about them and vary between different societies and periods, it is soon apparent, by the character of any further definition, or by the kind of response to a request for it, whether values and standards are true plurals, grouping a number of specific positions and judgments, or plural singulars, in which a generalizing version of the essence of a civilization or a university is being projected as if it were a specific grouping of certain defined valuations and standardizations. It is very significant that the popular use of standards - laudatory - is at odds with a popular use of standardization - derogatory. Standardization came into use in 1C19, from science (standardizing the conditions of an experiment) and then industry (standardizing parts). It is not controversial in these uses, but in its application to matters of mind and experience it has been widely resisted - 'people can't be standardized', 'teaching mustn't be standardized' - by, among others, those who insist on the 'maintenance of standards'. This odd usage probably depends on exploiting the range of senses from Royal Standard (respectful) to standard foot (all right in its place but here inappropriate). The power of the plural singular always depends on its not being spotted as a singular. If it is not spotted, it can be used to override necessary arguments or to appropriate the very process of valuation and definition to its own particular conclusions.

A further note is necessary on the phrase standard of living. This is now common but sometimes difficult. Its earliest form, from mC19, was standard of life, and this is still often used interchangeably. Yet as we realize when we think about standard, the term seems to imply a defined level or a necessary level, rather than, as in its now common use, a general condition or an averaged condition. It was first used in the strict sense of standard: standard of life meant the necessary level of income and conditions to maintain life ment. There has been controversy whether a standard of life or living can really be measured, while at the same time statistics of income, consumption, and so on have been used to define it. Standard Past, we might say, has been replaced by Standard Present. But there is also a use which draws on another sense of standard: not the agreed measure but, metaphorically, the flag: the standard we set ourselves; proper standards of health care; a proper standard of living. This is Standard Future: the old measures, or the existing grades, are inadequate, and we will aim at something better. It is a very interesting use. Instead of referring back to a source of authority, or taking a current measurable state, a standard is set, projected, from ideas about conditions which we have not yet realized but which we think should be realized. There is an active social history in this development of the phrase.

See DIALECT, TASTE, WESTERN

STATUS

Status has become a significant word in C20. It was taken directly into English from status , L - condition, which had earlier led to state and estate . It is still often used in specific Latin formations such as status quo . It had legal uses from C18, to define 'rights, duties, capacities or incapacities' (1832) and has survived in this sense (cf. marital status). Its extension to a more general social sense came from this kind of use: 'status as free or slave' (1865); 'legal status of negroes' (1888); 'civil status of actors' (1904). There was evident extension in Mill's 'status of a day-labourer' (1848) and perhaps in 'professional status' (1883), where general rather than legal condition was implied. Thus far the word is not difficult.

It became difficult from its use in a new general sense in some modern sociology, where it is frequently offered, as a more precise and measurable term, in preference to CLASS (q.v.). It is impossible to clarify this without reference to the three main social senses of class , as group, rank and formation. Clearly status has no clear use in the senses either of group or of formation, and its real significance is that

it is a new and modernizing term for rank (losing the inherited and formal associations of that term). It can thus be substituted for *class* in only this one of its senses. But the substitution is significant, in that this sense is chosen. The use is often traced to Max Weber, and to his critique of Marx's notion of *class*. But this is a confusion. Weber's word *Stand,* often now translated as **status,** could more properly be translated as *Estate* or *Order* , with reference to and effect from traditional legal definitions of *rank*. This sense can be extended to a social group which has motivations other than the strictly economic factors of *class* in Marx's main sense: motivations such as social beliefs and ideals proper to the group, or to a distinct social condition. In more recent sociology this important social observation has been transferred to the abstract sense of a generalized rank order: 'social status . . . the position occupied by a person, family, or kinship group in a social system relative to others . . . Social status has a hierarchical distribution in which a few persons occupy the highest positions . . .' (*A Dictionary of Sociology;*
G. D. Mitchell, 1968). An extraordinary technical sophistication has been brought to the elaboration of this competitive and hierarchical model of society. **Status** is a 'continuous variable' but with observable 'clusters'; these are its advantages, as a term of measurement, over *class* as rank, with its overtones of definite group or formation. They are also its disadvantages, since the term inherits (from its traditional associations) elements of respect and self-respect, which are bound to confuse the apparently objective process of **status-determination.** Where *rank* had titles and ribbons, **status** has *symbols*. But it is characteristic that these can be not only displayed but acquired: the objective or pseudo-objective signs are then confused with the subjective or merely pretentious emphases. It is especially significant that the language of **status,** in this specialized but now common sense, turns out to be the language of *class* in a deliberately reduced sense (*rank*). This has the double advantage, of appearing to cancel *class* in the sense of formation or even of broad group, and of providing a model of society which is not only hierarchical and individually competitive but is essentially defined in terms of consumption and display (see
CONSUMER). Thus one 'continuous scale of social status' has been based on 'the style of life reflected in the main living room of the home', which is certainly a matter of interest but which has reduced *society* to this series of units interpreted in terms of private possessions. As the units are grouped into **status-groups** or even a **status system,** the 'life' style which is being measured is life as defined by market-research, whether as goods and services or as 'public opinion'. What was once a term of legal condition or general condition (and which in its earlier adoption, in *estate*, had indicated effective social formations) is then, in its conventional modern use,
an operational term for the reduction of all social questions to the terms of a mobile consumer society.

See CLASS, CONSUMER, SOCIETY

STRUCTURAL

Structure, with its associated words, is a key term in modern thought, and in many of its recent developments it is especially complex. The word is from fw *structurc* , F, *structura* , L, rw *struere* , L - build. In its earUest English uses, from C15, **structure** was primarily a noun of process: the action of building. The word was notably developed in C17, in two main directions: (i) towards the whole product of building, as still in 'a wooden structure'; (ii) towards the manner of construction, not only in buildings but in extended and figurative applications. Most modern developments follow from (ii), but there is a persistent ambiguity in the relations between these and what are really extended and figurative applications of (i).

The particular sense that became important as an aspect of (ii) is that of 'the mutual relation of constituent parts or elements of a whole as defining its particular nature'. This is clearly an extension of the sense of a method of building, but it is characteristic that it carries a strong sense of *internal* structure,
even while **structure** is still important to describe the whole construction. The earliest specialized uses were in anatomy - 'structure of the Hand' (eC17) -and the word remained important in the general development of biology, often with a distinction *from function* (*fv, functionem*, L, rw *fungi* - perform), where observation of the (proper) *functioning* of an organ could be distinguished from observation of the **structure**