

# SOME SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SITUATIONS RELATED TO CHANGE IN ATTITUDE<sup>1</sup>

JEANNE WATSON

One of the major problems facing social scientists today is that of the formation and change of social attitudes. What is the most meaningful way to use the concept of attitude? What is meant by "change," and how does it occur? What are the social and psychological situations in which changes of attitude take place?

As an exploratory investigation in this area, non-directive interviews were conducted with forty-five residents of

New York City who reported that at some time in their lives a change had occurred in their attitude toward Jews or Negroes. An attempt was made to explore the relevant social and psychological factors operating before, during, and after the subjectively recognized change, and to develop hypotheses about the dynamics of change. This paper is a report of the study, with special emphasis on the hypotheses which developed from it.

## DEFINING THE PROBLEM

As a first approach to the definition of attitude, we shall accept G. W. Allport's (2) classical statement that 'An attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related.'

This concept of attitude as a persistent and underlying state of readiness is to be distinguished from that of opinion, or the individual's verbal report of his attitude. Faris (25) has pointed out that, 'It is only in those relatively infrequent moments when we are caught "off our guard" that attitudes and statements of opinion correspond.'

In a non-directive interview such unguarded moments occur fairly frequently. A tone of voice, a descriptive phrase, or an unguarded adjective all give the skilful interviewer clues to the underlying attitude of the respondent. Reports of behavior in situations involving members of the minority group provide additional evidence as to the attitude of the respondent. These two types of evidence, plus direct statements of opinion, were used in this study as a basis for determining the respondent's attitude.

Having agreed that an attitude influences 'the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related,' we may proceed to ask,

<sup>1</sup> This study was made possible by a grant from the Commission on Community Interrelations of the American Jewish Congress. Goodwin Watson gave valuable assistance in the original planning of the study.

what is meant by response? It is immediately clear that response can mean at least two things: what the person *sees*, and what he *does*. Thus, two perceptions are involved in a response: the perception of what is "out there", i.e., the perception of object characteristics; and the perception of some form of behavior as appropriate for this particular situation. Since each perception is influenced by the attitude, we must distinguish at least the two corresponding aspects of an attitude: the cognitive aspect (object characteristics) and the behavioral aspect (appropriate behavior).

Much of the work on measuring and changing intergroup attitudes has been concerned with the perception of object characteristics, i.e., with the cognitive aspect of the attitude. Many attitude tests consist primarily of statements attributing various stereotyped characteristics to different minority groups, and the attitude is defined in terms of the statements which the individual will accept. Correspondingly, "education" for better intergroup relations often consists of the presentation of arguments or research findings on group differences as an attempt to dislodge stereotypes about the "nature" of various groups.

A second approach to the study of intergroup attitudes, however, asks not what the minority group member is like, but how one should behave toward and with him. The Bogardus Social Distance Scale or the Hartley "Show Me" tests demonstrate the application of this approach to attitude measurement. The assumption implicit in these tests and in the theoretical analysis of this paper is that the subject consistently perceives a certain kind of relationship to be the appropriate one between himself and members of the minority group; that situations can be

ordered in terms of the demands of this relationship; and that this perceived relationship prepares one for certain kinds of behavior. It is this manner of defining the behavioral relationships between oneself and minority group members which has been designated the behavioral aspect of the attitude.

Perhaps the clearest conceptual approach to this point is to think of an attitudinal field, including both the individual who holds the attitude and the objects and situations with which the attitude is related. This notion has several implications. Behavior becomes not a single stereotyped response, but rather a process of dynamic interaction between the individual and the minority group member. In each new social situation we will expect a somewhat different resultant of forces. But the most important point is that a constant attitude implies a constant set of possible ways of behaving, from which is selected the one appropriate for a particular situation. These constant possible ways of behaving, plus the corresponding possible ways of perceiving, constitute the *structure* of the attitudinal field.

For example, the individual may feel that minority group members are his equals and should always be treated as such; or that minority group members are dangerous and should be avoided or attacked whenever possible. He may feel that minority group members are inferior and conclude that they should be given tolerance as long as they keep their place; or he may conclude that it is his duty to work actively to improve their lot in life. Each of these attitudes requires certain behaviors on the part of the individual; but both the attitude and the behaviors will be invoked only if the minority group member, in turn, is perceived to behave according to expectations.

*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

The behavioral aspect of an attitude may be considered as the resultant of several other forces. In part it is dependent on cognition, i.e., on the perceived characteristics of the attitudinal object. In part it is a matter of affect toward the object. And in part it reflects the basic personality needs of the individual. For example, the person with a great deal of hostility or guilt may react by scapegoating; the person who is happy and secure is likely to be more acceptant. It is neither necessary nor possible at this point, however, to explore the origins of the behavioral aspect of an attitude in detail.

With these conceptions in mind, how are we to conceive of changes in attitude? Attitude has been defined as a readiness to respond to attitudinal objects; similarly, the structure of the attitudinal field has been said to define the ways of perceiving and behaving which are possible for the individual. Change must mean a reorganization of the relationships among the objects in the attitudinal field, so that old possibilities of response are eliminated and new ones substituted. This will not occur in cases where existing field structure persists, with only slight elaborations in detail. Change must involve a restructuring of the attitudinal field; it must be a *structural* change.

Structural change will usually involve both the cognitive and the behavioral aspects of an attitude. Sometimes the behavioral aspect alone may change, as when the same perceived inferiority becomes a reason for helping instead of persecuting a minority group. In cases where only the cognitive aspect changes, however, and where the "new" perception is so much like the old that it makes no difference in behavior, it seems impossible to speak of structural change. Here it seems to be a case of modification of detail, without any

change in structure. Such change would be exemplified by the person who learns that Negroes are good entertainers, but who doesn't see any way in which this fact should affect his behavior toward Negroes. It seems probable that many of the changes in attitude which are reported in the literature to have occurred after exposure to various types of propaganda were not structural changes, but there is of course no way of knowing.

Attitudes of non-Jews toward Jews and of whites toward Negroes were chosen as the object of the study for several reasons. These attitudes had already been well studied, providing a wealth of material from which to formulate hypotheses. Also, they were well enough defined for the average person so that he could talk about them relatively easily. It was important that the attitudes studied be of a controversial nature, both so that there would be a wide range of opinion with relatively frequent cases of change, and so that persons whose attitudes had changed would recognize the change and be willing to talk about it.

It should be noted that attitudes toward Jews and Negroes in New York City represent two major aspects of outgroup attitudes in America today. On the one hand, there is the attitude toward a relatively large minority group which is the focus for local intergroup conflict and tension, and which is appreciably in evidence. In New York this is the Jewish group; in the South it might be the Negroes, and in other parts of the country it might be the Mexicans or the Japanese-Americans. On the other hand, there is the more casual attitude toward a minority group which presents no immediate threat to the *status quo*, and which can be more easily tolerated, e.g., in New York, the Negroes. Together, these attitudes

represent a large part of the more inclusive area of majority group atti-

tudes toward minority group members in America.

### METHODS USED

**The Interview.** It was felt that an open-end interview was the most suitable instrument for obtaining information about the dynamics of change. Each interviewer was equipped with a copy of the questionnaire (Appendix I), but the questions were used very freely. The general approach in the interview situation was to get the respondent to report how he had changed, and then, with the use of non-directive probes, to get as much information from him as possible about what had occurred before, during, and after the time of the change. Most of the interview was organized around the respondent's report, and not around any pre-conceived list of questions. It was the responsibility of the interviewer to have the general points of the questionnaire well enough in mind, so that he could probe for additional information at the relevant points, without referring to the formal questionnaire. Finally, when the respondent had finished his report, the interviewer filled in the gaps by asking any specific questions not previously answered.

Complete written notes were taken during the interview, and a verbatim report of the entire conversation was written up as soon afterward as possible. The interviews were then organized in summary form, and analyzed.

**The Sample.** The bulk of the sample was obtained from mailing a ballot to 2,500 names chosen at random from the Queens Borough telephone directory. Queens was chosen because of its

suburban character and because of the relatively low proportions of Jewish and Negro residents.<sup>2</sup> A copy of the ballot which was sent out is included in Appendix II. The main purpose of the mailing was to supply names of people whose attitudes toward Jews or Negroes had changed, and to provide some indication of how these people felt at the present time. The ballot therefore opened with two questions offering a choice of judgments of Jews and Negroes respectively; continued with questions asking, 'Has your feeling about Jews (Negroes) changed at some time during your life?'; and ended with a request for an interview and for a name and address.

People having telephones listed in Queens, of course, represent a highly select sample. In order to decrease the resulting bias, two ballots were included in each of the letters, with the instructions that, 'If there is anyone in your family whose feelings about Jews or Negroes have definitely changed, please ask him or her to fill out the extra ballot and send it in with yours.'

Of the 2,500 letters sent out, 363 (14.5%) produced returns. There were 97 cases in which both ballots were returned, yielding a total of 460 returned ballots. Of these 460 people, 29% stated that they had changed their opinions of Jews, and the same number that they had changed their opinions of Negroes. There is some overlap in these groups, so that altogether just 188 people, or 41%, reported change toward one or both groups.

<sup>2</sup> We were particularly interested in the attitudes of the majority group, and so wished to avoid Negro and Jewish respondents in so far as possible. The attitudes of Jews or Negroes toward members of their own groups represent an entirely different problem from the one we were studying.

*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

**TABLE 1**

**Change Reported in Ballots Returned from Queens**

\* Has your feeling about Jews (Negroes) changed at some time during your life?

	<i>No Change</i>	<i>Little Change</i>	<i>Much more Favorable</i>	<i>Much more Against</i>	<i>Not ascer- trained</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>
Jews	42%	25%	13%	16%	4%	100%
Negroes ...	47	20	21	8	4	100
N=460						

Most of the ballots were not signed, or in a few cases they were signed but an interview was refused. As a result, we were able to interview only 33 out of the 188 people who reported that they had changed. This is eighteen percent of those who reported having changed, seven percent of those who returned ballots, and only one percent of those to whom ballots were sent. Such a small return is hardly satisfactory. Among other things, it means that it is impossible to tell what population the sample represents.

To get a larger number of people in our study, twelve additional interviews were obtained from other sources. Two questions asking briefly about change in attitudes toward Jews or Negroes were included in the questionnaire of a contemporaneous study by Geshart Saenger.<sup>3</sup>

Five of the respondents from this study whose attitudes had changed were later re-interviewed by us. Another seven interviews were obtained with people who were personally acquainted with the interviewers. The total number of interviews represented in the study is thus 45.

**Sample Bias.** In addition to the undetermined biases resulting from poor sampling controls, there are a number

of biases present in the final sample which can be explicitly recognized:

- (1) Geographical bias, resulting from limitation of the sample to New York City, and primarily to Queens.
- (2) Socio-economic bias. Telephone owners and graduate students represent the higher socio-economic levels.
- (3) Religious bias. (See Table 2). The sample includes too many Jews and too few Catholics, when compared to the best available estimates of religious groups in New York City.
- (4) Age bias. (See Table 2). There are too many young people and too few old people.
- (5) Attitude bias, resulting from self-selection of respondents.

The effect of self-selection of respondents is of course undetermined. The respondent had to decide (i) whether or not to answer the mail questionnaire; (ii) whether or not his attitude had changed; (iii) whether or not he would let a stranger come to interview him. The 33 people out of 2,500 who decided that the answer to all these questions was "yes" must indeed have been a select group!

One result of the self-selection was advantageous. Inspection of 326 inter-

<sup>3</sup> Saenger, Gerhart, "The Influence of Discrimination on Minority Group Members in its Relation to Attempts to Combat Discrimination." *Journal of Psychology*, 1949, Vol. 28, No. 2.

*Jeanne Watson*

views from Saegner's study yielded a total of 54 persons (17%) who reported that their attitudes had changed; in our study, 41% reported some change of attitude. Self selection, then, was partly in the direction of eliminating people whose attitudes had never changed.

**TABLE 2**  
**Social Characteristics of the Interview Sample and of the New York City Population**

				<i>Interview Sample</i>	<i>New York City Population</i>
<i>Sex</i>					
Male	...	...		60%	50% <sup>1</sup>
Female	...	...		40	50
				100%	100%
<i>Religion</i>					
Jewish	...	...		22%	8.7% <sup>2</sup>
Catholic	...	...		13	24.0 <sup>3</sup>
Other	...	...		65	67.3
				100%	100%
<i>Race</i>					
White	...	...		96%	94% <sup>1</sup>
Other	...	...		4	6
				100%	100%
<i>Age</i>					
20—29	...	...		35%	25% <sup>1</sup>
30—39	...	...		33	25
40—49	...	...		16	22
50 and over	...	...		16	28
				100%	100%

<sup>1</sup> Figures taken from the 1940 United States Census.

<sup>2</sup> Census of Congregations, 1937, as reported by the librarian of the American Jewish Committee. Includes only Jewish church members.

<sup>3</sup> Census of Congregations, 1936, as reported by the New York Public Library. Includes Roman Catholic Church members only.

Comparison of the 460 ballots returned with the final sample interviewed (Tables 1 and 3) indicates some tendency for people who changed in a negative direction to refuse an interview.

Forty-one percent of the changes reported in the ballots were in a negative direction; only 31% of the people interviewed changed in a negative direction.

*Some Social and Psychological Situations related to Change in Attitude*

**TABLE 3**

**Change Reported by People Interviewed**

			<i>Favorable</i>	<i>Unfavorable</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>
Jews	...	...	10	9	19
Negroes	...	...	19	4	23
Both	...	...	2	1	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	...	...	<u>31</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>45</u>

Closely related to the sampling bias from self-selection of respondents is the reporting error due to *ex post facto* reporting. Both the memory and the verbal report of what change occurred are subject to error. This cannot be helped. However, it is important to emphasise that the respondent's interpretations of why and how much he changed were used as evidence along with his other statements about what happened at the same time, and were at no point considered as supplying the total answer. We formed our own conclusions about what had happened and why, and these might or might not be in agreement with those of the respondent.

It is also probable that the questioning of the interviewer helped to produce accurate results. Questions about such things as change in residence or occupation, experience with minority group members before and after the change, etc., refer to points lying in the realm of objective fact for the respon-

dent. He may not see that they apply to the change which he experienced, but he will tend to give accurate information about them when questioned.

A final danger in interpretation of our results arises from the fact that there was no control group. We may find that certain experiences have been associated with changes in attitude, but we cannot report on the people who apparently had the same experiences, but did not change.

In summary, then, we can make no claim to a representative sample nor to strict methodological controls. Quantitative relationships and frequencies cannot be extended to any larger population. Hence there has been no statistical treatment of the data. All tables relating to the group interviewed present raw figures only. It does seem likely, however, that the qualitative relationships observed here may be typical of a larger population, and that it is in the area of dynamics of change that this study will be most meaningful.

### CLASSIFICATION OF DATA

One of the most difficult problems in the relatively unexplored field of the dynamics of change is to know how to classify the material available. Since the manner of classification greatly affects the results obtained, I shall

discuss this before proceeding to treatment of specific findings.

#### 1. The Change Process

Careful study of the interviews indicated that there was a rather

consistent change process appearing in each case. It consists of four stages.

(a) First there is a change in the social-psychological environment of the individual, so that his previous patterns of adjustment become unsuitable. He enters a new group by joining the army, going to college, or getting a new job; he moves to a new geographical locality; he experiences some change in social or economic status; or he experiences some change in the level of emotional satisfaction. Whatever the experience, it creates the need for some sort of change in habitual attitudes and behavior. I have therefore called it the *predisposing experience*.

(b) As a result of the predisposing experience, there is a more or less *general re-structuring of social attitudes* to meet the total new social situation. This is the *specific pattern of change*; it may be considered as a cross-sectional stage of the longitudinal change process.

The extent of the pattern of change necessary to achieve a new state of equilibrium depends on the degree to which the previous adjustment has been upset. Sometimes the attitude toward minority groups is the only one challenged, and the change reported can be called an isolated one. Sometimes, however, a more general change occurs. These more general patterns of change can be classified in at least three groups.

First there is a general pattern of increased social-economic-political liberalism. In this case, if a more favorable attitude is adopted toward minority groups, it is because it is the liberal thing to do.

Secondly, there may be a change in general religious outlook, and with it, a change in attitudes toward other groups of people.

Thirdly, there is a pattern of change involving a reorganized personal adjust-

ment. In this case it is not so much that the individual sees the world differently, as above, but rather that he sees himself differently. This may be the result of a period of intense intellectual questioning and self criticism, or the result of a changed way of living—i.e., a sharp break from home, a marked change in socio-economic status, or marriage.

Other patterns of change undoubtedly exist, but were not reported in the sample. Patterns of negative change, in particular, are lacking. Only one person whose attitude had changed in a negative direction reported any other accompanying changes; in her case, there was a personal reorganization.

(c) Whatever the extent of the change, there is always some experience which calls attention directly to the inadequacy of the existing attitude toward minority groups. This specific stimulus I have called the *precipitating experience*. This is most often some unexpected or intense contact with individual members of the minority group. Sometimes, however, change occurs even when there is no personal contact. Contact with discrimination can serve as a stimulus, particularly if it is the beginning or end of discrimination against oneself. Or sometimes discussion of the problem on a verbal and intellectual level may serve as sufficient stimulus to change.

(d) Finally, after the initial change, there may be further experiences which act as *reinforcement* for the new attitude. The most common kinds of reinforcement include further contact with minority group members on the same basis as during the change; approval and agreement from individuals having high prestige; reading and other means of obtaining information; and taking action in support of the new attitude.

The conceptualization of the change process outlined here, like all the conclusions in this paper, must be



### *Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

regarded as highly tentative. The small and non-representative sample will not support any dogmatic assertions of fact. Hence, all generalizations for which there is evidence in the data will be stated as hypotheses which may be tested by further study. The conceptualization of the change process provides us with the first such hypothesis.

#### *Hypothesis 1*

Re-structuring of a social attitude occurs in the following stages: (i) a predisposition to change; (ii) a more or less generalized change in which (iii) attention is directed to the inadequacy of the particular attitude and it is changed accordingly; (iv) reinforcement of the new attitude.

#### **2. Object of Change**

Each person was classified as having changed his attitude toward Negroes, Jews, or both. Negroes and Jews were included in the sample only if they reported change toward the other minority group.

#### **3. Direction of Change**

Three categories were used in the classification of direction of change: "Favorable Change," or change from a neutral or unfavorable attitude to a favorable one; "Unfavorable change," or change from a neutral or positive attitude to an unfavorable one; and "Unfavorable reinforcement," or intensification of an already unfavorable attitude. Since there was only one case that might have been classified as "Favorable reinforcement," this category was not used.

#### **4. Kind of Change**

Respondents were classified in four groups in an attempt to specify whether or not there had been any structural change, and if so, to what extent. The experimenter made the classification after reading the interview, by asking

himself this question: How would the respondent have felt, before the change, about behaving toward minority groups in the manner which he now considers most appropriate?

(a) The "Reversal" group includes people for whom present behavior would have been inappropriate and contrary to their beliefs.

(b) The "creation of new attitude" group includes people for whom present behavior would not have been either condemned or praised because it would never have been considered.

(c) The "Modification" group includes those for whom present behavior would have been in the right direction but too extreme, and those for whom present behavior is mixed, with parts of it in accordance with earlier beliefs and parts not.

(d) The "No Structural Change" group includes people whose present behavior is not noticeably different from behavior before the "change" but who reported change which could be classified as modification of the cognitive aspect of the attitude.

#### **5. Nature of Present Attitude**

We have assumed thus far that every person has a definite attitude, and also therefore, a clear frame of reference. This is not in fact the case. There are a number of people who cannot answer a question concerning their attitude except by describing a number of specific and contradictory experiences they have had with minority group members. It is as if they started to generalize from each of these contradictory experiences, found that the resulting generalizations would be contradictory, and now refuse to verbalize any generalizations at all. They cannot adopt any one frame of reference, nor associate themselves with any one attitude. They can produce only an

unintegrated, admittedly self-contradictory listing of experiences. I have classified the attitudes of these people as non-integrated.

Among the people whose attitudes were integrated, there was a noticeable difference in the intensity with which the attitude was held. Some people had been active in programs to improve intergroup relations or had actively promoted practices of discrimination; they had made an effort to find out more about the problem; they had tried to know or avoid minority group members, etc. The attitude which they reported had resulted in observable non-verbal behavior and in some cases had been of central importance in the over-all organization of life activities. For other people, there was no indication that they had ever thought about the problem except when some one asked them questions. The difference could be described in terms of intensity; of ego-involvement; of affective content; of whether the attitude was active or inactive, salient or dormant. Perhaps the two most useful terms are salient and inactive, which are to be regarded as the two extremes of a single continuum.

There are thus three categories for classification of the nature of the present attitude: Non-integrated; Integrated and Salient; Integrated and Inactive.

#### **6. Childhood Training**

In an effort to get at some of the long-range influences affecting attitudes toward minority groups, several questions about childhood experiences

were included in the interview schedule. The material obtained proved to be not only sketchy, but also inconclusive. Even when the answers were reasonably complete, they could be related neither to the kind of change which occurred nor to the final attitude. The results of these questions are therefore not reported here.

#### **7. Related Socio-psychological attitudes**

A series of questions taken in part from the Frenkel-Brunswick questionnaire and in part from the study by Allport and Kramer was mimeographed and mailed or given to each respondent, to be returned to us by mail. (Appendix III). The object was to study the personality attributes of the individual as revealed on this "public opinion ballot" and relate these to his present attitude. Our hypothesis was that the same relationship between personality and attitude would be found among these people whose attitudes had changed as that which previous investigators had found among people in general. If true, this could mean either that the earlier attitude had been inconsistent with deeper personality attributes, so that the change of attitude had increased consistency, or that the attitude and the personality had both been modified in the same direction during the period of change. In any case, it would support the supposition that social attitudes are closely related to deeper-lying personality characteristics.

Let us now examine our findings in terms of the four stages of the change process outlined above.

### **THE PREDISPOSING EXPERIENCE**

All but three of the forty-five people in the sample reported some predisposing experience, i.e., some experience which preceded the change and seemed

to have some relevance to it. Many people reported more than one such experience. (A total of eighty was reported by the forty-five respondents.)

*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

We may therefore advance the following hypothesis with considerable confidence.<sup>4</sup>

*Hypothesis 2*

Re-structuring of a social attitude must be preceded by some change in the socio-psychological environment of the individual.

Association with a new institu-

tionalized group. The most frequently reported type of pre-disposing experience was that of the young person who went forth from home to his first job, to college, or into the armed services. Twenty-two people reported some such predisposition. Thus, about half of the forty-five people and about one fourth of the eighty pre-disposing experiences fall under this heading. (Table 4).

**TABLE 4**  
**Pre-disposing Experiences Reported in the Study**

Move to adult, institutionalized group	...	22
First Job	...	7
College	...	7
Job and College	...	2
Armed Services	...	6
Geographical change of residence	...	18
To New York	...	12
Other	...	6
Change in status	...	12
Acceptance by majority group	...	3
Rejection by majority group	...	4
Improved financial status	...	2
Lowered financial status	...	2
Retirement	...	1
Change in emotional satisfaction	...	10
Greater unhappiness; unhappy experience	...	7
Greater happiness	...	3
Prestige	...	9
Rebellion	...	5
Religious change	...	4
		80
<i>Number of People</i>		
Reported some predisposing experience		42
Reported no predisposing experience	...	3
		45

<sup>4</sup>The three people who report no predisposing experience do not really contradict this hypothesis. One of them was 35 years old and could not recall the circumstances preceding a change which took place when she was in high school. A second reported conflict of attitudes experienced after attending a party in Harlem. In her case the change has not been assimilated and remains incomplete. The third was a man who was impressed by the good work of Negro troops in the war, but whose behavior had not been changed. This latter example is one of a cognitive change without a structural change.

An experience of this kind includes both a moving *toward* and a moving *away from*. College, the army, and even most job situations may be described as institutionalized groups which have high prestige for the individual, and which he is entering for the first time. The institutional group has certain *mores* which he must accept if he is to become an accepted member; and if these *mores* differ from his previous habits of thought and action, it is expected and demanded that he change. At the same time, the individual is breaking away from home, trying to establish a new and adult role for himself. There is some rebellion from family control, and unusual readiness to reject the old and claim the new. He is peculiarly susceptible to the influences of new groups.

Of the twenty-two people who

changed at this point of breaking away from adolescence and entering a new adult world, twenty changed in a favorable direction. (Table 5). Correspondingly, every one of the people who reported some predisposition and who acquired a generally more liberal outlook did so at this time. (Table 6). It appears that at this point in the life of an individual he is either particularly sensitive to liberalizing forces, or else particularly exposed to them.

### Hypothesis 3

The time when a young person first enters a new and "adult" world as an independent person is a particularly favourable time for the growth of liberal ideas.

There are no other generalizations which can be made about the group as a whole. However, there is some

TABLE 5  
Relation Between Predisposing Experience and Direction of Change

Predisposing Experience				Favorable Change	Unfavorable Change	Reinforcement	TOTAL
Adult, institutionalized group	...			20	1	1	22
Geographical change							
To New York	...	...		3	4	5	12
Other	...	...	...	4	1	1	6
Change in status	...	...	...	9	2	1	12
Change in emotional satisfaction	...			6	3	1	10
Prestige	...	...	...	7	1	1	9
Rebellion	...	...	...	5	—	—	5
Religious Change	...	...	...	3	—	1	4
				—	—	—	—
				57	12	11	80
<i>Number of People</i>							
Reported some predisposing experience	...	...	...	28	7	7	42
Reported no predisposing experience	...	...	...	3	—	—	3
				—	—	—	—
				31	7	7	45

*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

**TABLE 6**  
**Relation Between Predisposing Experience and Pattern of Change**

<i>Predisposing Experience</i>	<i>Pattern of Change</i>				<i>TOTAL</i>
	<i>Isolated</i>	<i>Increased Liberalism</i>	<i>Religious Change</i>	<i>Personal Reorganization</i>	
Adult, institutionalized group	8	8	—	6	22
Geographical change ...	13	1	1	3	18
Change in status ...	3	3	2	4	12
Change in emotional satisfaction					
Greater unhappiness ...	4	—	—	3	7
Greater happiness ...	—	1	—	2	3
Prestige ...	4	3	—	2	9
Rebellion ...	—	2	—	3	5
Religious change ...	1	1	1	1	4
	—	—	—	—	—
	33	19	4	24	80
<i>Number of People</i>					
Reported some predisposing experience ...	22	8	3	9	42
Reported no predisposing experience ...	1	2	—	—	3
	—	—	—	—	—
	23	10	3	9	45

evidence that the job situation is less disturbing than either college or the armed services. There were more cases of non-integrated attitudes and fewer cases of personal reorganization among people who changed on the job than in the other two sub-groups.

**Geographical change.** Eighteen of the forty-five people reported that a change of residence had preceded the change of attitude. Twelve of these had moved to New York City, ten from other parts of the United States and two from Europe; the other six had moved from one section of the United States to another or from one section of New York City to another.

Every one of the twelve people who moved to New York changed in his

attitude toward Jews; one of them changed toward both Jews and Negroes. None of them changed toward Negroes alone. (Table 7). Nine of the twelve changes were in a negative direction. (Only fourteen of the forty-five people in the total sample changed in the negative direction.)

This association between moving to New York and acquiring a negative attitude toward Jews can be explained in part by assuming that Jews serve as a scapegoat for any kind of unpleasantness in New York City. There actually are relatively more Jews in New York City than in other parts of the country. If the life of an individual changes for the worse when he moves to New York (crowded living conditions, poverty, failure) he may look for the distinctive

characteristic of New York which has made the difference, and find it in the high Jewish population.

A more general explanation is suggested by the fact that the other six geographical moves were associated with changes in attitude toward Negroes, and consisted of moves to or from the South, or to or from Negro neighbourhoods in New York. It seems that for a geographical move to be associated with a change of intergroup attitudes, it must be to an area where there are noticeably more or noticeably fewer members of that minority group in the community. In many cases, of course, an individual may be sufficiently insulated from the community so that he is not aware of any change in the population. The change must be per-

ceived to be effective. But where it is perceived, former habits of thought and behavior may be deemed inappropriate, and new ones developed. In some cases, this may mean a reversal of attitude; in other cases it may mean an extension and activation of previously vague stereotypes. (Table 8). At any rate, we may advance the following hypothesis.

#### *Hypothesis 4*

Moving to a new community where a particular minority group is observed to be relatively larger or smaller than it was in the previous place or residence may lead to changed attitudes about that minority group.

A second hypothesis suggested by the information on geographic change is the following.

**TABLE 7**  
**Relation Between Predisposing Experience and Object of Change**

<i>Predisposing Experience</i>				<i>Object of Change</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>
				<i>Negroes</i>	<i>Jews</i> <i>Both</i>	
Adult, institutionalized group				10	10	22
Geographical change						
To New York	...	...	...	—	11	12
Other	...	...	...	6	—	6
Change in status	...	...	...	7	5	12
Change in emotional satisfaction	...	...	...	5	3	10
Prestige	...	...	...	7	2	9
Rebellion	...	...	...	1	3	5
Religious Change	...	...	...	2	2	4
				38	36	80
<i>Number of People</i>						
Reported some predisposing experience				20	19	42
Reported no predisposing experience				3	—	3
				23	19	45

*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

**TABLE 8**  
**Relation Between Predisposing Experience and Kind of Change**

<i>Precipitating Experience</i>	<i>Reversal</i>	<i>Modifi- cation</i>	<i>Kind of Change Creation of new attitude</i>	<i>No structural change</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>
Adult, institutionalized group	10	1	7	4	22
Geographical change ...	7	7	1	3	18
Change in status ...	9	—	2	1	12
Change in emotional satis- faction					
Greater unhappiness ...	4	2	—	1	7
Greater happiness ...	1	—	2	—	3
Prestige ...	3	1	4	1	9
Rebellion ...	2	—	3	—	5
Religious change ...	3	1	—	—	4
	—	—	—	—	—
	39	12	19	10	80
<i>Number of People</i>					
Reported some predis- posing experience ...	20	8	8	6	42
Reported no predisposing experience ...	—	1	1	1	3
	—	—	—	—	—
	20	9	9	7	45

*Hypothesis 5*

Change resulting from the incorporation of the norms of a new community involves a minimum of psychological resistance and conflict.

Support for the hypothesis depends upon the fact that geographical change is highly associated with negative change (Table 5) and with isolated change (Table 6). Since people reporting negative change on the ballots were less likely to grant an interview than those reporting positive change, we may assume that those people who were interviewed about a negative change were characterized by unusual lack of resistance and defensiveness. Similarly, we may assume that people for whom the change was confined to a single isolated area would show a

minimum of personality disturbances and psychological conflict about the change. If these two assumptions are granted, then the concentration of these two groups among those reporting geographical changes serves to support the hypothesis.

Although the evidence for the hypothesis is indirect and inconclusive, the theoretical basis seems sound. The fact that a new community is different from the old and has selected a different kind of behavior toward minority group members for approval does not reflect upon the rightness of one's previous behavior, at another time and under other circumstances. Each behavior (and so each attitude) is appropriate in its proper place; the difference (change) can therefore be accepted freely and without defensiveness.

**Changes in Status.** The seven people classified as having experienced a change in social status include three people who experienced only an isolated instance of discrimination, one man who lost his foot and had to adjust to being a cripple, and three minority group members who entered a new school or college and found themselves for the first time accepted by the majority group. Every one of these people changed in a favorable direction. The dynamics are somewhat different in the different situations, but there may be a basic similarity. In each case there was some experience with the unpleasant aspects of discrimination, combined with a fairly secure and acceptable status at the time of the change. The following hypothesis does not imply that this conjunction must always lead to a non-discriminatory attitude, but only that it may do so.

*Hypothesis 6*

Persons who have experienced discrimination but whose general social position at a given time is well established will tend to reject discrimination against other groups.

There was little evidence on the effects of changes in financial status. In the two cases of lowered financial status the changed attitude was both consistent and hostile. This is as might have been expected, and supports the following generally accepted hypothesis.

*Hypothesis 7*

Economic difficulties lead to greater hostility against the out-group.

Improved financial status, on the other hand, was for one person a mellowing influence, decreasing the need to hate Jews and making it possible to "love" them and embrace them as a part of the "cosmic con-

sciousness." In the other instance it brought a middle western businessman into prosperous Westchester circles where well-bred anti-Semitism was a prescribed pattern of behavior.

Retirement is a pattern which might be studied in more detail. There was only one retired businessman in our sample. He became more religious and more friendly toward both Germans (his old business rivals) and Negroes. In addition to this case, however, there were several unsigned ballots returned from men who reported that after retirement they became more religious and more tolerant of minority group members. Further study of people who changed after retirement might bear out the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 8*

Retirement from active participation in a competitive society predisposes one to greater tolerance of outgroup members.

Changes in status seem to be highly effective as predispositions to change. Nine of the twelve people whose status changed reversed their attitudes; and two developed entirely new attitudes. (Table 8). Four of them went through a period of personal reorganization; this is half of those who reported such reorientation. (Table 6). Conversely, only three of the twenty-three people who reported an isolated change experienced any change in status. There may be some relationship between a change in status and the necessity for extensive psychological readjustment.

*Hypothesis 9*

A change in social or economic status often requires major psychological readjustment; this may include a change in out-group attitudes.



*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

**Changes in emotional satisfaction.** Several people reported that a decided increase or decrease in happiness had occurred about the time of the change. As might have been expected, greater happiness was associated with positive change toward Negroes, Jews, or both; it was associated with either a general personality reorganization or a generally liberalized outlook on the world; and it resulted in an attitude which was both integrated and salient.

*Hypothesis 10*

An increase in the general level of happiness and satisfaction may be followed by an actively favorable attitude toward minority groups.

A state of general unhappiness did not lead to such consistent results. Unhappiness led to both positive and negative change; resulting attitudes were both integrated and non-integrated; the change sometimes occurred in isolation, and sometimes it was part of a totally reorganized personal adjustment.

**Prestige.** It may be assumed that prestige was operating in most of the change situations previously discussed. When a person moves into a new subculture, it is to be expected that the opinions and attitudes of that new group will have prestige for him. In these situations, however, prestige is actually only one of several interdependent elements. Others include the necessity for coping with situations for which old behavioral patterns are inadequate and the removal from situations in which old behavioral patterns would be expected. Prestige factors cannot be isolated.

Nine people, however, referred to specific individuals who had high prestige and who were influential in the

change. In these cases, the opinions of the prestige individual seemed to be important only after the change had already started. They served to direct a change once begun, but not to initiate it. The fact that a person of prestige had influenced the change was not related to the direction of the change, to the nature of the change pattern, to the depth of the change, nor to the integration or saliency of the attitude which eventually developed.

*Hypothesis 11*

When habitual attitudinal patterns have proved to be inadequate and new attitudes are being developed, the new attitudes will tend to conform to the opinions of people who have prestige for the individual.

**Rebellion.** Five people specifically indicated rebellion from family attitudes to be important. All of these people were among the group discussed first, who left home to go to college, join the armed forces, or who began their first job. Since parental attitudes are usually identified with the *status quo*, we might expect that changes associated with rebellion would be in a favorable direction; and indeed this was true.

Rebellion also seems to imply a whole-hearted identification with the new attitudes. Change associated with rebellion was in no case isolated; and the resulting attitude was always both integrated and salient. The following hypothesis is supported by our data.

*Hypothesis 12*

Social attitudes acquired during a period of rebellion against parental or other control will have high significance for the individual, and will be actively maintained by him.

**Religious change.** No conclusions

*Jeanne Watson*

can be drawn from the four people in whom religious change preceded the change in attitude. Like prestige, religious change is an intermediate step in the process, and has no direct connection with either the initiation of

change nor with the kind of attitude that results. In every case, the religious change was precipitated by some other occurrence: death of a parent, rebellion from maternal dominance, college or retirement.

## THE PATTERN OF CHANGE

The four observed patterns of change have already been described: isolated change, increased liberalism, religious change, and personal reorganization. It appears that change in attitude toward Jews and Negroes may come as a part of any one of these patterns of change. The particular attitude, then, must have different significance for different individuals, depending on the context in which it is perceived. For one person it is a necessary corollary of his socio-economic-political opinions; for another it is a necessary corollary of his religious views; for someone else it is a necessary outgrowth of his personal approach to people in general; and for a fourth, it is quite unrelated to all other attitudes. We cannot assume, as has sometimes been done, that an attitude sometimes associated with the general factor of liberalism-conservatism can always be explained by reference to this factor. Sometimes it will mean something quite different.

### *Hypothesis 13*

Structural change in a given social attitude may occur as an integral part of any one of several different patterns of change.

**Isolated change.** Twenty-three people reported that no other change of opinion or general outlook had been associated with the change in attitude toward Jews or Negroes, i.e., the change was "isolated." This group is half the

sample. It is important to decide whether to accept these reports at face value, and admit that isolated change is possible, or whether there are grounds for disregarding the reports.

One hypothesis is suggested by the fact that these twenty-three people include all but one of those who reported a non-integrated attitude. (Table 9). Similarly, they include all but one of the people who failed to indicate any structural change, and eight of the nine people whose attitudes were modified but not re-structured. (Table 10). In short, isolated change seems to be associated with change which is superficial or ineffective. It includes most of the change in which a cognitive characteristic is added or subtracted, but in which behavior is unaffected. And it includes most of the change consisting of the introduction of new beliefs or behavior patterns which contradict the old ones, but fall short of replacing them. In such a case the resulting attitude is non-integrated, with the old and new existing side by side, constituting a contradiction which the individual cannot reconcile to his own satisfaction.

### *Hypothesis 14*

Non-structural change in an attitude, such as the slight modification of its cognitive aspects or failure to integrate old and new structural elements, tends to be limited to changes which occur in isolation.

*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

Some additional support for this hypothesis may be inferred from the fact that all but one of the people who changed in a negative direction reported an isolated change. (Table 11). It was suggested earlier that many negative changes represented uncritical con-

formity to the *mores* of a new community. To the extent that this is true, the change need not involve discarding the old attitude, but may only mean that the old attitude is restricted to the old situation. This is not a true structural change in the attitude.

**TABLE 9**  
**Relation Between Pattern of Change and Resulting Attitude**

					<i>Present Attitude</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
					<i>Integrated Salient</i>	<i>Inactive</i>	<i>Non-integrated</i>	
Isolated	...	...	...	...	9	4	10	23
Religious Change	...	...	...	...	2	1	—	3
Increased Liberalism	...	...	...	...	7	2	1	10
Personal Reorganization	...	...	...	...	8	1	—	9
					—	—	—	—
					26	8	11	45

**TABLE 10**  
**Relation Between Pattern of Change and Kind of Change**

<i>Pattern of Change</i>				<i>Reversal</i>	<i>Modifi- cation</i>	<i>Kind of Change Creation of new attitude</i>	<i>No structural change</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>
Isolated	...	...	...	9	8	—	6	23
Religious Change	...	...	...	2	—	—	1	3
Increased Liberalism	...	...	...	3	1	6	—	10
Personal Reorganization	...	...	...	6	—	3	—	9
				—	—	—	—	—
				20	9	9	7	45

The high concentration of unfavorable attitudes in the isolated-change group also suggests the alternative hypothesis that reports of isolated change are to be considered as resistance to the interview situation. If resistance to granting an interview is higher among those with unfavorable than with favorable attitudes, we may expect that conscious and unconscious resistance in the actual interview situation will likewise be higher among those with

unfavorable attitudes, although it will also appear for some of those with favorable attitudes. Related to such resistance is the commonly accepted assertion that the attitude toward a minority group depends entirely on the group's objective characteristics, and that other possible changes and pressures in the life of the respondent are irrelevant. Among those holding such an attitude, resistance to being pushed beyond these comfortable

Jeanne Watson

defenses to a realization that the attitude may be reflecting the needs, frustrations, and personality of the respondent, would presumably be greatest for those with inadmissible frustrations and hostilities, and so with antagonistic attitudes. Hence, the reported association between negative attitudes and isolated change would reflect the respondent's inability to perceive other related changes in himself, and would

not be an accurate report of what occurred.

#### *Hypothesis 15*

A short survey-type interview is subject to bias in reports of the extent of socio-psychological change which occurred at a given time in the past. This is particularly true for people whose attitude have changed in a negative direction.

**TABLE 11**  
**Relation Between Pattern of Change and Direction of Change**

<i>Pattern of Change</i>					<i>Direction of Change</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>
					<i>Favorable</i>	<i>Unfavorable Change Reinforcement</i>	
Isolated ... ..	...	...	...	10	6	7	23
Religious Change...	...	...	...	3	—	—	3
Increased Liberalism	...	...	...	10	—	—	10
Personal Reorganization	...	...	...	8	1	—	9
				—	—	—	—
				31	7	7	45

**TABLE 12**  
**Relation Between Pattern of Change and Object of Change**

<i>Pattern of Change</i>					<i>Object of Change</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>
					<i>Negroes</i>	<i>Jews Both</i>	
Isolated ... ..	...	...	...	10	12	1	23
Religious Change...	...	...	...	2	1	—	3
Increased Liberalism	...	...	...	7	2	1	10
Personal Reorganization	...	...	...	4	4	1	9
				—	—	—	—
				23	19	3	45

Hypothesis 14 and 15 give us the means whereby we may attempt to explain away the possibility that structural change can occur in isolation. To do this, however, would mean explaining away quite a bit of our data. Even if we eliminate all cases where the attitude is non-integrated, the change is in a negative direction, or the change is not a structural one, there still remain

five of the twenty-three isolated-change people who reversed their attitudes, and who now have integrated, favorable attitudes. We are therefore forced to recognize the following hypothesis.

#### *Hypothesis 16*

It is possible for structural change in one's attitude toward other groups to occur as an isolated phenomenon.

*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

**Increased Liberalism.** The ten people whose attitudes changed as a part of a general increase in liberalism all report very similar experiences. All of them who reported any predisposing experience at all stated that the change had occurred in college, on a new job, or in the army. (Table 6). Nine of the ten had gained their insight as a result of equal-status contact. (Table 13). It is probable that a situation in which a general liberalizing of attitudes can occur is also one permitting equal-status contacts with minority group members and one in which such contacts tend to be seen as significant.

Of the ten people reporting increased liberalism, seven changed to become more favorable toward Negroes, one changed toward both Negroes and Jews, and two became more favorable toward Jews alone. (Table 12). This raises the larger question of why in the study as a whole the change toward Negroes was predominantly positive, while most of the negative change was directed toward Jews. Of the twenty-three people whose change was directed toward Negroes alone, four changed in a negative direction; whereas ten of the remaining twenty-two people changed negatively, toward Jews or both Jews and Negroes. (Table 3).

One possible explanation appears in the content of the interviews. A number of people who had moved into New York from some other place and were now unhappy and anxious to leave used the Jews as a scapegoat. Jews were felt by these persons to be responsible for everything that was wrong with New York and with their own personal lives in New York. This form of scapegoating was applied once to both Jews and Negroes, but never to Negroes alone. If this finding may be generalized, we would suggest that the identification of any minority group as uniquely

typical of a particular place singles that group out for negative but not for positive attention. The group becomes defined as a permissible scapegoat.

Another factor which may be operating in the New York situation is suggested by the tendency of liberal converts to become more favorable towards Negroes. The "Negro problem" has long been an issue for American liberals, so that a change in attitude toward Negroes is easily associated with a change in liberal-conservative ideas. Anti-semitism, on the other hand, has probably not been so well recognized as an issue for which Americans should assume moral responsibility.

**Personal reorganisation.** It might be expected that people who develop new attitudes as a means of resolving a crisis situation would feel actively committed to them. All the people for whom change occurred as part of a personal reorganization indicated an integrated attitude; and for all but one of them, this attitude was classified as salient. That is, they were anxious to talk about it and to take action in conformity with it. Most of these people had changed in a favorable direction. (Tables 9 and 11).

*Hypothesis 17*

Attitudes which develop as part of a general reorganization of one's personal-social adjustment tend to be expressed in overt behavior as well as in verbal statements of opinion.

**Religious change.** There were only three people for whom the change occurred as an integral part of a change in religious belief. (These people are to be distinguished from those for whom religion was a predisposing experience, i.e., religious change came first and was

not directly related to the situation in which the attitude changed). This number is too small to permit generalization.

### THE PRECIPITATING EXPERIENCE

Change occurs only when existing attitudes are perceived to be inadequate. When an individual is going through a process of restructuring a number of social and interpersonal attitudes, he is psychologically ready to change any attitude which he perceives to be mistaken. However, there must be a specific stimulus before a specific attitude will be altered. This is what we have called the precipitating experience.

#### *Hypothesis 18*

Change in a given attitude always involves some personal experience which specifically directs attention to the inadequacy of the present attitude.

**Direct contact with minority groups.** Allport and Kramer (3) have emphasized the relationship between the relative status of the minority group members whom one meets, and the attitudes which are formed about the group. In coding the interview material, therefore, we considered personal contact as the most important kind of precipitating experience. When some personal contact occurred, it was considered as sufficient to precipitate the change, and nothing else was coded as a precipitating experience. People who had had contact with minority group members were classified in three categories: those who had met people of equal or higher status, those who had met people of lower status, and those who had had only impersonal contact with members of the minority group. In cases where there had been contact with people of both equal and lower status, that relationship was selected

which had most impressed the respondent at the time of the change.

There is a clear relationship between the kind of contact and the direction of the change. (Table 13). Of the twenty-three people who met minority group members of equal or higher status, twenty-one changed in a favorable direction. This is in line with the findings of Allport and Kramer.

#### *Hypothesis 19*

Contact with minority group members having status equal to or higher than oneself usually leads to favorable attitudes toward that minority group.

Fourteen people reported contact with people of lower socio-economic status than themselves. The relationship is not quite so clear here, although the general trend is unmistakable. Ten of these people changed in a negative direction. The other four changed favorably. These four were all social workers who had been assigned to work with members of the particular minority group and who had been favorably impressed by them. It may be that social workers are trained to discount the effects of difference in status, or else that their favorable attitudes include a certain amount of patronizing superiority. At any rate, the evidence permits us to set forth the following hypothesis.

#### *Hypothesis 20*

Contact with minority group members of lower socio-economic status than oneself is conducive to the formation of negative attitudes toward that minority group.

No particular insights can be gained

*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

from the three people reporting only impersonal contact with minority group members. Two had met them on subways, in hotels, etc., and acquired more unfavorable attitudes; one man who knew of good work done by Negro troops was impressed favorably. The only thing common to all of them was that the change occurred in isolation. (Table 13).

**TABLE 13**

**Relation Between Nature of Precipitating Experience and Direction and Object of the Change**

<i>Precipitating Experience</i>	<i>Favorable Change</i>			<i>Unfavorable Change</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
	<i>Negroes</i>	<i>Jews</i>	<i>Both</i>	<i>Negroes</i>	<i>Jews</i>	<i>Both</i>	
Contact with person(s) of at least equal status ...	11	9	1	—	2	—	23
Contact with person(s) of lower status ...	3	1	—	4	6	—	14
Impersonal contact ...	1	—	—	—	1	1	3
Nothing but discrimination	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Nothing but intellectual persuasion ...	3	—	1	—	—	—	4
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	19	10	2	4	9	1	45

Equal-status contact seems to be related not only to the direction of change, but also to the integration of the resulting attitude. (Table 14). Very few of the people who changed in response to equal-status contacts expressed non-integrated attitudes. Such attitudes were expressed mostly by persons who had had only lower status or impersonal contacts. In order to understand why equal-status contacts should be particularly effective in resolving the conflict and ambivalence which lead to non-integrated attitudes, let us consider what the nature of this conflict may be.

Attitudes toward the members of a minority group seem to depend primarily on two sources. One is the personal experience of the individual

with members of the minority group; the other consists of the ideals, judgments, and stereotypes which he learns from his culture. An ambivalent attitude may derive from conflicting experiences with minority group members, or from the acceptance of conflicting ideologies, i.e., from the simultaneous belief in a democratic, Christian ideology, in the derogatory cultural stereotypes about Jews and Negroes.

Perhaps the most frequent source of conflict, however, is a combination of these two. On the one hand, there is a strong ideological training in Christian democracy and a sense of moral obligation to treat all people well. On the other hand, there are the stereotyped prejudices of our society, reinforced by

experience with Negro servants and Jewish shop-keepers who live up to stereotyped expectations. It is not possible to deny either the moral obligation to be democratic, nor the testimony of personal experience that minority group members are 'different.' Contact with minority group members who are much like oneself, and who do not live up to the stereotypes, will be particularly effective in resolving this kind of conflict in favor of an integrated, positive attitude.

**Change without contact.** There were five people in the sample whose change of attitude had not involved any contact with minority group members. One of these was a Jewish boy who felt discrimination for the first time while at college; three were college students who acquired a general liberal orientation in college and extended it to minority groups; and the fifth was a

girl in the Waves who argued with her unprejudiced and greatly admired liberal friend for six months, then convinced herself when she switched sides and argued with a conservative southerner. The last four are considered as examples of "intellectual persuasion."

These five cases showed considerable similarity. The pre-disposing experience for four included being at college. Among all the change was favorable. Each person accepted what was to him a new viewpoint—that all people are to be treated as human beings of equal merit. This is a form of abstract liberalism; hence we find it applied to Negroes more readily than to Jews. (Table 13). As an intellectual principle, it permits the rationalization of any specific contradictory experiences; hence we find that when it is fully accepted the resulting attitudes are well integrated. (Table 14).

**TABLE 14**  
**Relation Between Nature of Precipitating Experience and Resulting Attitude**

<i>Precipitating Experience</i>	<i>Present Attitude</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
	<i>Salient</i>	<i>Integrated Inactive</i>	<i>Non- integrated</i>	
Contact with person(s) of at least equal status ... ..	15	4	4	23
Contact with person(s) of lower status ... ..	8	1	5	14
Impersonal contact ... ..	—	1	2	3
Nothing but discrimination ...	1	—	—	1
Nothing but intellectual persuasion	2	2	—	4
	26	8	11	45

We may now ask how it is possible to establish this thoroughly liberal attitude without any personal contact, and where it means reversing old

attitudes or creating entirely new ones. (Table 15). Is it purely an intellectual matter, and if so, what is the effective intellectual approach?



*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

**TABLE 15**

**Relation Between Nature of Precipitating Experience and Kind of Change**

<i>Precipitating Experience</i>	<i>Reversal</i>	<i>Modifi- cation</i>	<i>Kind of Change Creation of new attitude</i>	<i>No structural change</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>
Contact with person(s) of at least equal status ... ..	10	3	7	3	23
Contact with person(s) of lower status ... ..	7	4	—	3	14
Impersonal contact ... ..	—	2	—	1	3
Nothing but discrimination	—	—	1	—	1
Nothing but intellectual persuasion ... ..	3	—	1	—	4
	—	—	—	—	—
	20	9	9	7	45

For three people, the change originated entirely in intellectual questioning. It was not, however, the result of a single book, lecture, movie, or college course. Rather, it sprang from a whole series of experiences challenging all aspects of the individual's previous adjustment; it required a critical re-evaluation of his whole way of life and way of thinking. This form of personal reorganization was in itself an emotional experience.

For the other two people, change began with some emotional impetus to question their outgroup attitudes. For

one, this was the experience of being discriminated against; for the other, the constant argument with a close and highly admired colleague. The following seems to be a plausible hypothesis.

*Hypothesis 21*

If intellectual pressures are to bring about structural change in social attitudes, they must either challenge a broad range of habits of social thought and personal adjustment, or they must be associated with some emotional incentive to change.

**REINFORCEMENT**

The last stage in the change process is probably the least essential of the four. Nine of the people in the sample reported nothing that could be interpreted as reinforcement, and they did not differ very much from the rest of the sample. The greatest difference is in the nature of the attitude at present. (Table 17). Five people are classified both as having received no reinforcement and as having an inactive attitude.

This is slightly over half of the people in each category. This association between lack of reinforcement and an inactive attitude suggests that the degree of conviction with which an attitude is maintained depends a good deal on the events which follow the change experience. If these events direct favorable attention to the attitude, it may come to be actively maintained; if they have nothing to do with the new

*Jeanne Watson*

attitude, it may fade into obscurity.

*Hypothesis 22*

A new attitude can be successfully established as the result of the single change experience; however, if the initial change is reinforced by subsequent experiences, information, or approval, the attitude is more likely to be actively maintained.

It is probable that in many cases the reinforcement, or lack of it, will determine whether the new attitude is maintained at all. This is particularly true of the individual who marries a person with strong feelings about the attitude, or who moves into a social group where some particular version of the attitude is clearly the acceptable one. There would be strong pressures

**TABLE 16**  
**Kinds of Reinforcement Reported**

Contact with minority group members ...	20
Equal status ... .. 16	
Lower status ... .. 3	
Impersonal ... .. 1	
Prestige ... .. 17	
Husband or wife ... .. 7	
Others ... .. 5	
Husband or wife, and others ... .. 3	
General social pressure ... .. 2	
Information and reading ... .. 16	
Reading ... .. 8	
Other information ... .. 5	
Both reading and other information ... .. 3	
Acting in accordance with new attitude ... .. 10	
Social action groups; protest ... .. 6	
Argument with friends ... .. 2	
Discrimination against others ... .. 2	
Miscellaneous ... .. 7	
Reaction against Nazi anti-Semitism ... .. 3	
Psychotherapy ... .. 1	
Discriminated against by others ... .. 1	
Move to New York ... .. 1	
Religious change ... .. 1	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>70</b>
<i>Number of People</i>	
Reported some reinforcement ... ..	36
Reported no reinforcement ... ..	9
	<b>45</b>

*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

**TABLE 17**

**Relation Between Reinforcement Experience and Nature of Attitude**

Reinforcement				Present Attitude			TOTAL
				Salient	Integrated Inactive	Non- Integrated	
Personal Contact							
Equal status ...	...	...	...	12	2	2	16
Lower status	...	...	...	3	—	—	3
Impersonal contact ...	...	...	...	—	—	1	1
Prestige ...	...	...	...	9	2	6	17
Reading and information	...	...	...	12	2	2	16
Taking action							
Positive action; protest; argument				8	—	—	8
Discriminating against others	...			1	—	1	2
Miscellaneous ...	...	...	...	4	1	2	7
				—	—	—	—
				49	7	14	70
Number of People							
Reported some reinforcement	...			24	3	9	36
Reported no reinforcement	...			2	5	2	9
				—	—	—	—
				26	8	11	45

on such a person to change in the direction of conformity, or, if he already held the appropriate attitude, to be outspoken about it. In this case it is the general situation, with the constant pressure for agreement and repeated approval for the "right" attitude (reinforcement) which may be held responsible for the change to the acceptable attitude, or for its maintenance if it already exists. The particular change situation is relatively unimportant. Evidence relating to this general point, however, could not be obtained from interviews which were focussed on the specific change situation.

Let us now turn to an appraisal of the different kinds of reinforcement reported in this study. In doing so we shall assume that the reinforcement as

reported in the interview was objectively real, and was not just a function of changed perception. This assumption is justified by the fact that there is no appreciable relation between reinforcement and the experiences which might be most directly related to perception, namely, personal reorganization and other patterns of change, and direction of change.

**Personal contact.** Sixteen people reported meeting minority group members on a basis of equality after the change had occurred. Twelve of these people had had such contacts before; four had not. Three people reported meeting minority group members of lower status than themselves after the change as well as before it. The person who reported impersonal contacts after

the change had previously met minority group members of equal status. Thus there were fifteen people who met the same kind of people after the change as at the time of the precipitating experience, and whose attitudes were presumably reinforced in the process. Five people met minority group members in a new relationship, four of them in equal-status contacts. The different

status relationship, however, did not affect the attitude; it remained as it was, favorable or unfavorable. (Table 18). It appears that there is a tendency for repeated equal status contact to be associated with a favorable attitude, and for repeated lower status contact to be associated with an unfavorable attitude, but neither association is completely consistent.

**TABLE 18**  
**Relation Between Personal Contacts Before and After the Change, and Direction of the Change**

Status of minority group members in contacts which precipitated change	Status of minority group members in reinforcement contacts						TOTAL
	EQUAL		LOWER		IMPERSONAL		
	Favorable	Unfavorable	Favorable	Unfavorable	Favorable	Unfavorable	
Equal ... ..	11	1	—	—	—	1	13
Lower ... ..	2	1	1	2	—	—	6
Impersonal ...	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No personal contact	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	14	2	1	2	—	1	20

**Prestige.** Next to personal contacts with minority group members, contact with members of one's own group who had high prestige was the most frequently reported type of reinforcement. Seventeen people, or about one third of the group, reported that the person to whom they were married, or someone else whom they respected and had come to know after the change in attitude, strongly supported the new attitude. Five of these people had also been influenced by people of prestige before the change—although it will be recalled that even there prestige became effective only after something else had happened to raise some questions for the individual. There were thus four people influenced by prestige only before the change, five influenced both before and after, and twelve people

influenced by prestige only after the change. This makes a total of twenty-one people who specifically mentioned that people of prestige had been important in the process of change. Most of them indicated that such individuals had given them support *after* the change.

Prestige support was relatively less important to the people who felt strongly about their new convictions than to those for whom the new attitude was either inactive or non-integrated. (Table 17). This may indicate that for the latter groups the new attitude is primarily a means of conforming to the social environment, whereas for the people who reported an active, aggressive attitude, the attitude was more likely to have acquired some additional personal sig-

*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

nificance. Another way of stating the same relationship is to say that attitudes may be acquired from contact with the attitude of others, but they do not acquire high significance for the individual until he has found independent support for them in his own experience. When the attitudes do acquire personal significance for him, prestige reinforcement becomes unimportant enough so that he fails to mention it in the interview.

*Hypothesis 23*

People whose attitudes are integrated and actively maintained are less dependent upon support from particular individuals with prestige than are people whose attitudes are casual or non-integrated.

Prestige reinforcement was reported by eleven of the nineteen people who changed their opinions about Jews, but by only six of the twenty-three who changed about Negroes. This importance of prestige in changes about Jews is in line with our earlier suggestion that in New York a changed attitude toward Jews may represent conformity to local opinion.

**Reading and Information.** Sixteen people or about one third of the sample reported that they had done some reading or otherwise had acquired additional pertinent information after their attitudes had changed. The information was sometimes acquired from classes and sometimes from other sources. One woman, for instance, reported that until the Red Cross blood drives during the war occurred she had never known that white and Negro blood were biologically the same. It is interesting that every one of the people who reported that he had done any reading or had benefitted from other

information had done so *after* the change. This suggests the following hypothesis.

*Hypothesis 24*

Deliberate teaching and propaganda in the limited area of intergroup relations will seldom initiate change, although it may reinforce and help to organize change already begun.

All but two of the people who had exposed themselves to reading or other information expressed integrated attitudes. (Table 17). We may infer that, when an individual is sufficiently sensitized to perceive this material, or sufficiently interested to look for it, he finds it of use to him in clarifying his ideas and eliminating inconsistencies. Or to put it another way, it helps him to rationalize his new attitude successfully.

Twelve of the sixteen people who reported additional reading and acquisition of information had changed their attitudes about Negroes while only three had changed about Jews and one had changed about both. This fact can be related to our assumption that Americans generally are more self-conscious about the "Negro problem" than about anti-Semitism. There is, therefore, less tolerance for one's own experience as a final criterion of judgment and more interest in reading what the expert has to say in the area of Negro-white relations than in that of Jewish-Christian relations.

**Taking action.** A third kind of reinforcement comes from acting upon one's ideas. Ten people reported such action. Eight of them were active liberals, and reported such things as working with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, walking out of a restricted summer resort, and frequent arguments with

friends. Two people reported having discriminated against the particular minority group. Such actions were associated with a salient and integrated attitude in all but one case. (Table 17).

The relationship between saliency of attitude and manifestation of the attitude in non-verbal behavior is probably a circular one. On the one hand, people with strongly emotional attitudes are more likely to act upon them; and on the other hand, people are forced to identify with and maintain those attitudes which they have once expressed publicly. Insofar as it is the latter half of the relationship which is operating, social action can act as important reinforcement for social attitudes.

#### *Hypothesis 25*

Action or argument based on one's social attitudes serves to reinforce and strengthen these attitudes.

**Other reinforcement.** Other kinds of reinforcement which were mentioned are listed in Table 16. Three people said that during the war they had seen the relationship between discrimination and Naziism, and so had rejected discrimination. All of these people expressed integrated attitudes. One person reported that she had first changed "superficially" but that it was only after psychoanalysis that she had made the emotional readjustments necessary for a "real" change.

### THE PUBLIC OPINION BALLOT

Several studies have been made which use questionnaires to relate prejudice or the lack of it to other socio-political attitudes and to psychological beliefs. Frenkel-Brunswik and Sanford (27) have reported finding anti-Semitism associated with an over-rigid adherence to middle-class morality, with uncritical devotion to authority in general, with automatic support for the *status quo*, and with a rigid ethnocentrism and rejection of out-groups. A number of their findings were supported by projective test results and by results from the Rorschach tests.

Allport and Kramer (3) report finding similar relationships in their study of 437 college students. They concluded that 'those who have a jungle philosophy of life are generally more prejudiced; those who have an authoritarian or disciplinarian outlook on life tend to be more prejudiced,' and that people who are suspicious of being tricked in ordinary dealings with people are more prejudiced both against Jews and against out-groups in general.

We were interested in finding out whether the same relationships would hold for people whose attitudes had changed. The expectation was that the same relationships would be found in the sample of people who had changed as had previously been found in a general sample of students. Such a finding would give strong support to the hypothesis that attitudes cannot be considered as isolated parts of an individual's social adjustment.

We were somewhat dubious about the reception of a questionnaire including the kind of projective items which had been used in the earlier studies. Such items are not widely understood by the general public, and they certainly have not won the type of cooperative acceptance that characterizes public opinion polls. We felt that the ballot had to be short, and that it had to have enough questions about current social and political events to justify calling it a public opinion ballot. We also felt that it should come after the interview, when the interviewer

*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

had presumably won the confidence of the respondent, and when any suspicions it might arouse would not affect the progress of the interview. The ballot was therefore sometimes left with the respondent by the interviewer, and sometimes sent to him by mail after the interview. People who did not mail in the ballot received a second letter and a new ballot a month or so later. Altogether 31 people returned ballots, one third of them only after the second request.

The ballot contained fourteen questions. (Appendix III). Each was worded in the form of a statement with which the respondent was to express agreement or disagreement. Three of the statements concerned attitudes toward labor unions, war with Russia, and Communism. These were chosen as perhaps the most controversial topics on the current political scene, and so the most sensitive indicators of *liberalism*. (Questions 2, 5, and 12). A second set of five questions dealt with the general area of *force and discipline* in American life. This scale included the question used by Allport and Kramer to indicate "an authoritarian or disciplinarian outlook on life" (Q. 8), two of the questions used by Frenkel-Brunswik and Sanford (Questions 4 and 7), and two that we added. (Questions 1 and 14). The other six questions were designed to reach somewhat deeper levels of the personality. Three of them were the ones used by Frenkel-Brunswik and Sanford as indications of rigid conformance to *middle class morality*. (Questions 6, 9, and 10). They were concerned with attitude toward parents, toward sex crimes, and toward hurting a close friend or relative. Finally there were three questions

previous investigators had used as *projective* questions. (Questions 3, 11, and 13).

There were four possible answers to each question, ranging from agreement, through slight agreement and slight disagreement, to disagreement. These were given scores of 1 through 4, with the lowest score assigned to the answer indicating most conservatism or repression. The scores were then summed for each individual, and the respondents were ranked. Results are presented in terms of the four quartiles.

Combined measurements were used to scale the kind of change which occurred, and the nature of the present attitude. The change was described as structural or non-structural,<sup>5</sup> and as favorable or unfavorable. This provided a four point scale, ranging from major positive change to major negative change. Similarly, combining the direction of the change (and so the inclination of the present attitude) with the integration and salience of the present attitude permits us to distribute present attitudes on a five point scale ranging from active support through ambivalence to active hostility.

In the total questionnaire, as in each of the sub-scales, persons reporting favorable structural change and strong lack of prejudice took a liberal position. They were favorable toward labor unions and not antagonistic toward Russia and Communism; they rejected authoritarian statements; they were sceptical of rigid adherence to middle class mores; and they rejected the suggestions that the world is a jungle, that being cheated is more to be feared than being attacked, and that one should not worry about his problems. People reporting negative structural

<sup>5</sup> Answers previously classified as "reversal" or "creation of a new attitude" were considered to indicate structural change; answers classified as "modification" or "no structural change" were combined as non-structural change.

change and strong prejudice, on the other hand, took the opposite positions. (Tables 19 and 20). These findings are all in agreement with those of previous investigators.

Many individuals responded differentially to the separate sub-scales. However, because the sample was small and non-representative, and because overall group scores did not differ very much from one sub-scale to another, only the results for the questionnaire as a whole have been presented. In general, the liberalism sub-scale appeared to be the most selective, while the projective items were the least discriminating. That is, there is a slight tendency for the intergroup attitudes of the thirty-one people who returned ballots to be embedded in the context of liberalism-conservatism, rather than for them to be associated with compelling psychological needs. The self-selection processes involved first in agreeing to an interview and second in returning the ballots by mail are more than enough to account for this difference, assuming

that liberal-conservative patterns are more readily accessible than psychological ones.

From these findings we may conclude then, that the socio-psychological correlates of out-group attitudes which have undergone some marked change are not noticeably different from those of attitudes shown by people in general. To the extent that attitudes are demonstrated to be associated with broader personality patterns, we must either assume that changes of attitude reflect broader changes in personality, or else that a change in attitude can occur only when there is originally some inconsistency between the attitude and the other aspects of the personality. Further research is needed to throw more light on this problem. Meantime, the evidence here supports the following hypothesis.

*Hypothesis 26*

Attitudes toward other groups exist and change only as integral parts of a larger personality.

**TABLE 19**  
**Relation Between Scores on Public Opinion Ballot and Nature of Change**

<i>Test Scores</i>	<i>Favorable, Structural</i>	<i>Favorable, Non-structural</i>	<i>Change Unfavorable, Non-structural</i>	<i>Unfavorable, Structural</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>
Lowest quartile	1	—	4	3	8
Second quartile	2	2	3	—	7
Third quartile ...	5	1	1	1	8
High quartile ...	8	—	—	—	8

**TABLE 20**  
**Relation Between Scores on Public Opinion Ballot and Present Attitude**

<i>Test Scores</i>	<i>Active, Favorable</i>	<i>Inactive, Favorable</i>	<i>Present Attitude Non-integrated</i>	<i>Inactive, Against</i>	<i>Active, Against</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>
Low quartile	—	1	2	1	4	8
Second quartile	3	—	4	—	—	7
Third quartile	4	1	2	—	1	8
High quartile	7	1	—	—	—	8



### SUMMARY

This study was concerned with changes in attitude toward Jews or Negroes as reported in open-end interviews by forty-five adult residents of New York City. An attitude was considered to have both a cognitive and a behavioral aspect; only those changes affecting the structuring of one's relationships to minority groups were considered to be genuine change.

A four-stage process of change was hypothesized after careful study of the interviews. This process includes (i) a predisposition to change; (ii) a more or less generalized change in which (iii) attention is directed to the inadequacy of the particular attitude and it is changed accordingly; (iv) reinforce-

ment of the new attitude. Each of these four stages was analyzed in terms of the interview material available, and hypotheses were suggested for relating the kind of experience at each stage to the nature of the change and of the final attitude.

Written answers were received from two-thirds of the sample to questions which had been used by previous investigators to relate out-group attitudes to other social attitudes and to personality structure. Results in this study were in agreement with previous findings, and it was concluded that change in attitude must also mean change in related social attitudes and personality structure.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ALEXANDER, FRANZ. "Discussion of *Hostility and Fear in Social Life* by John Dollard," *Social Forces*, 17:27-29 (1938).
2. ALLPORT, GORDON W. "Attitudes," *Handbook of Social Psychology*, ed. by Carl Murchison, 1935, Clark University Press, Worcester, Mass.
3. ALLPORT, GORDON W., and KRAMER, BERNARD M. "Some Roots of Prejudice," *J. of Psych.*, 22:9-39 (1946).
4. ASHER, R., and SARGENT, S. S. "Shifts in Attitude Caused by Cartoon Caricatures," *J. of Gen. Psych.*, 24:451-455 (1941).
5. BIRCH, HELEN G. "The Effect of Socially Disapproved Labeling upon a Well-structured Attitude," *J. Abn. and Soc. Psychol.*, 40:301-310 (1943).
6. BLAKE, ROBERT, and WAYNE, DENNIS. "The Development of Stereotypes Concerning the Negro," *J. of Abn. and Soc. Psychol.*, 38:525-531 (1943).
7. BOGARDUS, EMORY S. "A Social Distance Scale," *Soc. and Soc. Res.*, 17:265-271 (1933).
8. BOLTON, E. B. "Effect of Knowledge upon Attitude toward the Negro," *J. of Soc. Psychol.*, 6:68-90 (1935).
9. BOLTON, E. B. "Measuring Specific Attitudes towards the Social Rights of the Negro," *J. of Abn. and Soc. Psychol.*, 31:384-397 (1937).
10. BROPHY, IRA N. "The Luxury of Anti-Negro Prejudice," *Pub. Op. Quart.*, 9:456-466 (1945-46).
11. CANTRIL, HADLEY. "General and Specific Attitudes," *Psychol. Monographs*, 42: No. 192 (1932).

Jeanne Watson

12. CARLSON, H. B. "Attitudes of Undergraduate Students," *J. of Soc. Psychol.*, 5:202-212 (1934).
13. CHASE, WILTON P., "Attitudes of North Carolina College Students (Women) Toward the Negro," *J. of Soc. Psychol.*, 12:367-378 (1940).
14. CHEN, WILLIAM K-C. "The Influence of Oral Propaganda Material upon Students' Attitudes," *Arch. of Psychol.*, No. 150 (1933).
15. CHERRINGTON, BEN M., and MILLER, L. W. "Changes in Attitudes as the Result of a Lecture and of Reading Similar Materials," *J. of Soc. Psychol.*, 4:479-484 (1933).
16. CHILD, IRVIN L., and DOOB, LEONARD W. "Factors Determining National Stereotypes," *J. of Soc. Psychol.*, 17:203-219 (1943).
17. DAVIDSON, H. A. "The Anatomy of Prejudice," *Common Ground*, 1(2):3-12 (1943).
18. DAVIS, J., "A Study of 163 Outstanding Communist Leaders," *Proc. Amer. Sociol. Soc.*, 24:42-55 (1930).
19. DOLLARD, JOHN, and Others. *Frustration and Aggression*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1939.
20. DOOB, LEONARD W., and SEARS, ROBERT R. "Factors Determining Substitute Behavior and the Overt Expression of Aggression," *J. of Abn. and Soc. Psychol.*, 34:293-313 (1939).
21. DROBA, D. D. "Education and Negro Attitudes," *Soc. and Soc. Res.*, 17:137-141 (1932).
22. DROBA, D. D. "Topical Summaries of Current Literature: Social Attitudes," *Am. J. of Sociol.*, 39:513-524 (1934).
23. DUNHAM, H. WARREN. "Topical Summaries of Current Literature on Social Attitudes," *Am. J. of Sociol.*, 46:344-375 (1940).
24. EWING, T. N. "A Study of Certain Factors Involved in Changes of Opinion," *J. of Soc. Psychol.*, 16:63-68 (1942).
25. FARIS, E. "The Concept of Social Attitudes," in *Social Attitudes*, K. Young, Henry Holt, New York, 1931.
26. FINEBERG, S. A. *Overcoming Anti-Semitism*, Harper & Bros., New York, 1933.
27. FRENKEL-BRUNSWIK, ELSE, and SANFORD, R. N. "Some Personality Factors in Anti-Semitism," *J. of Psychol.*, 20:271-291 (1945).
28. GARRISON, K. C., and BURCH, J. S. "A Study of Racial Attitudes of College Students," *J. of Soc. Psychol.*, 4:230-235 (1933).
29. HARLAN, HOWARD H. "Some Factors Affecting Attitude toward Jews," *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, 7:816-827 (1942).
30. HARRIS, A. J., REMMERS, H. H., and ELLISON, C. E. "The Relation Between Liberal and Conservative Attitudes in College Students, and Other Factors," *J. of Soc. Psychol.*, 3:320-335 (1932).
31. HARTMANN, G. W. "A Field Experiment on the Comparative Effectiveness of 'Emotional' and 'Rational' Political Leaflets in Determining Election Results," *J. of Abn. and Soc. Psychol.*, 31:99-114 (1936).
32. HAYNES, G. E. "Public Approbation as a Means of Changing Interracial Attitudes and Customs," *Social Forces*, 24:105-110 (1945).
33. HOROWITZ, E. L., and HOROWITZ, R. E. "Development of Social Attitudes in Children," *Sociometry*, 1:301-338 (1938).

*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

34. HOROWITZ, E. L., "The Development of Attitude Toward the Negro," *Arch. of Psychol.*, No. 194, 1936.
35. INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL RESEARCH. "Research Project on Anti-Semitism," *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science*, 9, No. 1 (1941).
36. JOHNSON, CHARLES S. "Measurement of Racial Attitudes," *Amer. Sociol. Soc. Publ.*, 25 (2):150-153 (1931).
37. JONES, VERNON. "Attitudes of College Students Toward War, Race, and Religion, and the Changes in Such Attitudes During Four Years in College" (abstract), *Psychol. Bull.*, 33:731-732 (1936).
38. KATZ, DANIEL, and ALLPORT, F. H. *Students' Attitudes*. Syracuse: Craftsman Press, 1931.
39. KATZ, DANIEL, and BRALY, K. "Racial Stereotypes of One Hundred College Students," *J. of Abn. and Soc. Psychol.*, 28:280-290 (1933).
40. KATZ, DANIEL. "Attitude Measurement as a Method in Social Psychology," *Social Forces*, 15:474-482 (1937).
41. KNOWER, FRANKLIN H. "Experimental Studies of Changes in Attitude: I. A Study of the Effect of Oral Argument on Changes of Attitude," *J. of Soc. Psychol.*, 6:315-345 (1935); "... II. A Study of the Effect of Printed Argument on Changes in Attitude," *J. of Abn. and Soc. Psych.*, 31:522-532 (1936); "... III. Some Incidence of Attitude Changes," *J. of Appl. Psychol.*, 20:114-127 (1936).
42. LAPIERE, R. T. "Attitudes vs Actions," *Social Forces*, 13:230-237 (1934).
43. LAPIERE, R. T. "Race Prejudice; France and England," *Social Forces*, 7:102-111 (1928).
44. LASKER, BRUNO. *Race Attitudes in Children*. New York: Henry Holt, 1929.
45. LAZARSFELD, P. F., BERELSON, B., and CAUDET, H. *The People's Choice*, New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1944.
46. LEVINSON, D. J., and SANFORD, R. N. "A Scale for the Measurement of Anti-Semitism," *J. of Psychol.*, 17:339-370 (1944).
47. LEWIN, KURT. "Research on Minority Problems," *Technology Review*, 48:163-164, 182-190 (1946).
48. LIKERT, RENSIS, "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes," *Arch of Psychol.*, No. 140, 1932.
49. LIPPITT, RONALD, and RADKE, MARIAN. "New Trends in the Investigation of Prejudice," *The Annals*, 244:167-176 (1946).
50. LORGE, IRVING. "Prestige, Suggestion and Attitudes" (abstract), *Psychol. Bull.*, 32:750 (1935).
51. MACIVER, ROBERT. *Social Causation*. New York: Ginn, 1942.
52. MARPLE, CLARE H. "The Comparative Susceptibility of Three Age Levels to the Suggestion of Group versus Expert Opinion," *J. of Soc. Psychol.*, 4:176-184 (1933).
53. MCKEEL, SCUDDER. "Concerning Race Prejudice," *Am. J. of Orthopsychiatry*, 14:699-705 (1944).
54. MCLEAN, HELEN VINCENT. "Racial Prejudice," *Am. J. of Orthopsychiatry*, 14:706-714 (1944).
55. MURRAY, H. A., and Others. *Explorations in Personality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Jeanne Watson

56. NEWCOMB, T. M. *Personality and Social Change; Attitude formation in a Student Community*, New York: Dryden Press, 1943.
57. PAGET, E. H. "Sudden Changes in Group Opinion," *Social Forces*, 7:438-444 (1929).
58. PARK, R. E. "Experience and Race Relations," *J. App. Soc.*, 9:18-24 (1924).
59. PETERSON, RUTH C., and THURSTONE, L. L. "The Effect of a Motion Picture Film on Children's Attitudes toward Germans," *J. Ed. Psychol.*, 23:241-246 (1932).
60. PORTERFIELD, AUSTIN L. "Education and Race Attitudes," *Sociol. and Soc. Res.*, 21:538-543 (1937).
61. REMMERS, H. S. "Propaganda in the Schools—Do the Effects Last? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 2:197-210 (1938).
62. REUTER, E. B. "Racial Theory," *Am. J. of Sociol.*, 50:452-461 (1945).
63. ROBINSON, DUANE, and ROHDE, SYLVIA. "A Public Opinion Study of Anti-Semitism in New York City," *Amer. Sociol. Rev.*, 10:511-515 (1945).
64. ROBINSON, DUANE, and RODHE, SYLVIA. "Two Experiments with an Anti-Semitism Poll," *J. of Abn. and Soc. Psychol.*, 41:136-144 (1946).
65. ROSENTHAL, SOLOMON P. "Change of Socio-Economic Attitudes Under Radical Motion Picture Propaganda," *Arch. of Psychol.*, No. 166, 1934.
66. SAFFIR, M. A. "Nationality Preferences for Varying Types of Social Relations," *Psych. Bull.*, 31:717-718 (1933).
67. SHERIF, M., and CANTRIL, H. *The Psychology of Ego Involvements*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1947.
68. SIMMEL, ERNST. *Anti-Semitism, A Social Disease*. New York: International Universities Press, 1946.
69. SMITH, M. BREWSTER. "The Personal Setting of Public Opinion: A Study of Attitudes Towards Russia," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 11:507-523.
70. SMITH, F. T. *An Experiment in Modifying Attitudes toward the Negro*, PhD Thesis in the Library of Teachers College, Columbia University, 1933.
71. THURSTONE, L. L. "The Influence of Motion Pictures on Children's Attitudes," *J. Soc. Psychol.*, 2:291-305 (1931).
72. VAUGHN, W. F. "An Experimental Study of Political Prejudice," *J. Abn. and Soc. Psych.*, 25:268-274 (1930).
73. VETTER, G. B., and GREEN, M. "Personality and Group Factors in the Making of Attitudes," *J. Abn. and Soc. Psychol.*, 27:179-194 (1932).
74. WATSON, G. B. *Action for Unity*. New York: Harper Bros., 1947.
75. WILKE, WALTER H. "An Experimental Comparison of the Speech, the Radio, and the Printed Page as Propaganda Devices," *Arch. of Psych.*, No. 169, 1934.
76. YOUNG, DONALD. "Some Effects of a Course in American Race Problems on the Race Prejudice of 450 Undergraduates at the University of Pennsylvania," *J. of Abn. and Soc. Psychol.*, 22:235-242 (1927).
77. ZELENY, C. D. "A Measure of Social Opinions of Students," *J. Appl. Soc.*, 11:56-64 (1926).
78. ZELIGS, ROSE. "Tracing Racial Attitudes through Adolescence," *Sociol. and Soc. Res.*, 23:45-54 (1938).

*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

**APPENDIX I**  
**QUESTIONNAIRE**

(Some general questions and outline of points to be covered under each)

**I. Can you tell me something about the change?**

1. Can you sum up how you used to feel?
2. How do you feel now?

What comes to mind when you think of  $\frac{(\text{Negro})}{(\text{Jew})}$ ?

3. What is the best evidence of the change?

**II. How did you happen to change your mind?**

(Probe) What things led up to the change?

(Probe) When did you first become aware of it?

(Cover the following points):

1. Where there any particular experiences with  $\frac{\text{Negroes}}{\text{Jews}}$  that stand out as important?

(Determine whether these contacts were on a basis of equal or unequal social status. Note meaning of contacts for respondent. For instance:)

- A. Positive relationship with out-group member as equal or superior.
- B. Sympathy with out-group as people in distress.
- C. Rejection of out-group as somehow a threat.
  - (1) Neighborhood "invasion" of lower class people.
  - (2) Competition in job situation.
  - (3) Competition for love or friendship.
- D. Rejection of out-group as "not nice."

2. Were there any people in your own group whose opinions or experiences particularly influenced you?

(Again, note relative status of two parties, and meaning of relationship for respondent. For instance:)

- A. Identification with person holding opposite views from oneself. Status? Roles?
- B. Identification with person holding one's own view, but more strongly. Status? Roles?
- C. Attempt to convert person holding opposite view. Status? Roles?
- D. Attempt to convert person holding extreme version of one's own view. Status? Roles?

3. Were there other changes of opinion that occurred about the same time?

- A. Intellectual questioning—economic, political, social, religious, ethical, moral (including sex)?
- B. Challenge of authority—family, church, army, job?
- C. Emotional change—change in level of happiness or frustration? In family situation? Elsewhere?
- D. Period of economic difficulty? Occupational uncertainty?

**APPENDIX I (continued)**

4. Was the change connected with moving from one place to another?
  - A. Geographical move, as to New York City?
  - B. Going to college?
  - C. Change of employment?
5. Do you remember any particular efforts to make you change your mind that influenced you?
  - A. Reading of any sort?
  - B. Speeches, radio programs and announcements, movies, posters, Brotherhood Week, other propaganda?
  - C. Classes, courses, discussion groups?
  - D. Sustained informal discussion (friends, family)?
6. Do you know of any other people who had experienced a change something like yours?  
Who were they?  
What had you thought of them?  
(Note relative status, relationship to respondent)

**III. Now, can you tell me something about how you happened to think as you did before the change?**

1. What contacts had you had with  $\frac{\text{Negroes}}{\text{Jews}}$  before the change?  
(Note relative status, nature of relationship and its emotional meaning for respondent).
2. In most communities there are some families that stand pretty high socially, and others that don't rate so well. Was that true in the community where you grew up?  
(Find out if there was any awareness of a stratified society. Find out if there were any "scapegoat" groups in town—Jews, Negroes, nationality groups—and if so, what respondent's attitude toward them was.)
3. How did your own family stand in the community? How was your home different from others in your town?
4. Did you have any particular religious training?
5. Were you brought up strictly? How did that affect you, do you think?
6. Do you remember having many fears as a child? What sort of fears do you remember?
7. Were there some people you hated?
8. Did you get angry often? Did you get into many fights or quarrels?
9. Would you say you were happier as a child or now?

*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*

**APPENDIX I (continued)**

10. Will you bring  $\backslash$  up your children in much the same way as you were  
Are you bringing  $\int$  brought up?
11. Have you ever lived anywhere but here?  
(Get history of residential mobility)
12. Have there been any times in your life when things were particularly  
hard for you? (IF YES, get the story).  
(IF YES) Sometimes at times like that people get to feeling pretty bitter.  
Did you find that true?
13. Can you think of anything else that might have affected you?
14. Did you ever go through another period something like the one we have  
been talking about? (when your attitudes changed?)
- IV. What do you think should be done now about this whole problem?—Or  
is it a problem?—What would be the best solution?  
(Get unrealistic as well as realistic ideas about solutions)

(EXPLAIN ABOUT QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE FILLED IN AND  
RETURNED BY MAIL)

---

**APPENDIX II**

**THE ORIGINAL MAIL BALLOT**

1. Which of these statements tells best the way you feel about Jews?  
(Check the one that comes closest.)  
.....Jews are fine people, generally better than non-Jews.  
.....Jews are just like other groups—some are good and some are bad.  
.....There are some exceptions, but Jews are generally hard to get along  
with.  
.....Jews are naturally pushing and clannish; they will cheat you if they  
can.  
Comment? .....
2. Which of these statements tells best the way you feel about Negroes?  
(Check one).  
.....Negroes are fine people, generally better than whites.  
.....Negroes are just like other groups—some are bright and some are not.  
.....There are some outstanding individual Negroes, but the race as a  
whole will never amount to very much.  
.....Negroes are naturally lazy, irresponsible, and can't be trusted unless  
you watch them.  
Comment? .....

Jeanne Watson

APPENDIX II (continued)

3. Has your feeling about Jews changed at some time during your life?  
(Check one).  
.....No change.  
.....Little change.  
.....Much more favorable toward Jews than I used to be.  
.....Much more against Jews than I used to be.  
Comment? .....
4. Has your feeling about Negroes changed at some time during your life?  
(Check one).  
.....No change.  
.....Little change.  
.....Much more favorable toward Negroes than I used to be.  
.....Much more against Negroes than I used to be.  
Comment? .....
5. Please fill in these facts whether you sign your name or not:  
Sex..... Religion..... Race..... Age.....  
Occupation.....  
How long have you lived in or around New York City?.....
6. If your feelings about either Jews or Negroes have changed much, we would like to learn more about it. We are especially interested in any experiences that may have influenced you one way or another. Would you be willing to let someone come to talk with you?  
Check—.....Yes.....No.  
Comment .....
- Name (Needed if you are willing to  
give an interview) .....  
Address: .....



*Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude.*

**APPENDIX III**

**PUBLIC OPINION BALLOT**

This is a study of what people think and feel about a number of important social questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others. Whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many other people feel the same way you do. Be sure to answer *every question*.

*Directions: There are four words to the right of each question. Put a circle around the word which shows whether you agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, or disagree. Please answer every question by circling the word which comes closest to your personal opinion.*

- |  |       |                |                   |          |
|--|-------|----------------|-------------------|----------|
| 1. America should have a program of compulsory military training for all young men.  | Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Disagree |
| 2. Labor unions should become stronger and have more influence.  | Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Disagree |
| 3. When a person has a problem or worry it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.                | Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Disagree |
| 4. What this country needs most, more than new laws or political changes, is a few courageous and devoted leaders whom the people can trust. | Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Disagree |
| 5. The Russians are so unco-operative that we are going to have to fight them sooner or later.   | Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Disagree |
| 6. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.                      | Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Disagree |
| 7. The true American way of life is disappearing so fast that force may be necessary to preserve it.   | Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Disagree |
| 8. In general, I believe we do not have enough discipline in our American manner of life.  | Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Disagree |

*Jeanne Watson*

### APPENDIX III (continued)

9. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped or worse.	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree
10. The world is a hazardous place in which men are basically evil and dangerous.	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree
11. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree
12. No Communist should be allowed to remain a citizen of this country.	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree
13. I am more afraid of swindlers than of gangsters.	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree
14. Young people today are much "wilder" than they used to be.	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree

\* \* \*

### BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

JEANNE WATSON graduated from Antioch College in 1942, obtained her M.A. from Columbia in 1948, and is now doing graduate work at the University of Michigan. While in New York she served as secretary for the Research Committee on Intergroup Relations. In 1947-48 she held the position of assistant study director with the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan, and is now associated with the Research Center for Group Dynamics. She served on the research staff of the National Training Laboratory in Bethel, Maine, during the summer of 1949.