toleration' as a set of social or political practices and 'tolerance' as a set of attitudes." Random House Dictionary defines tolerance as "a fair, objective, and permissive attitude toward those whose opinions, beliefs, practices, racial or ethnic origins, etc., differ from one's own". The Merriam-Webster Dictionary associates toleration both with "putting up with" something undesirable, and with neglect or failure to prevent or alleviate it.

Social relation or Social Interaction

A social relation is the fundamental unit of analysis within the social sciences, and describes any voluntary or involuntary interpersonal relationship between two or more conspecifics within and/or between groups. The group can be a language or kinship group, a social institution or organization, an economic class, a nation, or gender. Social relations are derived from human behavioral ecology, and, as an aggregate, form a coherent social structure whose constituent parts are best understood relative to each other and to the social ecosystem as a whole.

Institutionalized deviant

In clinical and abnormal psychology, institutionalization or institutional syndrome refers to deficits or disabilities in social and life skills, which develop after a person has spent a long period living in mental hospitals, prisons or other remote institutions. In other words, individuals in institutions may be deprived of independence and of responsibility, to the point that once they return to "outside life" they are often unable to manage many of its demands; it has also been argued that institutionalized individuals become psychologically more prone to mental health problems.

Stimulus

In physiology, a stimulus is a change in a living thing's internal or external environment. This change can be detected by an organism or organ using sensitivity, and leads to a physiological reaction. Sensory receptors can receive stimuli from outside the body, as in touch receptors found in the skin or light receptors in the eye, as well as from inside the body, as in chemoreceptors and mechanoreceptors. When a stimulus is detected by a sensory receptor, it can elicit a reflex via stimulus transduction. An internal stimulus is often the first component of a homeostatic control system. External stimuli are capable of producing systemic responses throughout the body, as in the fight-or-flight response. In order for a stimulus to be detected with high probability, its level of strength must exceed the absolute threshold; if a signal does reach threshold, the information is transmitted to the central nervous system (CNS), where it is integrated and a decision on how to react is made. Although stimuli commonly cause the body to respond, it is the CNS that finally determines whether a signal causes a reaction or not.

Superficial consideration

Superficial charm is the social act of saying or doing things because they are well received by others, rather than what one actually believes or wants to do. It is sometimes referred to as "telling people what they want to hear". Generally, superficial charm is an effective way to ingratiate or persuade and it is one of the many elements of impression management / self-presentation.

Punctuality

***Punctuality** is the characteristic of completing a required task or fulfilling an obligation before or at a previously designated time based on job requirements and or daily operations. "Punctual" is often used synonymously with "on time". An opposite characteristic is tardiness, or more colloquially "being late".*

Conformity

Conformity or conformism is the act of matching attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors to group norms, politics or being like-minded. Norms are implicit, specific rules, guidance shared by a group of individuals, that guide their interactions with others. People often choose to conform to society rather than to pursue personal desires – because it is often easier to follow the path others have made already, rather than forging a new one. Thus, conformity is sometimes a product of group communication. This tendency to conform occurs in small groups and/or in society as a whole and may result from subtle unconscious influences, or from direct and overt social pressure. Conformity can occur in the presence of others, or when an individual is alone. For example, people tend to follow social norms when eating or when watching television, even if alone.

Idiosyncrasy credit

Idiosyncrasy credit is a concept in social psychology that describes an individual's capacity to acceptably deviate from group expectations. Idiosyncrasy credits are increased (earned) each time an individual conforms to a group's expectations, and decreased (spent) each time an individual deviates from a group's expectations. Edwin Hollander originally defined idiosyncrasy credit as "an accumulation of positively disposed impressions residing in the perceptions of relevant others; it is... the degree to which an individual may deviate from the common expectancies of the group".

Egalitarianism

Egalitarianism is a school of thought within political philosophy that builds on the concept of social equality, prioritizing it for all people. Egalitarian doctrines are generally characterized by the idea that all humans are equal in fundamental worth or moral status. As such, all people should be accorded equal rights and treatment under the law. Egalitarian doctrines have been important in many modern political philosophies and social movements, including the Enlightenment, classical liberalism, libertarianism, feminism, civil rights, and international human rights. Egalitarianism is a major principle of both

classical liberalism with its equality of rights, and redistributive left-wing politics with its stress on equality of outcome.

Social stratification

Social stratification refers to a society's categorization of its people into groups based on socioeconomic factors like wealth, income, race, education, ethnicity, gender, occupation, social status, or derived power. It is a hierarchy within groups that ascribe them to different levels of privileges. As such, stratification is the relative social position of persons within a social group, category, geographic region, or social unit.

Bulimia nervosa

***Bulimia nervosa**, also known simply as bulimia, is an eating disorder characterized by binge eating followed by compensatory behaviors, such as self-induced vomiting or fasting, to prevent weight gain.*

White-collar work force

A white-collar worker is a person who performs knowledge-based, aptitude-based, managerial, or administrative work generally performed in an office or similar setting. White-collar workers include job paths related to banking, finance, compliance, legal, risk management, internal audit, data privacy, cybersecurity, insurance, government, consulting, academia, accountancy, business and executive management, customer support, design, economics, science, technology, engineering, market research, human resources, operations research, marketing, public relations, real estate, information technology, networking, healthcare, architecture, and research and development.

Social order

The term social order can be used in two senses: In the first sense, it refers to a particular system of social structures and institutions. Examples are the ancient, the feudal, and the capitalist social order. In the second sense, social order is contrasted to social chaos or disorder and refers to a stable state of society in which the existing social structure is accepted and maintained by its members. The problem of order or Hobbesian problem, which is central to much of sociology, political science and political philosophy, is the question of how and why it is that social orders exist at all.

Contingency (philosophy)

In logic, contingency is the feature of a statement making it neither necessary nor impossible. Contingency is a fundamental concept of modal logic. Modal logic concerns the manner, or mode, in which statements are true. Contingency is one of three basic modes alongside necessity and impossibility. In modal logic, a contingent statement stands in the modal realm between what is necessary and what is impossible, never crossing into the territory of either status. Contingent and necessary statements form the complete set of possible statements. While this definition is widely accepted, the precise distinction between what is contingent and what is necessary has been challenged since antiquity.

Operant conditioning

*Operant conditioning, also called **instrumental conditioning**, is a learning process in which voluntary behaviors are modified by association with the addition of reward or aversive stimuli. The frequency or duration of the behavior may increase through reinforcement or decrease through punishment or extinction.*

Rule of thumb

In English, the phrase rule of thumb refers to an approximate method for doing something, based on practical experience rather than theory. This usage of the phrase can be traced back to the 17th century and has been associated with various trades where quantities were measured by comparison to the width or length of a thumb.

Nash equilibrium

In **game theory**, a Nash equilibrium is a situation where no player could gain more by changing their own strategy in a game. Nash equilibrium is the most commonly used solution concept for non-cooperative games.

Equilibrium selection

Equilibrium selection is a concept from game theory which seeks to address reasons for players of a game to select a certain equilibrium over another. The concept is especially relevant in evolutionary game theory, where the different methods of equilibrium selection respond to different ideas of what equilibria will be stable and persistent for one player to play even in the face of deviations of the other players. This is important because there are various equilibrium concepts, and for many particular concepts, such as the Nash equilibrium, many games have multiple equilibria.

Conformity

Matching opinions and behaviors to group norms

Conformity or conformism is the act of matching attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors to group norms, politics or being like-minded. Norms are implicit, specific rules, guidance shared by a group of individuals, that guide their interactions with others. People often choose to conform to society rather than to pursue personal desires – because it is often easier to follow the path others have made already, rather than forging a new one. Thus, conformity is sometimes a product of group communication. This tendency to conform occurs in small groups and/or in society as a whole and may result from subtle unconscious influences (predisposed state of mind), or from direct and overt social pressure. Conformity can occur in the presence of others, or when an individual is alone. For example, people tend to follow social norms when eating or when watching television, even if alone.

Solomon Asch, a social psychologist whose obedience research remains among the most influential in psychology, demonstrated the power of conformity through his experiment on line judgment. The Asch conformity experiment demonstrates how much influence conformity has on people. In a laboratory experiment, Asch asked 50 male students from Swarthmore College in the US to participate in a 'vision test'. Asch put a naive participant in a room with seven stooges in a line judgment task. When confronted with the line task, each stooge had already decided what response they would give. The real members of the experimental group sat in the last position, while the others were pre-arranged experimenters who gave apparently incorrect answers in unison; Asch recorded the last person's answer to analyze the influence of conformity. Surprisingly, about one third (32%) of the participants who were placed in this situation sided with the clearly incorrect majority on the critical trials. Over the 12 critical trials, about 75% of participants conformed at least once. Asch demonstrated in this experiment that people could produce obviously erroneous responses just to conform to a group of similar erroneous responders, this was called normative influence. After being interviewed, subjects acknowledged that they did not actually agree with the answers given by others. The majority of them, however, believed that groups are wiser or did not want to appear as mavericks and chose to repeat the same obvious misconception. There is another influence that is sometimes more subtle, called informational influence. This is when people turn to others for information to help them make decisions in new or ambiguous situations. Most of the time, people were simply conforming to social group norms that they were unaware of, whether consciously or unconsciously, especially through a mechanism called the Chameleon effect. This effect is when people unintentionally and automatically mimic others' gestures, posture, and speech style in order to produce rapport and create social interactions that run smoothly (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999). It is clear from this

that conformity has a powerful effect on human perception and behavior, even to the extent that it can be faked against a person's basic belief system.

Changing one's behaviors to match the responses of others, which is conformity, can be conscious or not. People have an intrinsic tendency to unconsciously imitate other's behaviors such as gesture, language, talking speed, and other actions of the people they interact with. There are two other main reasons for conformity: informational influence and normative influence. People display conformity in response to informational influence when they believe the group is better informed, or in response to normative influence when they are afraid of rejection.[8] When the advocated norm could be correct, the informational influence is more important than the normative influence, while otherwise the normative influence dominates.

People often conform from a desire for security within a group, also known as normative influence—typically a group of a similar age, culture, religion or educational status. This is often referred to as groupthink: a pattern of thought characterized by self-deception, forced manufacture of consent, and conformity to group values and ethics, which ignores realistic appraisal of other courses of action. Unwillingness to conform carries the risk of social rejection. Conformity is often associated in media with adolescence and youth culture, but strongly affects humans of all ages.

Although peer pressure may manifest negatively, conformity can be regarded as either good or bad. Driving on the conventionally-approved side of the road may be seen as beneficial conformity. With the appropriate environmental influence, conforming, in early childhood years, allows one to learn and thus, adopt the appropriate behaviors necessary to interact and develop "correctly" within one's society. Conformity influences the formation and maintenance of social norms, and helps societies function smoothly and predictably via the self-elimination of behaviors seen as contrary to unwritten rules. Conformity was found to impair group performance in a variable environment, but was not found to have a significant effect on performance in a stable environment.

According to Herbert Kelman, there are three types of conformity:

- 1) **compliance** (which is public conformity, and it is motivated by the need for approval or the fear of disapproval;*
- 2) **identification** (which is a deeper type of conformism than compliance);*
- 3) **internalization** (which is to conform both publicly and privately).*

Major factors that influence the degree of conformity include culture, gender, age, size of the group, situational factors, and different stimuli. In some cases, minority influence, a special case of informational influence, can resist the pressure to conform and influence the majority to accept the minority's belief or behaviors.

Definition and context

Definition

Conformity is the tendency to change our perceptions, opinions, or behaviors in ways that are consistent with group norms. Norms are implicit, specific rules shared by a group of individuals on how they should behave. People may be susceptible to conform to group norms because they want to gain acceptance from their group.

Peer

Some adolescents gain acceptance and recognition from their peers by conformity. This peer moderated conformity increases from the transition of childhood to adolescence. It follows a U-shaped age pattern wherein conformity increases through childhood, peaking at sixth and ninth grades and then declines. Adolescents often follow the logic that "if everyone else is doing it, then it must be good and right". However, it is found that they are more likely to conform if peer pressure involves neutral activities such as those in sports, entertainment, and prosocial behaviors rather than anti-social behaviors. Researchers have found that peer conformity is strongest for individuals who reported strong identification with their friends or groups, making them more likely to adopt beliefs and behaviors accepted in such circles.

There is also the factor that the mere presence of a person can influence whether one is conforming or not. Norman Triplett (1898) was the researcher that initially discovered the impact that mere presence has, especially among peers. In other words, all people can affect society. We are influenced by people doing things beside us, whether this is in a competitive atmosphere or not. People tend to be influenced by those who are their own age especially. Co-actors that are similar to us tend to push us more than those who are not.

Social responses

According to Donelson Forsyth, after submitting to group pressures, individuals may find themselves facing one of several responses to conformity. These types of responses to conformity vary in their degree of public agreement versus private agreement.

When an individual finds themselves in a position where they publicly agree with the group's decision yet privately disagrees with the group's consensus, they are experiencing compliance or acquiescence. This is also referenced as apparent conformity. This type of conformity recognizes that behavior is not always consistent with our beliefs and attitudes, which mimics Leon Festinger's cognitive dissonance theory. In turn, conversion, otherwise known as private acceptance or "true conformity", involves both publicly and privately agreeing with the group's decision. In the case of private acceptance, the person conforms to the group by changing their beliefs and attitudes. Thus, this represents a true change of opinion to match the majority.

Another type of social response, which does not involve conformity with the majority of the group, is called convergence. In this type of social response, the group member agrees with the group's decision from the outset and thus does not need to shift their opinion on the matter at hand.

In addition, Forsyth shows that nonconformity can also fall into one of two response categories. Firstly, an individual who does not conform to the majority can display independence. Independence, or dissent, can be defined as the unwillingness to bend to group pressures. Thus, this individual stays true to his or her personal standards instead of the swaying toward group standards. Secondly, a nonconformist could be displaying anticonformity or counterconformity which involves the taking of opinions that are opposite to what the group believes. This type of nonconformity can be motivated by a need to rebel against the status quo instead of the need to be accurate in one's opinion.

To conclude, social responses to conformity can be seen to vary along a continuum from conversion to anticonformity. For example, a popular experiment in conformity research, known as the Asch situation or Asch conformity experiments, primarily includes compliance and independence. Also, other responses to conformity can be identified in groups such as juries, sports teams and work teams.

Main experiments

Sherif's experiment (1935)

Muzafer Sherif was interested in knowing how many people would change their opinions to bring them in line with the opinion of a group. In his experiment, participants were placed in a dark room and asked to

stare at a small dot of light 15 feet away. They were then asked to estimate the amount it moved. The trick was, there was no movement, it was caused by a visual illusion known as the autokinetic effect. The participants stated estimates ranging from 1–10 inches. On the first day, each person perceived different amounts of movement, but from the second to the fourth day, the same estimate was agreed on and others conformed to it. Over time, the personal estimates converged with the other group members' estimates once discussing their judgments aloud. Sherif suggested this was a simulation for how social norms develop in a society, providing a common frame of reference for people. His findings emphasize that people rely on others to interpret ambiguous stimuli and new situations.

Subsequent experiments were based on more realistic situations. In an eyewitness identification task, participants were shown a suspect individually and then in a lineup of other suspects. They were given one second to identify him, making it a difficult task. One group was told that their input was very important and would be used by the legal community. To the other it was simply an experiment. Being more motivated to get the right answer increased the tendency to conform. Those who wanted to be more accurate conformed 51% of the time as opposed to 35% in the other group. Sherif's study provided a framework for subsequent studies of influence such as Solomon Asch's 1955 study.

Asch's experiment (1951)

Asch conformity experiments

Which line matches the first line, A, B, or C? In the Asch conformity experiments, people frequently followed the majority judgment, even when the majority was wrong.

Solomon E. Asch conducted a modification of Sherif's study, assuming that when the situation was very clear, conformity would be drastically reduced. He exposed people in a group to a series of lines, and the participants were asked to match one line with a standard line. All participants except one were accomplices and gave the wrong answer in 12 of the 18 trials.

The results showed a surprisingly high degree of conformity: 74% of the participants conformed on at least one trial. On average people conformed one third of the time. A question is how the group would affect individuals in a situation where the correct answer is less obvious.

After his first test, Asch wanted to investigate whether the size or unanimity of the majority had greater influence on test subjects. "Which aspect of the influence of a majority is more important – the size of the majority or its unanimity? The experiment was modified to examine this question. In one series the size of the opposition was varied from one to 15 persons." The results clearly showed that as more people opposed the subject, the subject became more likely to conform. However, the increasing majority was only influential up to a point: from three or more opponents, there is more than 30% of conformity.

Besides that, this experiment proved that conformity is powerful, but also fragile. It is powerful because just by having actors giving the wrong answer made the participant to also give the wrong answer, even though they knew it was not correct. It is also fragile, however, because in one of the variants for the experiment, one of the actors was supposed to give the correct answer, being an "ally" to the participant. With an ally, the participant was more likely to give the correct answer than he was before the ally. In addition, if the participant was able to write down the answer, instead of saying out loud, he was also more likely to put the correct answer. The reason for that is because he was not afraid of being different from the rest of the group since the answers were hidden.

Milgram's shock experiment (1961)

This experiment was conducted by Yale University psychologist Stanley Milgram in order to portray obedience to authority. They measured the willingness of participants (men aged 20 to 50 from a diverse range of occupations with different levels of education) to obey the instructions from an authority figure

to supply fake electric shocks that would gradually increase to fatal levels. Regardless of these instructions going against their personal conscience, 65% of the participants shocked all the way to 450 volts, fully obeying the instruction, even if they did so reluctantly. Additionally, all participants shocked to at least 300 volts.

In this experiment, the subjects did not have punishments or rewards if they chose to disobey or obey. All they might receive is disapproval or approval from the experimenter. Since this is the case they had no motives to sway them to perform the immoral orders or not. One of the most important factors of the experiment is the position of the authority figure relative to the subject (the shocker) along with the position of the learner (the one getting shocked). There is a reduction in conformity depending on if the authority figure or learner was in the same room as the subject. When the authority figure was in another room and only phoned to give their orders the obedience rate went down to 20.5%. When the learner was in the same room as the subject the obedience rate dropped to 40%.

Stanford prison experiment (August 15–21, 1971)

Stanford prison experiment

This experiment, led by psychology professor Philip G. Zimbardo, recruited Stanford students using a local newspaper ad, who he checked to be both physically and mentally healthy.[36] Subjects were either assigned the role of a "prisoner" or "guard" at random over an extended period of time, within a pretend prison setting on the Stanford University Campus. The study was set to be over the course of two weeks but it was abruptly cut short because of the behaviors the subjects were exuding. It was terminated due to the "guards" taking on tyrannical and discriminatory characteristics while "prisoners" showed blatant signs of depression and distress.

In essence, this study showed us a lot about conformity and power imbalance. For one, it demonstrates how situations determines the way our behavior is shaped and predominates over our personality, attitudes, and individual morals. Those chosen to be "guards" were not mean-spirited. But, the situation they were put in made them act accordingly to their role. Furthermore, this study elucidates the idea that humans conform to expected roles. Good people (i.e. the guards before the experiment) were transformed into perpetrators of evil. Healthy people (i.e. the prisoners before the experiment) were subject to pathological reactions. These aspects are also traceable to situational forces. This experiment also demonstrated the notion of the banality of evil which explains that evil is not something special or rare, but it is something that exists in all ordinary people.

Varieties

Harvard psychologist Herbert Kelman identified three major types of conformity.

1. **Compliance** is public conformity, while possibly keeping one's own original beliefs for yourself. Compliance is motivated by the need for approval and the fear of being rejected.
2. **Identification** is conforming to someone who is liked and respected, such as a celebrity or a favorite uncle. This can be motivated by the attractiveness of the source, and this is a deeper type of conformism than compliance.
3. **Internalization** is accepting the belief or behavior and conforming both publicly and privately, if the source is credible. It is the deepest influence on people, and it will affect them for a long time.

Although Kelman's distinction has been influential, research in social psychology has focused primarily on two varieties of conformity. These are informational conformity, or informational social influence, and normative conformity, also called normative social influence. In Kelman's terminology, these correspond to internalization and compliance, respectively. There are naturally more than two or three variables in

society influential on human psychology and conformity; the notion of "varieties" of conformity based upon "social influence" is ambiguous and indefinable in this context.

According to Deutsch and Gérard (1955), conformity results from a motivational conflict (between the fear of being socially rejected and the wish to say what we think is correct) that leads to normative influence, and a cognitive conflict (others create doubts in what we think) which leads to informational influence.

Informational influence

Informational social influence

Informational social influence occurs when one turns to the members of one's group to obtain and accept accurate information about reality. A person is most likely to use informational social influence in certain situations: when a situation is ambiguous, people become uncertain about what to do and they are more likely to depend on others for the answer; and during a crisis when immediate action is necessary, in spite of panic. Looking to other people can help ease fears, but unfortunately, they are not always right. The more knowledgeable a person is, the more valuable they are as a resource. Thus, people often turn to experts for help. But once again people must be careful, as experts can make mistakes too. Informational social influence often results in internalization or private acceptance, where a person genuinely believes that the information is right.

Normative influence

Main article: Normative social influence

Normative social influence occurs when one conforms to be liked or accepted by the members of the group. This need of social approval and acceptance is part of our state of humans. In addition to this, we know that when people do not conform with their group and therefore are deviants, they are less liked and even punished by the group. Normative influence usually results in public compliance, doing or saying something without believing in it. The experiment of Asch in 1951 is one example of normative influence. Even though John Turner et al. argued that the post experimental interviews showed that the respondents were uncertain about the correct answers in some cases. The answers might have been evident to the experimenters, but the participants did not have the same experience. Subsequent studies pointed out the fact that the participants were not known to each other and therefore did not pose a threat against social rejection.

Normative influence vs. referent informational influence

The Asch conformity experiments are often interpreted as evidence for the power of conformity and normative social influence, where normative influence is the willingness to conform publicly to attain social reward and avoid social punishment. From this perspective, the results are viewed as a striking example of people publicly endorsing the group response despite knowing full well that they were endorsing an incorrect response.

Similarly, Jerry M. Burger admits the normative influence effect of the experiment in Chapter 21 of Noba online book. He mentioned that people follow the crowd to avoid potential criticism. During Asch's experiment, participants choose the wrong answer to keep the association with the group. The demonstration in this experiment broadens people's understanding of the large application of normative influence. To stay consistent with other group members, people may follow a trend that is apparently wrong. Moreover, the behavior of normative conformity may reduce when the individual response is not accessible to other people. This phenomenon further stresses the social role in normative influence.

In contrast, John Turner and colleagues argue that the interpretation of the Asch conformity experiments as normative influence is inconsistent with the data.[18][19][20] They point out that post-experiment interviews revealed that participants experienced uncertainty about their judgement during the

experiments. Although the correct answer appeared obvious to the researchers, this was not necessarily the experience of participants. Subsequent research has demonstrated similar patterns of conformity where participants were anonymous and thus not subject to social punishment or reward on the basis of their responses. From this perspective, the Asch conformity experiments are viewed as evidence for the self-categorization theory account of social influence (otherwise known as the theory of referent informational influence). Here, the observed conformity is an example of depersonalization processes, whereby people expect to hold the same opinions as others in their ingroup and will often adopt those opinions.

Social comparison theory

The conformity demonstrated in Asch experiments may contradict aspects of social comparison theory. Social comparison theory suggests that, when seeking to validate opinions and abilities, people will first turn to direct observation. If direct observation is ineffective or not available, people will then turn to comparable others for validation. In other words, social comparison theory predicts that social reality testing will arise when physical reality testing yields uncertainty. The Asch conformity experiments demonstrate that uncertainty can arise as an outcome of social reality testing. More broadly, this inconsistency has been used to support the position that the theoretical distinction between social reality testing and physical reality testing is untenable.

In a reinterpretation of the original data from these experiments Hodges and Geyer (2006) found that Asch's subjects were not so conformist after all: The experiments provide powerful evidence for people's tendency to tell the truth even when others do not. They also provide compelling evidence of people's concern for others and their views. By closely examining the situation in which Asch's subjects find themselves they find that the situation places multiple demands on participants: They include truth (i.e., expressing one's own view accurately), trust (i.e., taking seriously the value of others' claims), and social solidarity (i.e., a commitment to integrate the views of self and others without deprecating). In addition to these epistemic values, there are multiple moral claims as well: These include the need for participants to care for the integrity and well-being of other participants, the experimenter, themselves, and the worth of scientific research.

Deutsch & Gérard (1955) designed different situations that varied from Asch's experiment and found that when participants were writing their answer privately, they gave the correct one.

Normative influence, a function of social impact theory, has three components. The number of people in the group has a surprising effect. As the number increases, each person has less of an impact. A group's strength is how important the group is to a person. Groups we value generally have more social influence. Immediacy is how close the group is in time and space when the influence is taking place. Psychologists have constructed a mathematical model using these three factors and are able to predict the amount of conformity that occurs with some degree of accuracy.

Baron and his colleagues conducted a second eyewitness study that focused on normative influence. In this version, the task was easier. Each participant had five seconds to look at a slide instead of just one second. Once again, there were both high and low motives to be accurate, but the results were the reverse of the first study. The low motivation group conformed 33% of the time (similar to Asch's findings). The high motivation group conformed less at 16%. These results show that when accuracy is not very important, it is better to get the wrong answer than to risk social disapproval.

An experiment using procedures similar to Asch's found that there was significantly less conformity in six-person groups of friends as compared to six-person groups of strangers. Because friends already know and accept each other, there may be less normative pressure to conform in some situations. Field studies

on cigarette and alcohol abuse, however; generally demonstrate evidence of friends exerting normative social influence on each other.

Minority influence

Although conformity generally leads individuals to think and act more like groups, individuals are occasionally able to reverse this tendency and change the people around them. This is known as minority influence, a special case of informational influence. Minority influence is most likely when people can make a clear and consistent case for their point of view. If the minority fluctuates and shows uncertainty, the chance of influence is small. However, a minority that makes a strong, convincing case increases the probability of changing the majority's beliefs and behaviors. Minority members who are perceived as experts, are high in status, or have benefited the group in the past are also more likely to succeed.

Another form of minority influence can sometimes override conformity effects and lead to unhealthy group dynamics. A 2007 review of two dozen studies by the University of Washington found that a single "bad apple" (an inconsiderate or negligent group member) can substantially increase conflicts and reduce performance in work groups. Bad apples often create a negative emotional climate that interferes with healthy group functioning. They can be avoided by careful selection procedures and managed by reassigning them to positions that require less social interaction.

Specific predictors

Culture

Individualism versus collectivism

- **Individualism** is the moral stance, political philosophy, ideology, and social outlook that emphasizes the worth or central role of the individual. Individualists promote realizing one's goals and desires, valuing independence and self-reliance, and advocating that the interests of the individual should gain precedence over the state or a social group, while opposing external interference upon one's own interests by society or institutions such as the government. Individualism makes the individual its focus, and so starts "with the fundamental premise that the human individual is of primary importance in the struggle for liberation".
- **Collectivism**, In sociology, a social organization is a pattern of relationships between and among individuals and groups. Characteristics of social organization can include qualities such as sexual composition, spatiotemporal cohesion, leadership, structure, division of labor, communication systems, and so on.

Stanley Milgram found that individuals in Norway (from a collectivistic culture) exhibited a higher degree of conformity than individuals in France (from an individualistic culture). Similarly, Berry studied two different populations: the Temne (collectivists) and the Inuit (individualists) and found that the Temne conformed more than the Inuit when exposed to a conformity task.

Bond and Smith compared 134 studies in a meta-analysis and found that there is a positive correlation between a country's level of collectivistic values and conformity rates in the Asch paradigm. Bond and Smith also reported that conformity has declined in the United States over time.

Influenced by the writings of late-19th- and early-20th-century Western travelers, scholars or diplomats who visited Japan, such as Basil Hall Chamberlain, George Trumbull Ladd and Percival Lowell, as well as by Ruth Benedict's influential book *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*, many scholars of Japanese studies speculated that there would be a higher propensity to conform in Japanese culture than in American culture. However, this view was not formed on the basis of empirical evidence collected in a systematic way, but rather on the basis of anecdotes and casual observations, which are subject to a

variety of cognitive biases. Modern scientific studies comparing conformity in Japan and the United States show that Americans conform in general as much as the Japanese and, in some situations, even more. Psychology professor Yohtaro Takano from the University of Tokyo, along with Eiko Osaka reviewed four behavioral studies and found that the rate of conformity errors that the Japanese subjects manifested in the Asch paradigm was similar with that manifested by Americans. The study published in 1970 by Robert Frager from the University of California, Santa Cruz found that the percentage of conformity errors within the Asch paradigm was significantly lower in Japan than in the United States, especially in the prize condition. Another study published in 2008, which compared the level of conformity among Japanese in-groups (peers from the same college clubs) with that found among Americans found no substantial difference in the level of conformity manifested by the two nations, even in the case of in-groups.

Gender

Societal norms often establish gender differences and researchers have reported differences in the way men and women conform to social influence. For example, Alice Eagly and Linda Carli performed a meta-analysis of 148 studies of influenceability. They found that women are more persuadable and more conforming than men in group pressure situations that involve surveillance. Eagly has proposed that this sex difference may be due to different sex roles in society. Women are generally taught to be more agreeable whereas men are taught to be more independent.

The composition of the group plays a role in conformity as well. In a study by Reitan and Shaw, it was found that men and women conformed more when there were participants of both sexes involved versus participants of the same sex. Subjects in the groups with both sexes were more apprehensive when there was a discrepancy amongst group members, and thus the subjects reported that they doubted their own judgments. Sistrunk and McDavid made the argument that women conformed more because of a methodological bias. They argued that because stereotypes used in studies are generally male ones (sports, cars..) more than female ones (cooking, fashion..), women felt uncertain and conformed more, which was confirmed by their results.

Age

Research has noted age differences in conformity. For example, research with Australian children and adolescents ages 3 to 17 discovered that conformity decreases with age. Another study examined individuals that were ranged from ages 18 to 91. The results revealed a similar trend – older participants displayed less conformity when compared to younger participants.

In the same way that gender has been viewed as corresponding to status, age has also been argued to have status implications. Berger, Rosenholtz and Zelditch suggest that age as a status role can be observed among college students. Younger students, such as those in their first year in college, are treated as lower-status individuals and older college students are treated as higher-status individuals. Therefore, given these status roles, it would be expected that younger individuals (low status) conform to the majority whereas older individuals (high status) would be expected not to conform.

Researchers have also reported an interaction of gender and age on conformity. Eagly and Chvrvala examined the role of age (under 19 years vs. 19 years and older), gender and surveillance (anticipating responses to be shared with group members vs. not anticipating responses being shared) on conformity to group opinions. They discovered that among participants that were 19 years or older, females conformed to group opinions more so than males when under surveillance (i.e., anticipated that their responses would be shared with group members). However, there were no gender differences in conformity among participants who were under 19 years of age and in surveillance conditions. There were also no gender differences when participants were not under surveillance. In a subsequent research article, Eagly suggests that women are more likely to conform than men because of lower status roles of women in

society. She suggests that more submissive roles (i.e., conforming) are expected of individuals that hold low status roles. Still, Eagly and Chrvala's results do conflict with previous research which have found higher conformity levels among younger rather than older individuals.

Size of the group

Although conformity pressures generally increase as the size of the majority increases, Asch's experiment in 1951 stated that increasing the size of the group will have no additional impact beyond a majority of size three. Brown and Byrne's 1997 study described a possible explanation that people may suspect collusion when the majority exceeds three or four. Gerard's 1968 study reported a linear relationship between the group size and conformity when the group size ranges from two to seven people.[69] According to Latane's 1981 study, the number of the majority is one factor that influences the degree of conformity, and there are other factors like strength and immediacy.

Moreover, a study suggests that the effects of group size depend on the type of social influence operating. This means that in situations where the group is clearly wrong, conformity will be motivated by normative influence; the participants will conform in order to be accepted by the group. A participant may not feel much pressure to conform when the first person gives an incorrect response. However, conformity pressure will increase as each additional group member also gives the same incorrect response.

Situational factors

Research has found different group and situation factors that affect conformity. Accountability increases conformity, if an individual is trying to be accepted by a group which has certain preferences, then individuals are more likely to conform to match the group. Similarly, the attractiveness of group members increases conformity. If an individual wishes to be liked by the group, they are increasingly likely to conform.

Accuracy also effects conformity, as the more accurate and reasonable the majority is in their decision than the more likely the individual will be to conform. As mentioned earlier, size also effects individuals' likelihood to conform. The larger the majority the more likely an individual will conform to that majority. Similarly, the less ambiguous the task or decision is, the more likely someone will conform to the group. When tasks are ambiguous people are less pressured to conform. Task difficulty also increases conformity, but research has found that conformity increases when the task is difficult but also important.

Research has also found that as individuals become more aware that they disagree with the majority they feel more pressure, and hence are more likely to conform to the decisions of the group. Likewise, when responses must be made face-face, individuals increasingly conform, and therefore conformity increases as the anonymity of the response in a group decreases. Conformity also increases when individuals have committed themselves to the group making decisions.

Conformity has also been shown to be linked to cohesiveness. Cohesiveness is how strongly members of a group are linked together; and conformity has been found to increase as group cohesiveness increases. Similarly, conformity is also higher when individuals are committed and wish to stay in the group. Conformity is also higher when individuals are in situations involving existential thoughts that cause anxiety, in these situations individuals are more likely to conform to the majority's decisions.

Different stimuli

In 1961 Stanley Milgram published a study in which he utilized Asch's conformity paradigm using audio tones instead of lines; he conducted his study in Norway and France. He found substantially higher levels of conformity than Asch, with participants conforming 50% of the time in France and 62% of the time in Norway during critical trials. Milgram also conducted the same experiment once more, but told participants that the results of the study would be applied to the design of aircraft safety signals. His

conformity estimates were 56% in Norway and 46% in France, suggesting that individuals conformed slightly less when the task was linked to an important issue. Stanley Milgram's study demonstrated that Asch's study could be replicated with other stimuli, and that in the case of tones, there was a high degree of conformity.

Neural correlates

Evidence has been found for the involvement of the posterior medial frontal cortex (pmFC) in conformity, an area associated with memory and decision-making. For example, Klucharev et al. revealed in their study that by using repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on the pmFC, participants reduced their tendency to conform to the group, suggesting a causal role for the brain region in social conformity.

Neuroscience has also shown how people quickly develop similar values for things. Opinions of others immediately change the brain's reward response in the ventral striatum to receiving or losing the object in question, in proportion to how susceptible the person is to social influence. Having similar opinions to others can also generate a reward response.

The amygdala and hippocampus have also been found to be recruited when individuals participated in a social manipulation experiment involving long-term memory. Several other areas have further been suggested to play a role in conformity, including the insula, the temporoparietal junction, the ventral striatum, and the anterior and posterior cingulate cortices.

More recent work stresses the role of orbitofrontal cortex (OFC) in conformity not only at the time of social influence, but also later on, when participants are given an opportunity to conform by selecting an action. In particular, Charpentier et al. found that the OFC mirrors the exposure to social influence at a subsequent time point, when a decision is being made without the social influence being present. The tendency to conform has also been observed in the structure of the OFC, with a greater grey matter volume in high conformers.

Related Extensions

Authoritarian personality

The authoritarian personality is a personality type characterized by a disposition to treat the voice of authority figures with unquestioning obedience and respect. Conceptually, the term originated from the writings of Erich Fromm and is usually applied to people who exhibit a strict and oppressive personality towards their subordinates, but was in fact inspired by Siegfried Kracauer's observation of a niche catering to the decisions of those they perceived to be above them and behaving aggressively toward those below them. Regardless of whether authoritarianism is more of a personality, attitude, ideology or disposition, scholars find it has had significant influence on public opinion and political behavior.

Bandwagon effect

The bandwagon effect is a psychological phenomenon where people adopt certain behaviors, styles, or attitudes simply because others are doing so. More specifically, it is a cognitive bias by which public opinion or behaviours can alter due to particular actions and beliefs rallying amongst the public. It is a psychological phenomenon whereby the rate of uptake of beliefs, ideas, fads and trends increases with respect to the proportion of others who have already done so. As more people come to believe in something, others also "hop on the bandwagon", regardless of the underlying evidence.

Behavioral contagion

Behavioral contagion is a form of social contagion involving the spread of behavior through a group. It refers to the propensity for a person to copy a certain behavior of others who are either in the vicinity, or whom they have been exposed to. The term was originally used by Gustave Le Bon in his 1895 work *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind* to explain undesirable aspects of behavior of people in crowds. In

the digital age, behavioral contagion is also concerned with the spread of online behavior and information. A variety of behavioral contagion mechanisms were incorporated in models of collective human behavior.

Conventional wisdom

The conventional wisdom or received opinion is the body of ideas or explanations generally accepted by the public and/or by experts in a field.

Countersignaling

Countersignaling is the behavior in which agents with the highest level of a given property invest less into proving it than individuals with a medium level of the same property. This concept is primarily useful for analyzing human behavior and thus relevant to signaling theory in economics, sociology and psychology.

Cultural assimilation

Cultural assimilation is the process in which a minority group or culture comes to resemble a society's majority group or fully adopts the values, behaviors, and beliefs of another group. The melting pot model is based on this concept. A related term is "cultural integration", which describes the process of becoming economically and socially integrated into another society while retaining elements of one's original culture. Cultural assimilation is the opposite of multiculturalism, as assimilation involves a minority group adopting the dominant culture, while multiculturalism promotes the coexistence and preservation of multiple cultures. Another closely related concept is acculturation, which occurs through cultural diffusion and involves changes in the cultural patterns of one or both groups, while still maintaining distinct characteristics.

Honne and tatemae

In Japan, honne and tatemae are Japanese terms relating to a person's feelings and outward behaviors. Honne refers to a person's true feelings and desires, and tatemae refers contrastingly to the behavior and opinions one displays in public. This distinction began to be made in the post-war era.

Knowledge falsification

*Knowledge falsification is the deliberate misrepresentation of what one knows under perceived social pressures. The term was coined by Timur Kuran in his book *Private Truths, Public Lies: The Social Consequences of Preference Falsification*.*

Milieu control

Milieu control is a term popularized by psychiatrist Robert Jay Lifton to describe tactics that control environment and human communication through the use of social pressure and group language. This includes tactics such as dogma, protocols, innuendo, slang, and pronunciation, which enables group members to identify other members, or to promote cognitive changes in individuals. Lifton originally used "milieu control" to describe brainwashing and mind control, but the term has since been applied to other contexts.

Preference falsification

Preference falsification is the act of misrepresenting a preference under perceived public pressure. It involves the selection of a publicly expressed preference that differs from the underlying privately held preference. People frequently convey to each other preferences that differ from what they would communicate privately under credible cover of anonymity. Techniques such as list experiments can be used to uncover preference falsification.

Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes

Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes (1965/1973) is a book on the subject of propaganda by French philosopher, theologian, legal scholar, and sociologist Jacques Ellul. This book appears to be the first attempt to study propaganda from a sociological approach as well as a psychological one. It presents a sophisticated taxonomy for propaganda, including such paired opposites as political–sociological, vertical–horizontal, rational–irrational, and agitation–integration. The book contains Ellul's theories about the nature of propaganda to adapt the individual to a society, to a living standard, and to an activity aiming to make the individual serve and conform.

Spiral of silence

The spiral of silence theory is a political science and mass communication theory which states that an individual's perception of the distribution of public opinion influences that individual's willingness to express their own opinions. Also known as the theory of public opinion, the spiral of silence theory claims individuals will be more confident and outward with their opinion when they notice that their personal opinion is shared throughout a group. But if the individual notices that their opinion is unpopular with the group, they will be more inclined to be reserved and remain silent. In other words, from the individual's perspective, "not isolating themselves is more important than their own judgement", meaning their perception of how others in the group perceive them is more important to themselves than the need for their opinion to be heard.

Social inertia

In psychology and sociology, social inertia or cultural inertia is the resistance to change or the permanence of stable relationships possibly outdated in societies or social groups. Social inertia is the opposite of social change.

Common Courtesy

Courtesy

That's a great, simple word that encompasses a complex but vital concept!

Courtesy is fundamentally defined as polite behavior that shows respect and consideration for other people.

It is more than just good manners; it reflects a genuine regard for the feelings and well-being of others.

Courtesy Facets

1. **Respect & Consideration:** *The core component of courtesy is treating others with respect, acknowledging their inherent worth, and considering how your words and actions might affect them.*
2. **Politeness & Good Manners:** *This includes using language like "please," "thank you," and "excuse me," and adhering to common social rules (etiquette).*
3. **Voluntary Action:** *A truly courteous act is often done as a kindness or favor, not because it is strictly required or obligatory.*
4. **Civility:** *Courtesy is a cornerstone of civil society, making all interactions—from professional to public to personal—smoother and more harmonious.*

Examples of Showing Courtesy

Courtesy is practiced through simple, everyday actions:

❖ **Category**

❖ **Examples of Courtesy**

❖ **Verbal**

❖ *Saying "Please" when making a request.*

❖ *Saying "Thank you" when receiving a service or item.*

❖ *Not interrupting someone while they are speaking.*

❖ **Non-Verbal**

❖ *Holding a door open for the person behind you.*

❖ *Making eye contact when someone is speaking to you.*

- ❖ *Yielding a seat on public transport to an elderly or pregnant person.*
- ❖ **Situational**
- ❖ *Returning borrowed items promptly and in good condition.*
- ❖ *Using headphones for music or videos in public spaces.*
- ❖ *Cleaning up a mess you've made in a shared area.*

Origin of the Word

The word "courtesy" comes from the Middle English *curteisie*, derived from the Old French *courtoisie*. This root is related to the word "court" (the residence of a sovereign).

In the Middle Ages, courtesy referred to the polite, elegant, and chivalrous behavior expected of those who belonged to the royal or noble court. Over time, it evolved to mean the general politeness and good manners that should be shown by all people.

Would you like to know how courtesy is applied specifically in a particular setting, like in the workplace or in digital communication?

Common courtesy

Common courtesy is the basic level of politeness and respectful behavior expected in daily interactions, such as saying "**please**" and "**thank you**," holding doors for others, and listening attentively when someone is speaking. It involves treating others with respect and dignity, and practicing good manners to create positive social interactions.

Examples of **common courtesy**

1. Verbal

- a. Saying "please," "thank you," and "excuse me"
- b. Apologizing when you make a mistake
- c. Greeting others with a kind word
- d. Not talking loudly on a mobile phone in public places

2. Physical

- a. Holding a door open for the person behind you
- b. Giving up your seat to someone who needs it more, like an elderly person or pregnant woman
- c. Helping with luggage or other tasks for someone who needs it
- d. Cleaning up your own mess, such as wiping up a spill at a restaurant
- e. Attentiveness:
- f. Making eye contact and listening attentively when someone is speaking to you
- g. Putting away your phone to give someone your full attention

h. Asking if you can assist someone

3. Social

- a. Writing a thank-you note for a gift
- b. Letting someone with fewer items go ahead of you in a checkout line
- c. Accepting compliments or a gift gracefully

Why Is There an R in Mrs.?

There's no r in missus, so what's it doing in the abbreviation?

Mr. & Mrs. Despite its pronunciation, the abbreviation Mrs. is derived from the title mistress. If we pronounce the title Mrs. as "missus," why is there an r in it? Despite its pronunciation, the abbreviation Mrs. is derived from the title mistress, which accounts for that confusing extra letter. Mistress is the counterpart of master, which—you guessed it—is abbreviated to Mr. (Of course, English speakers now pronounce the title Mr. as "mister.").

While mistress may have distasteful connotations today, in the mid-18th century the title referred to a woman of economic or social capital. Mrs. was an honorific: a woman referred to as Mrs. generally had servants or was part of an upper social echelon. Most notably, the title Mrs. did not signify that a woman was married, just like Mr. today. In fact, Samuel Johnson's dictionary of 1755 offers six definitions for the word mistress, which range from the respectful ("a woman who governs" or "a woman skilled in anything") to the ironic ("a term of contemptuous address" or "a whore or concubine"), but no definition mentions marital status.

The use of Mrs. to refer to a married woman is linked to the history of another title: Miss. Miss became a popular title in the late 18th century and specifically referred to an unmarried woman (often a schoolteacher) of a high social status. (Originally, Miss was actually a title for young girls, while Master was the title for boys.) This, according to scholar Amy Erickson, caused a shift in the use of Mrs. to signify a married woman in the late 18th century and still informs our use of the title Mrs. today.

How the pronunciation of mistress turned to "missus" is somewhat unclear. Erickson cites John Walker's A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary, and Expositor of the English Language from 1828: "The same haste and necessity of dispatch, which has corrupted Master into Mister, has, when a title of civility only, contracted Mistress into Missis." The change in pronunciation was essentially a colloquial and utilitarian shortening, and by the tail end of the 18th century, this pronunciation was the preferred one.

Courtesy

Gentle politeness and courtly manners

Courtesy (from the word courteis, from the 12th century) is gentle politeness and courtly manners. In the Middle Ages in Europe, the behaviour expected of the nobility was compiled in courtesy books.

History

The apex of European courtly culture was reached in the Late Middle Ages and the Baroque period (i.e. roughly the four centuries spanning 1300–1700). The oldest courtesy books date to the 13th century, but they become an influential genre in the 16th, with the most influential of them being Il Cortegiano (1508), which not only covered basic etiquette and decorum but also provided models of sophisticated conversation and intellectual skill.

The royal courts of Europe persisted well into the 18th century (and to some limited extent to the present day), but in the 18th century, the notion of courtesy was replaced by that of gallantry, referring to an ideal emphasizing the display of affected sensitivity in direct contrast with the ideals of self-denial and dignified seriousness that were the Baroque norm. During the late medieval and early modern period, the bourgeois class tended to emulate the courtly etiquette of their betters. This changed in the 19th century, after the end of the Napoleonic Wars, with the emergence of a middle class with its own set of bourgeois etiquette, which in turn was mocked in the classist theory of Marxism as petite bourgeoisie.

The analogue concept in the court culture of medieval India was known by the Sanskrit term dakṣiṇya, literally meaning "right-handedness", but as in English dexterity having a figurative meaning of "apt, clever, appropriate", glossed as "kindness and consideration expressed in a sophisticated and elegant way".

Golden Rule

Principle of treating others

The Golden Rule is the principle of treating others as one would want to be treated by them. It is sometimes called an ethics of reciprocity, meaning that one should reciprocate to others how one would like them to treat the person (not necessarily how they actually treat them). Various expressions of this rule can be found in the tenets of most religions and creeds through the ages.

The maxim may appear as a positive or negative injunction governing conduct:

- 1. Treat others as one would like others to treat them (positive or directive form)*
- 2. Do not treat others in ways that one would not like to be treated (negative or prohibitive form)*
- 3. What one wishes upon others, they wish upon themselves (empathetic or responsive form)*

Etymology

The term "Golden Rule", or "Golden law", began to be used widely in the early 17th century in Britain by Anglican theologians and preachers; the earliest known usage is that of Anglicans Charles Gibbon and Thomas Jackson in 1604.

Ancient history

Bedouin systems of justice and Honor codes of the Bedouin

There is evidence that pre-Islamic Arab ethics contained principles similar to the Golden Rule, even if they weren't formally codified like in later religious texts. The idea was embedded in tribal honor, poetry, and customary law ('urf).

Urf refers to the traditional customs and practices that were widely accepted and followed within Arab tribes. These customs were not codified in written laws but were deeply embedded in the social fabric and were passed down through generations. The adherence to 'urf was considered essential for maintaining social harmony and tribal cohesion.

Antara Ibn Shaddad, a pre-Islamic poet, is quoted saying in his poetry "He who witnessed the battle informs you that I charge into combat and remain chaste at the spoils." (Showing integrity—he does not take more than is rightfully his.), whilst Imru Al-Qais is quoted saying "On that day I killed my riding camel for food for the maidens - How merry was their dividing my camel's trappings to be carried on their camels.."

Key aspects of 'Urf

- **Honor codes (Sharaf and 'Ird):** Central to 'urf were the concepts of sharaf (honor) for men and 'ird (honor) for women. These codes dictated behavior and were crucial in maintaining personal and familial dignity. Violations of these codes often led to severe repercussions, including blood feuds.
- **Hospitality (Diyāfa):** Hospitality was a sacred duty. Offering shelter and sustenance to guests, even if they were enemies, was a fundamental practice. This act was seen as a reflection of one's honor and generosity. Imru' al-Qays and other poets praised generosity and care toward travelers and guests.
- **Dispute resolution:** Tribal elders and leaders were responsible for mediating conflicts and disputes. The process often involved compensation (diya) or other forms of restitution. In some cases, trial by ordeal, such as the bisha'a (ordeal by fire), was used to determine guilt.
- **Blood feuds (Thar):** The principle of thar emphasized the importance of avenging wrongs to restore honor. Failure to do so could lead to collective punishment of the tribe.

Ancient Egypt

Possibly the earliest affirmation of the maxim of reciprocity, reflecting the ancient Egyptian goddess Ma'at, appears in the story of "The Eloquent Peasant", which dates to the Middle Kingdom (c. 2040–1650 BCE): "Now this is the command: Do to the doer to make him do." This proverb embodies the do ut des principle. A Late Period (c. 664–323 BCE) papyrus contains an early negative affirmation of the Golden Rule: "That which you hate to be done to you, do not do to another."

Ancient India

Sanskrit tradition

In Mahābhārata, the ancient epic of India, Vyasa says:

Do not to others what you do not wish done to yourself; and wish for others too what you desire and long for for yourself—this is the whole of Dharma; heed it well
—Mahabharata, Anusasana Parva 113.8

The Mahābhārata is usually dated to the period between 400 BCE and 400 CE.

Tamil tradition

In Chapter 32 in the Book of Virtue of the Tirukkural (c. 1st century BCE to 5th century CE), Valluvar says:

Do not do to others what you know has hurt yourself.
—Kural 316

Why does one hurt others knowing what it is to be hurt?
—Kural 318

Furthermore, in verse 312, Valluvar says that it is the determination or code of the spotless (virtuous) not to do evil, even in return, to those who have cherished enmity and done them evil. According to him, the proper punishment to those who have done evil is to put them to shame by showing them kindness, in return and to forget both the evil and the good done on both sides (verse 314).

Ancient Greece

The Golden Rule in its prohibitive (negative) form was a common principle in ancient Greek philosophy. Examples of the general concept include:

- "Avoid doing what you would blame others for doing." – Thales (c. 624 – c. 546 BCE)
- "What you do not want to happen to you, do not do it yourself either." – Sextus the Pythagorean. The oldest extant reference to Sextus is by Origen in the third century of the common era.
- "Ideally, no one should touch my property or tamper with it, unless I have given him some sort of permission, and, if I am sensible I shall treat the property of others with the same respect." – Plato (c. 420 – c. 347 BCE)
- "Do not do to others that which angers you when they do it to you." – Isocrates (436–338 BCE)
- "It is impossible to live a pleasant life without living wisely and well and justly, and it is impossible to live wisely and well and justly without living pleasantly." – Epicurus (341–270 BC) where "justly" refers to "an agreement made in reciprocal association ... against the infliction or suffering of harm."

Ancient Persia

The Pahlavi Texts of Zoroastrianism (c. 300 BCE – 1000 CE) were an early source for the Golden Rule: "That nature alone is good which refrains from doing to another whatsoever is not good for itself." Dadestan-I-denig, 94,5, and "Whatever is disagreeable to yourself do not do unto others." Shayast-na-Shayast 13:29.

Ancient Rome

Seneca the Younger (c. 4 BCE – 65 CE), a practitioner of Stoicism (c. 300 BCE – 200 CE), expressed a hierarchical variation of the Golden Rule in his Letter 47, an essay regarding the treatment of slaves: "Treat your inferior as you would wish your superior to treat you."

Religious context

Judaism	That which is hateful to you do not do to another; that is the entire Torah, and the rest is its interpretation. Go study. - Talmud, Shabbat 31a	Buddhism	Hurt not others in ways that you yourself would find hurtful -Udanavarga 5:18
Christianity	In everything, do to others as you would have them do unto you; for this is the law and the Prophets. - New Testament, Matthew 7:12	Jainism	In happiness and suffering, in joy and grief, we should regard all creatures as we regard our own self, and should therefore refrain from inflicting upon others such injury as would appear undesirable to us if inflicted upon ourselves. -Yogasutra
Islam	None of you truly believes until he loves for his brother what he loves for himself. - 40 Hadith 13	Confucianism	Zigong asked, "If there a single saying that one may put into practice all one's life?" The Master said, "That would be 'reciprocity': That which you do not desire, do not do to others." - The Analects of Confucius 15.24
Baha'i Faith	Lay not on any soul a load which ye would not wish to be laid upon you, and desire not for any one the things ye would not desire for yourselves. -Gleanings From the Writings of Baha'u'llah, page 128	Taoism	Regard your neighbor's gain as your own gain, and your neighbor's loss as your own loss. - Lao Tse's Treatise on the Response of the Tao
Hinduism	One should never do that to another which one regards as injurious to one's own self. This, in brief, is the rule of dharma. - Brihaspati, Mahabharata 13.113.8 (Critical edition)	Wicca	Ever mind the Rule of Three Three times your acts return to thee This lesson well, thou must learn Thou only gets what thee dost earn - The Rule of Three

According to Simon Blackburn, the Golden Rule "can be found in some form in almost every ethical tradition". A multi-faith poster showing the Golden Rule in sacred writings from 13 faith traditions (designed by Paul McKenna of Scarboro Missions, 2000) has been on permanent display at the Headquarters of the United Nations since 4 January 2002. Creating the poster "took five years of research that included consultations with experts in each of the 13 faith groups."

Abrahamic religions

Judaism

Judaism and Jewish ethics

A rule of reciprocal altruism was stated positively in a well-known Torah verse (Hebrew: וְאָהַבְתָּ לְרֵעֶךָ כָּמוֹךָ):

You shall not take vengeance or bear a grudge against your kinsfolk. Love your neighbor as yourself: I am the LORD.

—Leviticus 19:18

According to John J. Collins of Yale Divinity School, most modern scholars, with Richard Elliott Friedman as a prominent exception, view the command as applicable to fellow Israelites.

Rashi commented what constitutes revenge and grudge, using the example of two men. One man would not lend the other his ax, then the next day, the same man asks the other for his ax. If the second man should say, "I will not lend it to you, just as you did not lend to me," it constitutes revenge; if "Here it is for you; I am not like you, who did not lend me," it constitutes a grudge. Rashi concludes his commentary by quoting Rabbi Akiva on love of neighbor: "This is a fundamental [all-inclusive] principle of the Torah."

Hillel the Elder (c. 110 BCE – 10 CE) used this verse as a most important message of the Torah for his teachings. Once, he was challenged by a gentile who asked to be converted under the condition that the Torah be explained to him while he stood on one foot. Hillel accepted him as a candidate for conversion to Judaism but, drawing on Leviticus 19:18, briefed the man:

What is hateful to you, do not do to your fellow: this is the whole Torah; the rest is the explanation; go and learn.

—Babylonian Talmud

Hillel recognized brotherly love as the fundamental principle of Jewish ethics. Rabbi Akiva agreed, while Simeon ben Azzai suggested that the principle of love must have its foundation in Genesis chapter 1, which teaches that all men are the offspring of Adam, who was made in the image of God. According to Jewish rabbinic literature, the first man Adam represents the unity of mankind. This is echoed in the modern preamble of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is also taught that Adam is last in order according to the evolutionary character of God's creation:

Why was only a single specimen of man created first? To teach us that he who destroys a single soul destroys a whole world and that he who saves a single soul saves a whole world; furthermore, so no race or class may claim a nobler ancestry, saying, "Our father was born first"; and, finally, to give testimony to the greatness of the Lord, who caused the wonderful diversity of mankind to emanate from one type. And why was Adam created last of all beings? To teach him humility; for if he be overbearing, let him remember that the little fly preceded him in the order of creation.

The Jewish Publication Society's edition of Leviticus states:

Thou shalt not hate thy brother, in thy heart; thou shalt surely rebuke thy neighbour, and not bear sin because of him. Thou shalt not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I am the LORD.

This Torah verse represents one of several versions of the Golden Rule, which itself appears in various forms, positive and negative. It is the earliest written version of that concept in a positive form.

At the turn of the era, the Jewish rabbis were discussing the scope of the meaning of Leviticus 19:18 and 19:34 extensively:

The stranger who resides with you shall be to you as one of your citizens; you shall love him as yourself, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt: I the LORD am your God.
—Leviticus 19:34

Commentators interpret that this applies to foreigners (e.g. Samaritans), proselytes ('strangers who reside with you') and Jews.

On the verse, "Love your fellow as yourself", the classic commentator Rashi quotes from Torat Kohanim, an early Midrashic text regarding the famous dictum of Rabbi Akiva: "Love your fellow as yourself – Rabbi Akiva says this is a great principle of the Torah."

In 1935, Rabbi Eliezer Berkovits explained in his work "What is the Talmud?" that Leviticus 19:34 disallowed xenophobia by Jews.

Israel's postal service quoted from the previous Leviticus verse when it commemorated the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on a 1958 postage stamp.

Christianity

New Testament

The Golden Rule was proclaimed by Jesus of Nazareth during his Sermon on the Mount and described by him as the second great commandment. The common English phrasing is "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you". Various applications of the Golden Rule are stated positively numerous times in the Old Testament: "You shall not take vengeance or bear a grudge against any of your people, but you shall love your neighbor as yourself: I am the LORD." Or, in Leviticus 19:34: "The alien who resides with you shall be to you as the native-born among you; you shall love the alien as yourself, for you were aliens in the land of Egypt: I am the LORD your God." These two examples are given in the Septuagint as follows: "And thy hand shall not avenge thee; and thou shalt not be angry with the children of thy people; and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; I am the Lord." and "The stranger that comes to you shall be among you as the native, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God."

Two passages in the New Testament quote Jesus of Nazareth espousing the positive form of the Golden rule:

"In everything do to others as you would have them do to you, for this is the Law and the Prophets."
—Matthew 7:12, New Revised Standard Version, Updated Edition (NRSVUE)

Do to others as you would have them do to you.
—Luke 6:31, New Revised Standard Version, Updated Edition (NRSVUE)

A similar passage, a parallel to the Great Commandment, is to be found later in the Gospel of Luke.

An expert in the law stood up to test him [Jesus]. "Teacher," he said, "what must I do to inherit eternal life?"

He said to him, "What is written in the law? What do you read there?"

He answered, "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your strength and with all your mind and your neighbor as yourself."

*And he said to him, "You have given the right answer; do this, and you will live."
—Luke 10:25–28, New Revised Standard Version, Updated Edition (NRSVUE)*

The passage in the book of Luke then continues with Jesus answering the question, "Who is my neighbor?", by telling the parable of the Good Samaritan, which John Wesley interprets as meaning that "your neighbor" is anyone in need.

Jesus' teaching goes beyond the negative formulation of not doing what one would not like done to themselves, to the positive formulation of actively doing good to another that, if the situations were reversed, one would desire that the other would do for them. This formulation, as indicated in the parable of the Good Samaritan, emphasizes the needs for positive action that brings benefit to another, not simply restraining oneself from negative activities that hurt another.

In one passage of the New Testament, Paul the Apostle refers to the golden rule, restating Jesus' second commandment:

*For the whole law is summed up in a single commandment, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself."
—Galatians 5:14, New Revised Standard Version, Updated Edition (NRSVUE)*

St. Paul also comments on the golden rule in the Epistle to the Romans:

Owe no one anything, except to love one another, for the one who loves another has fulfilled the law.

*The commandments, "You shall not commit adultery; you shall not murder; you shall not steal; you shall not covet," and any other commandment, are summed up in this word, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself."
—Romans 13:8–9, New Revised Standard Version, Updated Edition (NRSVUE)*

Deuterocanon

The Old Testament Deuterocanonical books of Tobit and Sirach, accepted as part of the Scriptural canon by Catholic Church, Eastern Orthodoxy, and the non-Chalcedonian churches, express a negative form of the golden rule:

*And what you hate, do not do to anyone. May no evil go with you on any of your way.
—Tobit 4:15, New Revised Standard Version, Updated Edition (NRSVUE)*

*Judge your neighbor's feelings by your own, and in every matter be thoughtful.
—Sirach 31:15, New Revised Standard Version, Updated Edition (NRSVUE)*

Church Fathers

Early Christian authors wrote on the Golden Rule. The early Christian treatise the Didache included the Golden Rule in saying "in everything, do not do to another what you would not want done to you."

Clement of Alexandria, commenting on the Golden Rule in Luke 6:31, calls the concept "all embracing" for how one acts in life. Clement further pointed to the phrasing in the book of Tobit as part of the ethics between husbands and wives. Tertullian stated that the rule taught "love, respect, consolation, protection, and benefits".

While many Church Fathers framed the Golden Rule as part of Jewish and Christian Ethics, Theophilus of Antioch stated that it had universal application for all of humanity. Origen connected the Golden Rule with the law written on the hearts of Gentiles mentioned by Paul in his letter to the Romans, and had universal application to Christian and non-Christian alike.

Basil of Caesarea commented that the negative form of the Golden Rule was for avoiding evil while the positive form was for doing good.

Islam

Islamic ethics

The Arabian peninsula was said to not practice the golden rule prior to the advent of Islam. [according to whom?] However, in some instances it is clear that the pre-Islamic Arabs, did to some extent understand the Golden Rule, such as after the Battle of Autas where the companions of Mohammed refused to have intercourse with married women taken as captives before a verse allowing them to do so was revealed, they would also not take bounties/spoils of war as Antara Ibn Shaddad is quoted saying in his poetry "He who witnessed the battle informs you that I charge into combat and remain chaste at the spoils." (Showing integrity—he does not take more than is rightfully his.), which Mohammed allowed for himself, furthermore, Imru' Al-Qays (pre-Islamic poet) emphasizes similarly in his poetry, reflecting an early form of the Golden Rule.

According to Th. Emil Homerin: "Pre-Islamic Arabs regarded the survival of the tribe, as most essential and to be ensured by the ancient rite of blood vengeance." Homerin goes on to say:

Similar examples of the golden rule are found in the hadiths. The hadith recount what the prophet is claimed to have said and done, and generally Muslims regard the hadith as second to only the Qur'an as a guide to correct belief and action.

From the hadith:

A Bedouin came to the prophet, grabbed the stirrup of his camel and said: O the messenger of God! Teach me something to go to heaven with it. Prophet said: "As you would have people do to you, do to them; and what you dislike to be done to you, don't do to them. Now let the stirrup go! [This maxim is enough for you; go and act in accordance with it!]"
—Kitab al-Kafi, Volume 2, Book 1, Chapter 66:10[
(Shia source)

None of you [truly] believes until he wishes for his brother what he wishes for himself.

—An-Nawawi's Forty Hadith 13 (p. 56) (Sunni source)

Seek for mankind that of which you are desirous for yourself, that you may be a believer.
—Sukhanan-i-Muhammad (Teheran, 1938) (Shia source)

That which you want for yourself, seek for mankind.

The most righteous person is the one who consents for other people what he consents for himself, and who dislikes for them what he dislikes for himself.

Ali ibn Abi Talib (4th Caliph in Sunni Islam, and first Imam in Shia Islam) says:

O my child, make yourself the measure (for dealings) between you and others. Thus, you should desire for others what you desire for yourself and hate for others what you hate for yourself. Do not oppress as you do not like to be oppressed. Do good to others as you would like good to be done to you. Regard bad for yourself whatever you regard bad for others. Accept that (treatment) from others which you would like others to accept from you ... Do not say to others what you do not like to be said to you.

—Nahjul Balaghah, Letter 31

Muslim scholar Al-Qurtubi looked at the Golden Rule of loving one's neighbor and treating them as one wishes to be treated as having universal application to believers and unbelievers alike. Relying upon a Hadith, exeget Ibn Kathir listed those "who judge people the way they judge themselves" as people who will be among the first to be Resurrected.

Hussein bin Ali bin Awn al-Hashemi (102nd Caliph in Sunni Islam), repeated the Golden Rule in the context of the Armenian genocide, thus, in 1917, he states:

Winter is ahead of us. Refugees from the Armenian Jacobite Community will probably need warmth. Help them how you would help your brothers. Pray for these people who have been expelled from their homes and left homeless and devoid of livestock and all their property.

Mandaeism

In Mandaean scriptures, the Ginza Rabba and Mandaean Book of John contain a prohibitive form of the Golden Rule that is virtually identical to the one used by Hillel.

ia mhaïmnia u-šalmania kul d-īlauaikun snia b-habraikun la-tibdun

—Mandaic transliteration

Translation:

O you believers and perfect ones! All that is hateful to you – do not do it to your neighbours.

—Right Ginza Book 1, section 150, p. 32 (Gelbert 2011)

O you perfect and faithful ones! Everything that is hateful and detestable to you – do not do it to your neighbours. Everything that seems good to you – do it if you are capable of doing it, and support each other.

—Right Ginza Book 2, section 65, p. 51 (Gelbert 2011)

My sons! Everything that is hateful to you, do not do it to thy comrade, for in the world to which you are going, there is a judgment and a great summing up.

—Mandaean Book of John Chapter 47, section 13, pp. 117–8 (Gelbert 2017)

Bahá'í Faith

The writings of the Bahá'í Faith encourage everyone to treat others as they would treat themselves and even prefer others over oneself:

O SON OF MAN! Deny not My servant should he ask anything from thee, for his face is My face; be then abashed before Me.

—Bahá'u'lláh

Blessed is he who preferreth his brother before himself.

—Bahá'u'lláh

And if thine eyes be turned towards justice, choose thou for thy neighbour that which thou choosest for thyself.

—Bahá'u'lláh

Ascribe not to any soul that which thou wouldst not have ascribed to thee, and say not that which thou doest not.

—Bahá'u'lláh

Indian religions

Hinduism

One should never do that to another which one regards as injurious to one's own self. This, in brief, is the rule of dharma. Other behavior is due to selfish desires.

—Brihaspati, Mahabharata 13.113.8 (Critical edition)

By making dharma your main focus, treat others as you treat yourself

Also,

श्रूयतां धर्मसर्वस्वं श्रुत्वा चाप्यवधार्यताम्।
आत्मनः प्रतिकूलानि परेषां न समाचरेत्॥

If the entire Dharma can be said in a few words, then it is—that which is unfavorable to us, do not do that to others.

—Padmapuraana, shrushti 19/357–358

Buddhism

Buddhism and Buddhist ethics

Buddha (Siddhartha Gautama, c. 623–543 BCE) made the negative formulation of the golden rule one of the cornerstones of his ethics in the 6th century BCE. It occurs in many places and in many forms throughout the Tripitaka.

Comparing oneself to others in such terms as "Just as I am so are they, just as they are so am I," he should neither kill nor cause others to kill.

—Sutta Nipata 705

One who, while himself seeking happiness, oppresses with violence other beings who also desire happiness, will not attain happiness hereafter.

—Dhammapada 10. Violence

Hurt not others in ways that you yourself would find hurtful.

—Udanavarga 5:18

Putting oneself in the place of another, one should not kill nor cause another to kill.

Jainism

The Golden Rule is paramount in the Jainist philosophy and can be seen in the doctrines of ahimsa and karma. As part of the prohibition of causing any living beings to suffer, Jainism forbids inflicting upon others what is harmful to oneself.

The following line from the Acaranga Sutra sums up the philosophy of Jainism:

Nothing which breathes, which exists, which lives, or which has essence or potential of life, should be destroyed or ruled over; or subjugated, or harmed, or denied of its essence or potential. In support of this Truth, I ask you a question – "Is sorrow or pain desirable to you?" If you say "yes it is", it would be a lie. If you say, "No, It is not" you will be expressing the truth. Just as sorrow or pain is not desirable to you, so it is to all which breathe, exist, live or have any essence of life. To you and all, it is undesirable, and painful, and repugnant.

A man should wander about treating all creatures as he himself would be treated.
—Sutrakritanga, 1.11.33

In happiness and suffering, in joy and grief, we should regard all creatures as we regard our own self.

—Lord Mahavira, 24th Tirthankara

Sikhism

Precious like jewels are the minds of all. To hurt them is not at all good. If thou desirest thy Beloved, then hurt thou not anyone's heart.

—Guru Arjan Dev Ji 259, Guru Granth Sahib

Chinese religions **Confucianism**

己所不欲，勿施於人。

Translation:

What you do not wish for yourself, do not do to others.

子貢問曰：「有一言而可以終身行之者乎？」

子曰：「其恕乎！己所不欲，勿施於人。」

—Confucius, *Analects* XV.24

Translation

Zi Gong [a disciple of Confucius] asked: "Is there any one word that could guide a person throughout life?"

The Master replied: "How about 'shu' [reciprocity]: never impose on others what you would not choose for yourself?"

—tr. David Hinton (another translation is in the online Chinese Text Project)

The same idea is also presented in V.12 and VI.30 of the Analects (c. 500 BCE), which can be found in the online Chinese Text Project. The phraseology differs from the Christian version of the Golden Rule. It does not presume to do anything unto others, but merely to avoid doing what would be harmful. It does not preclude doing good deeds and taking moral positions.

In relation to the Golden Rule, Confucian philosopher Mencius said "If one acts with a vigorous effort at the law of reciprocity, when he seeks for the realization of perfect virtue, nothing can be closer than his approximation to it."

Taoism

The sage has no interest of his own, but takes the interests of the people as his own. He is kind to the kind; he is also kind to the unkind: for Virtue is kind. He is faithful to the faithful; he is also faithful to the unfaithful: for Virtue is faithful.

—Tao Te Ching, Chapter 49

Regard your neighbor's gain as your own gain, and your neighbor's loss as your own loss.
—T'ai Shang Kan Ying P'ien

Mohism

If people regarded other people's states in the same way that they regard their own, who then would incite their own state to attack that of another? For one would do for others as one would do for oneself. If people regarded other people's cities in the same way that they regard their own, who then would incite their own city to attack that of another? For one would do for others as one would do for oneself. If people regarded other people's families in the same way that they regard their own, who then would incite their own family to attack that of another? For one would do for others as one would do for oneself. And so if states and cities do not attack one another and families do not wreak havoc upon and steal from one another, would this be a harm to the world or a benefit? Of course one must say it is a benefit to the world.
—Mozi, c. 400 BCE

Mozi regarded the Golden Rule as a corollary to the cardinal virtue of impartiality, and encouraged egalitarianism and selflessness in relationships.

Gratitude

Feeling or attitude in acknowledgement of a benefit that one has received or will receive

Gratitude, thankfulness, or gratefulness is a feeling of appreciation (or similar positive response) by a recipient of another's kindness. This kindness can be gifts, help, favors, or another form of generosity to another person.

Gratitude. Statue in Palácio Nacional da Ajuda.

*The word comes from the Latin word *gratus*, which means "pleasing" or "thankful". The absence of gratitude where gratitude is expected is called *ingratitude* or *ungratefulness*.*

Gratitude has been a part of several world religions. It also has been a topic of interest to ancient, medieval, and modern philosophers.

The discipline of psychology attempts to understand the short term experience of gratitude (state gratitude), individual differences in how frequently gratitude is felt (trait gratitude), the relationship between these two, and the therapeutic benefits of gratitude.

Philosophical approaches

Gratitude is a topic of interest in the philosophical disciplines of normative ethics, applied ethics, and political philosophy, as well as in the field of moral psychology.

A. D. M. Walker suggests, contrary to views that only characterize gratitude as a kind of reciprocity, that gratitude is appropriate even toward an unintentional kindness, such as an offhand remark from a

stranger. Walker further observes that Thomas Aquinas commended gratefulness for what benefits one even when done from contempt, reluctance and regret.

Religious approaches

Filial piety in Buddhism § Repaying the debt of gratitude

Spirituality and gratitude are not dependent on each other, but studies have found that spirituality can enhance a person's ability to be grateful. Those who regularly attend religious services or engage in religious activities are more likely to have a greater sense of gratitude in all areas of life. Gratitude is prized in the Christian, Buddhist, Muslim, Jewish, Bahá'í, and Hindu traditions. Worship with gratitude to God, or a similar religious figure, is a common theme in such religions, and the concept of gratitude permeates religious texts, teachings, and traditions. It is one of the most common emotions that religions aim to evoke and maintain in followers and is regarded as a universal religious sentiment.

Jewish conceptions

Berachot — thanksgiving and praise prayers. Illustration from the Jewish Encyclopedia of Brockhaus and Efron (1906–1913).

In Judaism, gratitude is an essential part of the act of worship and every aspect of a worshipper's life. According to the Hebrew worldview, all things come from God and, due to this, gratitude is essential to the followers of Judaism.

The Hebrew Scriptures are filled with the idea of gratitude. Two examples in the Psalms are "O Lord my God, I will give thanks to you forever", and "I will give thanks to the Lord with my whole heart." Jewish prayers often incorporate gratitude, beginning with the Shema, in which the worshipper states that out of gratitude, "You shall love the Eternal, your God, with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your might." One of the crucial blessings in the central thrice-daily prayer, the Amidah, is called Modim – "We give thanks to You"; this is also the only blessing that is recited by the congregation together with the leader during their repetition of the Amidah. The concluding prayer, the Alenu, also speaks of gratitude by thanking God for the particular destiny of the Jewish people. Along with these prayers, faithful worshippers recite more than one hundred blessings, called berachot, throughout the day.

In Judaism there is also a significant emphasis on gratitude for acts of human kindness and goodness.

Christian conceptions

New Orleans: Thank you message in the grotto of Our Lady of Guadalupe Church; added by those for whom prayer or miracles were granted

Martin Luther referred to gratitude as "the basic Christian attitude" and today it is still referred to as "the heart of the gospel". Christians are encouraged to praise and give gratitude to their creator. In Christian gratitude, God is seen as the selfless giver of all good things and, because of this, gratefulness enables Christians to share a common bond, shaping all aspects of a follower's life. Gratitude in Christianity is an acknowledgement of God's generosity that inspires Christians to shape their own thoughts and actions around such[specify] ideals.

Not simply a sentimental feeling, Christian gratitude is a virtue that shapes not only emotions and thoughts, but also actions and deeds.

Jonathan Edwards wrote in his book A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections that gratitude and thankfulness toward God are among the signs of true religion. Allport (1950) suggested that mature religious intentions come from feelings of profound gratitude; Edwards (1746/1959)[claimed that the

"affection" of gratitude is one of the most accurate ways to find the presence of God in a person's life. In a small sample of Catholic nuns and priests, out of 50 emotions, love and gratitude were the most experienced emotions towards God.

Pope Francis has noted that one of the lessons generally learned in family life is learning to say "thank you" as "an expression of genuine gratitude for what we have been given".

In the Orthodox, Catholic, Lutheran, and Anglican churches, the most important rite is called the Eucharist; the name derives from the Greek word Eucharistic, meaning thanksgiving.

Islamic conceptions

The Islamic sacred text, the Quran, is filled with the idea of gratitude. Islam encourages Muslims to be grateful and to express thanks to Allah in all circumstances. Muslims commonly express their gratitude using the term "Alhamdulillah" (praise be to God), which is one of the four beloved words of Allah.

Even some verses of Quran indicates that, our main duty on this earth is to show our gratitude. For example,

*Then I (satan) will come upon them from the front and from the rear; and from their right and from their left. And You will not find most of them thankful.
—(Quran 7:17)*

In this verse satan is saying to Allah that He will not find most humans grateful toward Him after when he (satan) refused to prostrate Adam. And the term Kafir also means 'ungrateful' (toward God) with the most fundamental sense in Quran. Here are some other verses from Quran:

*Thus We (Allah) punished them because of their ungratefulness. We do not give (such a) punishment but to the ungrateful.
—(Quran 34:17)*

*We (Allah) already showed them the Way, whether they `choose to` be grateful or ungrateful.
—(Quran 76:3)*

Islamic teaching emphasizes that those who are grateful will be rewarded with more. A traditional Islamic saying is "The first who will be summoned to paradise are those who have praised God in every circumstance." The Quran also states, in Sura 14, that those who are grateful will be given more by Allah.

Many practices of Islam encourage gratitude. For example, the Pillar of Islam that calls for daily prayer encourages believers to pray to Allah five times a day in order to thank him for his goodness, and the pillar of fasting during the month of Ramadan is for the purpose of putting the believer in a state of gratitude.

Individual differences in gratitude

- *It is important to note that cultural and linguistic factors play a significant role in shaping expressions of gratitude worldwide. Much research into gratitude focuses on individual differences in gratitude and the consequences of being a more or less grateful person. Three scales have been developed to measure individual differences in gratitude, each of which assesses somewhat different conceptions. The GQ6 measures individual differences in how frequently and intensely people feel gratitude. The Appreciation Scale measures eight different aspects of gratitude:*

appreciation of people, possessions, the present moment, rituals, feelings of awe, social comparisons, existential concerns, and behavior which expresses gratitude. The GRAT assesses gratitude towards other people, gratitude towards the world in general, and a lack of resentment for what you lack. A study showed that these scales all measure the same way of approaching life; this suggests that individual differences in gratitude include all of these components.

Empirical findings

Association with well-being

Happiness and gratitude

Gratitude not only contributes to positive emotions, but it also leads to a reduction in negative emotions. People who are more grateful have higher levels of subjective well-being. Grateful people are happier, less depressed, less stressed, and more satisfied with their lives and social relationships. Gratitude may shield against depression by enhancing the encoding and recall of positive experiences. Grateful people tend to exercise greater levels of control over their environments, experience personal growth, find purpose in life, and accept themselves. They also tend to employ more constructive coping strategies when faced with life's challenges. They are more likely to seek support from other people and to reinterpret and grow from experiences, and they spend more time planning how to deal with problems. Grateful people rely less on negative coping mechanisms, such as avoidance, self-blame, or substance use. Grateful people also sleep better, because they think more positive thoughts just before going to sleep. They tend to have better relationships, as a person's gratitude can positively impact their partner's satisfaction in the relationship. Grateful people are more likely to have higher levels of happiness and lower levels of stress and depression.

Although many emotions and personality traits are important to well-being and mental health, gratitude may be especially important. A longitudinal study showed that people who were more grateful coped better with a life transition. Specifically, people who were more grateful before the transition were less stressed, less depressed, and more satisfied with their relationships three months later. Two other studies suggested that gratitude may have a unique relationship with well-being and can explain aspects of well-being that other personality traits cannot. Both studies showed that gratitude was able to explain more well-being than the Big Five and 30 of the most commonly studied personality traits.

Gratitude also has a positive impact on physical well-being. For example, in one study, teens who wrote letters expressing gratitude to other people over the course of a month were more inclined to eat healthier food. This phenomenon might be explained by the notion that when people experience gratitude, they are more motivated to reciprocate the kindness shown by others. Therefore, rather than engaging in behaviors that may undermine their own health, they feel driven to adopt healthier lifestyles as a way of acknowledging the support they have received from others. Moreover, gratitude is known to trigger positive emotions, which in turn direct individuals' attention towards optimistic possibilities in the future. As a result, people are more likely to embrace behaviors that are conducive to a better future, such as healthy eating.

People who express gratitude also demonstrate improved overall health by way of greater physical activity, better sleep, fewer health care visits, and better nutrition. Practicing gratitude may be correlated with small improvements in cardiovascular health.

Relationship to altruism

Gratitude makes people more altruistic. One study found that gratitude correlates with economic generosity. The study used an economic game, and showed increased gratitude to directly mediate increased monetary giving, and that grateful people are more likely to sacrifice individual gains for

communal profit. Another study found similar correlations between gratitude and empathy, generosity, and helpfulness towards the creation of social reciprocity, even with strangers, that is beneficial to the individuals in the short and in the middle terms.

As a motivator of behavior

Ben Franklin effect

Gratitude may reinforce future prosocial behavior in benefactors. For example, one experiment found that customers of a jewelry store who were called and thanked showed a subsequent 70% increase in purchases. In comparison, customers who were called and told about a sale showed only a 30% increase in purchases, while customers who were not called at all showed no increase in purchases. In another study, a restaurant's regular patrons gave bigger tips when servers wrote "Thank you" on their checks.

Some[who?] starkly distinguish between gratitude and indebtedness. While both emotions may occur in response to help or favors, indebtedness is said to occur when an individual subjectively perceives that they are under an obligation to provide repayment or compensation for the aid. The two emotions then lead to different actions: Indebtedness may motivate the recipient to avoid the person who helped them, whereas gratitude may motivate a recipient to seek out their benefactor and to improve their relationship with them. A study of the feelings of migrant adolescents towards their parents noted that "gratitude serves and indebtedness challenges intergenerational relations after migration". The study also noted that, "when the expectations of return from the benefactor increase, indebtedness of the beneficiary increases but gratitude decreases". Unlike compassion or sadness, gratitude decreases cigarette craving suggesting a potential role in public health reductions of appetitive risk behaviors.

Psychological interventions

A gratitude journal is a means of learning to focus on things that make one grateful, which can enhance happiness.

Several psychological interventions have been developed to increase gratitude.

For example, Watkins and colleagues had participants test a number of different gratitude exercises, such as thinking about a living person for whom they are grateful, writing about someone for whom they are grateful, and writing a letter to deliver to someone for whom they are grateful. Participants in the control group were asked to describe their living room. Participants who engaged in a gratitude exercise showed increases in their experiences of positive emotion immediately after the exercise, and this effect was strongest for participants who were asked to think about a person for whom they are grateful. Participants who had grateful personalities to begin with showed the greatest benefit from these gratitude exercises.

In another study, participants were randomly assigned to one of six therapeutic intervention conditions designed to improve the participants' overall quality of life. Of these, the biggest short-term effects came from a "gratitude visit" in which participants wrote and delivered a letter of gratitude to someone in their life. This condition showed a rise in happiness scores by 10 percent and a significant fall in depression scores, results that lasted up to one month after the visit. Of the six conditions, the longest-lasting effects were associated with writing "gratitude journals" of three things they were grateful for every day. These participants' happiness scores also increased and continued to increase each time they were tested periodically after the experiment. The greatest benefits were usually found to occur around six months after treatment began. This exercise was so successful that although participants were only asked to continue the journal for a week, many participants continued to keep the journal long after the study was over.

Similar results have been found in studies conducted by Emmons and McCullough (2003) and Lyubomirsky et al. (2005).

The Greater Good Science Center at the University of California, Berkeley, offered awards for dissertation-level research projects with the greatest potential to advance the science and practice of gratitude.

Relationship to mental health

A study on the benefits of mental health counseling divided approximately 300 college students into three groups prior to their first counseling session. The first group was instructed to write one letter of gratitude a week for three weeks, the second group was asked to write about their negative experiences, and the third group received only counseling. When compared, the first group reported better mental health after completing their writing exercises. The study suggests that practicing gratitude may help the brain react more sensitively to the experience of gratitude in the future, and therefore, may improve mental health.

Conclusions

Benevolence gladdens constantly the grateful; the ungrateful, however, but once.
—Seneca

Gratitude is not only the greatest of virtues, but the parent of all others.
—Cicero

Multiple studies have shown the positive correlation between gratitude and increased well being, not only for the person expressing gratitude, but for all people involved. The positive psychology movement embraced these studies and, in an effort to increase overall well-being, has begun to incorporate mental and emotional exercises to increase gratitude.

Art criticism

Discussion or evaluation of visual art

Art criticism is the discussion or evaluation of visual art. Art critics usually criticize art in the context of aesthetics or the theory of beauty. A goal of art criticism is the pursuit of a rational basis for art appreciation but it is questionable whether such criticism can transcend prevailing socio-political circumstances.

Monkeys as Judges of Art, 1889, Gabriel von Max

The variety of artistic movements has resulted in a division of art criticism into different disciplines which may each use different criteria for their judgements. The most common division in the field of criticism is between historical criticism and evaluation, a form of art history, and contemporary criticism of work by living artists.

Despite perceptions that art criticism is a much lower risk activity than making art, opinions of current art are always liable to drastic corrections with the passage of time. Critics of the past are often ridiculed for dismissing artists now venerated (like the early work of the Impressionists). Some art movements themselves were named disparagingly by critics, with the name later adopted as a sort of badge of honour by the artists of the style (e.g., Impressionism, Cubism), with the original negative meaning forgotten.

Artists have often had an uneasy relationship with their critics. Artists usually need positive opinions from critics for their work to be viewed and purchased; unfortunately for the artists, only later generations may understand it.

There are many different variables that determine judgment of art such as aesthetics, cognition or perception. Art is a human instinct with a diverse range of form and expression. Art can stand alone with an instantaneous judgment, or be viewed with a deeper knowledge. Aesthetic, pragmatic, expressive, formalist, relativist, processional, imitation, ritual, cognition, mimetic and postmodern theories, are some of many theories to criticize and appreciate art. Art criticism and appreciation can be subjective based on personal preference toward aesthetics and form, or it can be based on the elements and principle of design and by social and cultural acceptance.

Definition

Art criticism has many and often numerous subjective viewpoints which are nearly as varied as there are people practising it. It is difficult to come by a more stable definition than the activity being related to the discussion and interpretation of art and its value. Depending on who is writing on the subject, "art criticism" itself may be obviated as a direct goal or it may include art history within its framework. Regardless of definitional problems, art criticism can refer to the history of the craft in its essays and art history itself may use critical methods implicitly. According to art historian R. Siva Kumar, "The borders between art history and art criticism... are no more as firmly drawn as they once used to be. It perhaps began with art historians taking interest in modern art."

Methodology

Art criticism includes a descriptive aspect, where the work of art is sufficiently translated into words so as to allow a case to be made. The evaluation of a work of art that follows the description (or is interspersed with it) depends as much on the artist's output as on the experience of the critic. There is in an activity with such a marked subjective component a variety of ways in which it can be pursued. As extremes in a possible spectrum, while some favour simply remarking on the immediate impressions caused by an artistic object, others prefer a more systematic approach calling on technical knowledge, favoured aesthetic theory and the known sociocultural context the artist is immersed in to discern their intent.

History

Critiques of art likely originated with the origins of art itself, as evidenced by texts found in the works of Plato, Vitruvius or Augustine of Hippo among others, that contain early forms of art criticism. Also, wealthy patrons have employed, at least since the start of Renaissance, intermediary art-evaluators to assist them in the procurement of commissions and/or finished pieces.

Origins

Jonathan Richardson coined the term 'art criticism' in 1719.

*Art criticism as a genre of writing, obtained its modern form in the 18th century. The earliest use of the term art criticism was by the English painter Jonathan Richardson in his 1719 publication *An Essay on the Whole Art of Criticism*. In this work, he attempted to create an objective system for the ranking of works of art. Seven categories, including drawing, composition, invention and colouring, were given a score from 0 to 18, which were combined to give a final score. The term he introduced quickly caught on, especially as the English middle class began to be more discerning in their art acquisitions, as symbols of their flaunted social status.*

In France and England in the mid-1700s, public interest in art began to become widespread, and art was regularly exhibited at the Salons in Paris and the Summer Exhibitions of London. The first writers to

acquire an individual reputation as art critics in 18th-century France were Jean-Baptiste Dubos with his *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture* (1718) which garnered the acclaim of Voltaire for the sagacity of his approach to aesthetic theory; and Étienne La Font de Saint-Yenne with *Reflexions sur quelques causes de l'état présent de la peinture en France* who wrote about the Salon of 1746, commenting on the socioeconomic framework of the production of the then popular Baroque art style, which led to a perception of anti-monarchist sentiments in the text.

The 18th-century French writer Denis Diderot greatly advanced the medium of art criticism. Diderot's "The Salon of 1765" was one of the first real attempts to capture art in words. According to art historian Thomas E. Crow, "When Diderot took up art criticism it was on the heels of the first generation of professional writers who made it their business to offer descriptions and judgments of contemporary painting and sculpture. The demand for such commentary was a product of the similarly novel institution of regular, free, public exhibitions of the latest art".

Meanwhile, in England an exhibition of the Society of Arts in 1762 and later, in 1766, prompted a flurry of critical, though anonymous, pamphlets. Newspapers and periodicals of the period, such as the *London Chronicle*, began to carry columns for art criticism; a form that took off with the foundation of the Royal Academy in 1768. In the 1770s, the *Morning Chronicle* became the first newspaper to systematically review the art featured at exhibitions.

19th century

John Ruskin, the preeminent art critic of 19th century England

From the 19th century onwards, art criticism became a more common vocation and even a profession, developing at times formalised methods based on particular aesthetic theories. In France, a rift emerged in the 1820s between the proponents of traditional neo-classical forms of art and the new romantic fashion. The Neoclassicists, under Étienne-Jean Delécluze defended the classical ideal and preferred carefully finished form in paintings. Romantics, such as Stendhal, criticized the old styles as overly formulaic and devoid of any feeling. Instead, they championed the new expressive, Idealistic, and emotional nuances of Romantic art. A similar, though more muted, debate also occurred in England.

One of the prominent critics in England at the time was William Hazlitt, a painter and essayist. He wrote about his deep pleasure in art and his belief that the arts could be used to improve mankind's generosity of spirit and knowledge of the world around it. He was one of a rising tide of English critics that began to grow uneasy with the increasingly abstract direction J. M. W. Turner's landscape art was moving in.

One of the great critics of the 19th century was John Ruskin. In 1843 he published *Modern Painters*, which repeated concepts from "Landscape and Portrait-Painting" in *The Yankee* (1829) by first American art critic John Neal in its distinction between "things seen by the artist" and "things as they are." Through painstaking analysis and attention to detail, Ruskin achieved what art historian E. H. Gombrich called "the most ambitious work of scientific art criticism ever attempted." Ruskin became renowned for his rich and flowing prose, and later in life he branched out to become an active and wide-ranging critic, publishing works on architecture and Renaissance art, including *the Stones of Venice*.

Charles Baudelaire's Salon of 1845 art review shocked its audience with its ideas.

Another dominating figure in 19th-century art criticism, was the French poet Charles Baudelaire, whose first published work was his art review Salon of 1845, which attracted immediate attention for its boldness. Many of his critical opinions were novel in their time, including his championing of Eugène Delacroix. When Édouard Manet's famous *Olympia* (1865), a portrait of a nude courtesan, provoked a

scandal for its blatant realism, Baudelaire worked privately to support his friend. He claimed that "criticism should be partial, impassioned, political—that is to say, formed from an exclusive point of view, but also from a point of view that opens up the greatest number of horizons". He tried to move the debate from the old binary positions of previous decades, declaring that "the true painter, will be he who can wring from contemporary life its epic aspect and make us see and understand, with colour or in drawing, how great and poetic we are in our cravats and our polished boots".

In 1877, John Ruskin derided *Nocturne in Black and Gold – The Falling Rocket* after the artist, James McNeill Whistler, showed it at Grosvenor Gallery: "I have seen, and heard, much of Cockney impudence before now; but never expected to hear a coxcomb ask two hundred guineas for flinging a pot of paint in the public's face." This criticism provoked Whistler into suing the critic for libel. The ensuing court case proved to be a Pyrrhic victory for Whistler.

Turn of the twentieth century

Self portrait of Roger Fry, described by the art historian Kenneth Clark as "incomparably the greatest influence on taste since Ruskin... In so far as taste can be changed by one man, it was changed by Roger Fry".

Towards the end of the 19th century a movement towards abstraction, as opposed to specific content, began to gain ground in England, notably championed by the playwright Oscar Wilde. By the early twentieth century these attitudes formally coalesced into a coherent philosophy, through the work of Bloomsbury Group members Roger Fry and Clive Bell. As an art historian in the 1890s, Fry became intrigued with the new modernist art and its shift away from traditional depiction. His 1910 exhibition of what he called post-Impressionist art attracted much criticism for its iconoclasm. He vigorously defended himself in a lecture, in which he argued that art had moved to attempt to discover the language of pure imagination, rather than the staid and, to his mind, dishonest scientific capturing of landscape. Fry's argument proved to be very influential at the time, especially among the progressive elite. Virginia Woolf remarked that: "in or about December 1910 [the date Fry gave his lecture] human character changed."

Portrait painting of Clive Bell, seated wearing a suit and tie

Clive Bell by Roger Fry, 1924, oil on canvas. National Portrait Gallery, London. NPG 4967.

Independently, and at the same time, Clive Bell argued in his 1914 book *Art* that all art work has its particular 'significant form', while the conventional subject matter was essentially irrelevant. This work laid the foundations for the formalist approach to art. In 1920, Fry argued that "it's all the same to me if I represent a Christ or a saucepan since it's the form, and not the object itself, that interests me." As well as being a proponent of formalism, he argued that the value of art lies in its ability to produce a distinctive aesthetic experience in the viewer: an experience he called "aesthetic emotion". He defined it as that experience which is aroused by significant form. He also suggested that the reason we experience aesthetic emotion in response to the significant form of a work of art was that we perceive that form as an expression of an experience the artist has. The artist's experience in turn, he suggested, was the experience of seeing ordinary objects in the world as pure form: the experience one has when one sees something not as a means to something else, but as an end in itself.

Herbert Read was a champion of modern British artists such as Paul Nash, Ben Nicholson, Henry Moore and Barbara Hepworth and became associated with Nash's contemporary arts group Unit One. He focused on the modernism of Pablo Picasso and Georges Braque, and published an influential 1929 essay on the meaning of art in *The Listener*. He also edited the trend-setting *Burlington Magazine* (1933–38) and helped organise the London International Surrealist Exhibition in 1936.

Since 1945

As in the case of Baudelaire in the 19th century, the poet-as-critic phenomenon appeared once again in the 20th, when French poet Apollinaire became the champion of Cubism. Later, French writer and hero of the Resistance André Malraux wrote extensively on art, going well beyond the limits of his native Europe. His conviction that the vanguard in Latin America lay in Mexican Muralism (Orozco, Rivera and Siqueiros)[citation needed] changed after his trip to Buenos Aires in 1958. After visiting the studios of several Argentine artists in the company of the young Director of the Museum of Modern Art of Buenos Aires Rafael Squirru, Malraux declared the new vanguard to lie in Argentina's new artistic movements.[citation needed] Squirru, a poet-critic who became Cultural Director of the OAS in Washington, D.C., during the 1960s, was the last to interview Edward Hopper before his death, contributing to a revival of interest in the American artist.

In the 1940s there were not only few galleries (The Art of This Century) but also few critics who were willing to follow the work of the New York Vanguard. There were also a few artists with a literary background, among them Robert Motherwell and Barnett Newman who functioned as critics as well.

Although New York and the world were unfamiliar with the New York avant-garde, by the late 1940s most of the artists who have become household names today had their well established patron critics. Clement Greenberg advocated Abstract Expressionist and color field painters like Jackson Pollock, Clyfford Still, Mark Rothko, Barnett Newman, Adolph Gottlieb and Hans Hofmann. Harold Rosenberg seemed to prefer the action painters such as Willem de Kooning and Franz Kline. Thomas B. Hess, the managing editor of ARTnews, championed Willem de Kooning.

The new critics elevated their protégés by casting other artists as "followers" or ignoring those who did not serve their promotional goal. As an example, in 1958, Mark Tobey "became the first American painter since Whistler (1895) to win top prize at the Biennale of Venice. New York's two leading art magazines were not interested. Arts mentioned the historic event only in a news column and Art News (Managing editor: Thomas B. Hess) ignored it completely. The New York Times and Life printed feature articles".

Barnett Newman, a late member of the Uptown Group wrote catalogue forewords and reviews and by the late 1940s became an exhibiting artist at Betty Parsons Gallery. His first solo show was in 1948. Soon after his first exhibition, Barnett Newman remarked in one of the Artists' Session at Studio 35: "We are in the process of making the world, to a certain extent, in our own image". Utilizing his writing skills, Newman fought every step of the way to reinforce his newly established image as an artist and to promote his work. An example is his letter to Sidney Janis on 9 April 1955:

It is true that Rothko talks the fighter. He fights, however, to submit to the philistine world. My struggle against bourgeois society has involved the total rejection of it.

The person thought to have had most to do with the promotion of this style was a New York Trotskyist, Clement Greenberg. As long time art critic for the Partisan Review and The Nation, he became an early and literate proponent of Abstract Expressionism. Artist Robert Motherwell, well-heeled, joined Greenberg in promoting a style that fit the political climate and the intellectual rebelliousness of the era.

Clement Greenberg proclaimed Abstract Expressionism and Jackson Pollock in particular as the epitome of aesthetic value. Greenberg supported Pollock's work on formalistic grounds as simply the best painting of its day and the culmination of an art tradition going back via Cubism and Cézanne to Monet, in which painting became ever "purer" and more concentrated in what was "essential" to it, the making of marks on a flat surface.

Jackson Pollock's work has always polarised critics. Harold Rosenberg spoke of the transformation of painting into an existential drama in Pollock's work, in which "what was to go on the canvas was not a

picture but an event". "The big moment came when it was decided to paint 'just to paint'. The gesture on the canvas was a gesture of liberation from value—political, aesthetic, moral."

One of the most vocal critics of Abstract Expressionism at the time was New York Times art critic John Canaday. Meyer Schapiro and Leo Steinberg were also important postwar art historians who voiced support for Abstract Expressionism. During the early to mid sixties younger art critics Michael Fried, Rosalind Krauss and Robert Hughes added considerable insights into the critical dialectic that continues to grow around Abstract Expressionism.

Feminist art criticism

Feminist art criticism emerged in the 1970s from the wider feminist movement as the critical examination of both visual representations of women in art and art produced by women.

Today

Art critics today work not only in print media and in specialist art magazines as well as newspapers. Art critics appear also on the internet, TV, and radio, as well as in museums and galleries. Many are also employed in universities or as art educators for museums. Art critics curate exhibitions and are frequently employed to write exhibition catalogues. Art critics have their own organisation, the International Association of Art Critics, which is affiliated with UNESCO and has around 76 national sections and a politically non-aligned section for refugees and exiles.

Art blogs

Since the early 21st century, online art critical websites and art blogs have cropped up around the world to add their voices to the art world.[84][85] Many of these writers use social media resources like Facebook, Twitter, Tumblr and Google+ to introduce readers to their opinions about art criticism.

Related Extensions

1. Art history
2. Art critic
3. Documenta 12 magazines (contemporary examples of art criticism)

