CHAPTER I
No other problem in Social Psychology has received more attention than this problem of social attitudes since 1920. It is looked upon as a central important problem for social psychology. The net product of the socialisation process is the formation of the social attitudes among individuals. In interaction with other persons and groups in dealing with the cultural products in all these, we see the influence of social attitudes. In the last 60 years, considerable work has been done in research regarding the formation, the change and the measurement of social attitudes. Psychologists and sociologists find in social attitudes a meeting point for discussion and research. The concept of social attitudes and beliefs virtually established itself as the keystone in the edifice of social psychology.

As observed by some social scientists, among modern social psychologists there is a general consensus about their subject of study and investigation. There may be slight differences in terminology used by them, but they all agree that social psychology is the study of the behaviour of individuals in relation to other individuals or groups. L. G. Brown (1944) in his Social Pathology stresses that it "studies the unique experience of the person as his organism and social
heritages interact to produce human nature. The social psychologist is not interested in each of the two heritages by itself but in the human nature which results from the interaction of both. Murphy, Murphy and Newcomb (1931) in their Experimental Social Psychology think that social psychology is concerned with a process by which the individual organism becomes socialized, utilizes and expresses social patterns in the world about him, builds within himself the attitude and outlooks which characterize the family and neighbourhood groups, participates in community life, and leaves his small or large impress upon the personality patterns of those with whom he comes in contact. Muzafer Sherif (1960) in his book on 'An Outline of Social Psychology' writes that it deals with the experience and behaviour of the individual in relation to the social stimulus situations. Interpersonal relationships, group interactions and their products, values or norms, language, art forms, institutions and technology are certainly among the major social stimuli or stimulus situations. Kimball Yong (1963) in his 'Handbook of Social Psychology' says that it is concerned with the study of the interactional processes of human beings. S. S. Sargent (1953) in his 'Social Psychology' writes that it is the scientific study of persons as members of groups with emphasis on their social or interpersonal relationships. Thus recent social psychologists have attempted/combined the 'individual approach' and the 'social approach' and to integrate the psychological and sociological-anthropological points of view as well as materials.
There are three major trends in modern social psychology.

In the first place with the increasing impact of cultural anthropology on this field it is being more and more clearly realized that a better and fuller understanding of individual behaviour, product of social attitudes, is possible if its study is made in the context of a variety of cultures and social organizations. A comparative study of personality in different cultures will yield a fuller and richer picture of human nature, human personality, human interactions and social attitudes.

Secondly, social psychology is rapidly taking its place alongside other branches of science by the use of experimental techniques. The application of experimental methods to group data is growing and descriptions and analyses of social behaviour are consequently becoming more accurate. This will be dealt with under varied topics of discussion in social psychology. Thirdly, social psychology is rapidly becoming an applied science to solve, for example the problem of improving human relations and modifying social attitudes through varied techniques of persuasion. By studying group dynamics, interactional processes and social attitudes, it can improve morale and production in industry, interrelation between capital and labour, diagnose and remove causes of indiscipline in educational institutions, reduce communal tensions in society, lessen intergroup prejudices and contribute to international understanding and peace ultimately.

In fact, several writers, viz. Bogardus (1931), Thomas and Znaniecki (1918), Folson (1931), define social psychology as the scientific study of attitudes. We see that a social attitude being important in the person's schema has the essential earmark
of a motive. Such an attitude sets the person for or against events, persons or things; defines what is preferred, expected, and desired, marks off what is undesirable, what is to be avoided. In terms of its consequences in the person's behaviour, an attitude is goal-directed. An attitude develops from the kind of feeling tone that habitually is associated with a person, events, situation, a condition or a thing.

NATURE OF ATTITUDES

Social psychologists have shown keen interest in the study of attitudes because of the key role that they play in manifestation of social behaviour. As a result of this, a number of studies on formation, modification, manifestation and measurement of social attitudes and social behaviour have been undertaken. Daniel Katz and Egra Stotland (1959) think that attitudes have effective cognitive and behavioural components which involve feelings, emotions, beliefs and action and define them as 'individual's tendencies or predispositions to evaluate objects or symbols of the object in certain ways'. In a given attitude there may be more of one component than another. Some attitudes are heavily loaded with affective component. In such cases, only feelings are expressed without any actions being taken. In case of other attitudes, it becomes difficult to foretell the course of action an individual takes in a certain social situation. When needs are satisfied very easily, in an action-oriented attitude, there is minimum of feelings and beliefs in such attitudes.
Further, each attitude is a result of one cause or the other. However, they can be classified according to value systems. Every group or an institution has a policy of its own. We call it its ideology. It is on beliefs and values that the group has developed that particular ideology, formed its attitudes and determines its action or behavioural pattern.

Next, we are always consistent in our responses to social situations. This sort of consistency in our behaviour helps us to develop a system of attitudes and values. These attitudes and values that we have set help us to decide our course of action, when we are faced with a complicated social situation. We evaluate and interpret particular events that take place around us on the basis of attitudes we have developed and the values we have set. In the absence of such attitudes and values, things appear to be very confusing. Value systems help us to determine how to perceive things. It is rather difficult to distinguish between motive to perceive a thing in a particular way and the perceptual act itself. Our attitudes and values that we conceive depend upon what we have learnt. What we learn depends upon our models to a very great extent. It is very likely that our attitudes and values are just the opposite of what they are in another social group. To chew a pan and spit may be a very a simple and common thing to do for a common man in our society in India, but to a Westerner it might be a social crime. In the same way to go dating may be a very common custom among the adolescents in the West but in an Indian society this becomes a social crime.
As observed by N. N. Shukla (1972) in his book on 'Fundamentals of Social Psychology', attitudes may not always lead to any kind of action directly, but there is always an underlying move behind every behaviour of an individual. Campbell uses the term 'Acquired Behavioural Disposition' instead of the term 'Social Motive' for this. Our behaviour is modified by experience, and while this modification takes place, a certain residue of experience is left over that serves to guide, bias or otherwise influence later behaviour. This residue is what we call 'attitude'.

Thus, an attitude is a specific mental state of the individual towards something according to which his behaviour towards it is moulded. Various authors have defined 'attitude' in various ways with a common thread running through these diverse definitions. Some of these are quoted below:

1. An attitude is readiness for attention or action of a definite sort. — (Baldwin - 1901-1905).

2. Attitudes are literally mental postures, guides for conduct to which each new experience is referred before a response is made. — (Morgan J. J. B. (1934).

3. Attitude — 'the specific mental disposition towards an incoming experience, whereby that experience is modified, or a condition of readiness for a certain type of activity. — Dictionary of Psychology, Warren (1934).

4. An attitude is a complex of feelings, desires, fears, convictions, prejudices or other tendencies that have given a set or readiness to act to a person because of varied experiences. — (Chave - 1928).

5. From the viewpoint of Gestalt Psychology, a change of attitude involves a definite psychological stress, external upon a sensory field by processes originating in other parts of the nervous system. — (Kohler - 1929).
By attitude we understand a process of individual consciousness which determines real or possible activity of the individual counterpart of social value; activity, in whatever form, is the bond between them. (Thomas & Znaniecki - 1918).

The attitude or preparation in advance of the actual response, constitutes an important determinant of the ensuing social behaviour. Such neutral settings, with their accompanying consciousness are numerous and significant in social life. (F. H. Allport - 1924).

An attitude is a mental disposition of the human individual to act for or against a definite object. (Droba - 1933).

An attitude is a disposition to act which is built up by the integration of numerous specific responses of a similar type, but which exists as a general neutral "set" and when activated by a specific stimulus results in behaviour that is more obviously a function of the disposition than of the activating stimulus. (The important thing to note about this definition is that it considers attitudes as broad, genetic determinants of behaviour). (G. W. Allport - 1929).

We shall regard attitudes here as verbalised or verbalisable tendencies dispositions, adjustment towards certain acts. They relate not to the past nor even primarily to the present, but as a rule to the future. Sometimes, of course, it is a hypothetical future. The 'attitude' is primarily a way of being 'set' towards or against things. (Murphy and Murphy - 1931).

It is not difficult to trace the common thread running through these diverse definitions. In one or another, each regards the essential future of attitude as a preparation or readiness for response. The attitude is incipient and preparatory rather than overt and consummatory. It is not behaviour, but the preconditions of behaviour. It may exist in all degrees of readiness from the most latent, dormant traces of forgotten habits to the tension or motion which is actively determining a course of conduct that is under way.
It is not easy to construct a definition sufficiently broad to cover the many kinds of attitudinal determination which psychologists today recognize. The definitions considered above contain helpful suggestions, and yet none alone is entirely satisfactory. The chief drawback of most of them seems to be their failure to distinguish between attitudes, which are often very general, and habits, which are always limited in their scope. Yet the following definition has the merit of including recognized types of attitudes: the Aufgabe, the quasi-need the Beunachtigung, interest and subjective value, prejudice, beliefs, stereotypes and even the broadest conception of all, the philosophy of life. It excludes those types of readiness which are expressly innate, which are bound rigidly and invariably to the stimulus, which lack flexibility, and which lack directionality and reference to some external or conceptual object. In light of this the following definitions deserve merit:

(1) An attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organised through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related.
   " (Martin Fishbein - 1967).

(2) More specifically: an attitude can be defined as an enduring organisation of motivational, emotional, perceptual and cognitive processes with respect to some aspect of the individual's world.
   " (David Krech and Richard S. Crutchfield - 1948).

**DIMENSIONS OF ATTITUDES**

From above discussion of analysis and definitions of attitudes it follows that attitudes can be said to have the following dimensions: (i) the direction, (ii) intensity or
strength, (iii) centrality, and (iv) salience, and (v) consistency.

(1) **Direction**: The items in the attitude scales have options like 'like-dislike', 'agree-disagree', or 'yes-no', and so on. Thus, they tell us whether they are for or against a person, object or an event, and indicate the direction of the attitude.

(ii) **Intensity or strength**: Intensity or strength is much important as its direction. Directions indicate the feelings for or against a person, object or event, but it is equally important to know the strength of those feelings, that are involved in the expression. This is done by indicating one's position on a graded scale of values. The respondent has to select a statement from an array whose intensity may range from 'strong to weak' or 'very strong to very weak'. Thus, the respondent tells us whether his feelings about the target of the attitude are strong, weak or neutral (nothing to say about).

(iii) **Centrality**: Centrality of the attitude is sometimes the aim of the measurement. We want to find out whether it is close to the centre of the system of the attitudes and values that are highly significant to the welfare and goals of the individual or whether it is only a marginal one. Here, all aspects of affection, cognition and behaviour are involved. Attitudes that are strongly held are usually central. They are usually supported by the beliefs and provide motives for an action.
(iv) **Salience**: Salience is the degree to which an attitude is given prominence by its holder. It is closely related to the centrality and the intensity of the attitude. It is the degree with which an attitude is visible, however, all attitudes are not prominently visible.

(v) **Consistency**: Consistency means the extent to which various attitudes and attitude systems fit together and are related. Attitudes can be measured in terms of this consistency also. The attitude that one has towards an institution, such as, the political party, is generally consistent with the attitude towards the persons associated with that particular institution. There is usually a tendency to have a degree of consistency among all the attitudes held by an individual, with respect to any one issue or a group of common related issues. For example, if a person has a conservative attitude towards social customs, he will be also having a conservative attitude towards the issue of marriage system, as is studied in the present investigation.

**ATTITUDE FORMATION AND MODIFICATION**

Formation or change of an attitude is not self-generating. An attitude is not formed in thin air. It is formed in relation to an object, a person, a group, an institution, an issue, a value or norm through exposure to them in inter-personal relations, in group relations, in communications from newspaper, radio, television, book, poster and like. Also individual's own selectivity, largely determined by his existing motives and attitudes has to be considered as well.
In attitude formation and change we have to study both internal and external factors in an interrelated way. Among the internal factors are existing attitudes and other motives relevant to the object, person, issue or communication to which the individual is exposed or exposes himself. For external factors specific analysis of person's point of view, stand represented in the stimulus material, who represents it, the form of presentation, the medium through which it is presented, the social context at the time etc. The external factors in development of social attitudes include also the organismic factors, such as, sex, age, or even generation gap as well as the socio-cultural and environmental factors, such as, the family influence, peer group, society, religious and political groups, education or training, socio-economic status, cultural or caste background, etc., some of which have been studied in the present investigation.

From the last 20 years there has been a wide spread interest in actively modifying the attitudes of people within the country and towards people in other countries. Groups within the country, as observed by B. Kappuswamy (176), as well as the government are engaged in changing the attitudes of people towards the various problems in the country. In the United States, during 1930, Roosevelt brought about a big change in the attitudes of the people towards workers as well as farmers because of the measures he took to counteract the disastrous economic consequences of 'depression'. Similarly, the labour party of Great Britain brought about vast changes among the people
towards the problems of working classes. In India, Gandhiji undertook the enormous task of changing the attitudes of the millions of people who were either apathetic or actually frightened of the British sovereignty. He adopted several techniques to let the Indians develop an attitude favourable to 'Swaraj' and 'Democracy' and against the foreign rule. At the same time, he tried to change the attitudes of the British so that they became favourable to end colonialism and unfavourable to the use of violence against unarmed Satyagrahis. Further, he tried to change the attitude of the Hindus so that they became favourable towards the Muslims, the Harijans and other minority groups. Similarly, he tried to change the attitudes of Muslims so that they became favourable towards Hindus. It is needless to list all the various changes which Gandhiji brought about in the political, social, economic, religious, educational and other fields. It is by changing our attitudes so thoroughly and so pervasively that Gandhiji was able to build up a nation which has weathered all the difficulties in the years since the attainment of the country's Independence. Many attempts today in our country are being made to change the attitude of the farmers and peasants so that they take up to new methods of agriculture, chemical manures, cattle breeding, cooperative societies, etc. Similarly, attempts are being made to change the attitudes of the industrialists so that they work, not only for their own profit, but also for the well-being and economic prosperity of the country. The Government is also making varied efforts to change the social structure, to introduce varied reforms in the society and attempts to solve various problems in the society and the country at large through various techniques.
Much research work has been done through different techniques of persuasion and propaganda or mass media of communication to change or modify attitudes (Saryu 1984, Yagnik 1985, and others). The impacts of various techniques of communication, persuasion, influence and social change with respect to communal harmony and national integration has been also pointed out by Patel (1978) in his presidential address at the Section of Psychology and Educational Sciences at Bhubaneshwar.

**THE DISTINGUISHING FEATURES OF ATTITUDES**

An attitude which determines the characteristics or a consistent mode of behaviour in relation to a particular aspect of the environment is an internal factor. Sherif has given a few criteria which help to differentiate attitudes as internal factors from other internal factors or processes, such as, belief, opinion, values, etc. According to Sherif, the following are the distinguished features of attitudes (1956).

(i) Attitudes are not innate. They are formed or learnt by the individual as he grows up in the group. Consequently attitudes are not biogenic thought they are based on the biogenic motives. The children in the South, and in other predominantly rice-eating parts of India, have to change their attitudes towards wheat consumption, and this can be done if parents induce such attitudes in the children from childhood.

(ii) Attitudes are more or less lasting and enduring. But they are not immutable and are subject to change. As observed in the earlier paragraphs on 'Attitude Formation and Modification',
attitudes vary with the socio-cultural factors and can be modified through adequate techniques of attitude change.

(iii) Attitudes imply a subject-object relationship. Attitudes are always formed in relation to certain persons, groups, objects or institutions or events. Attitudes are not just internal factors without any relationship with the external factors. They can arise only in relation to some aspects of the environment.

(iv) Attitudes involve individuals as well as the groups. For example, most of the Muslims in India, Pakistan and elsewhere seem to be entertaining unfavourable attitude towards Hindus, and similarly, most of the Hindus show unfavourable attitude to the Muslims. Thus, our social attitudes may encompass not only individuals but also groups, small as well as large. There is a process of generalisation and consequently all the out-groups are looked upon as aggressive, dishonest and so on by the in-group members. This feature seems to be an important factor determining the social behaviour.

(v) Attitudes have motivational-affective properties. Attitudes are learnt. Unlike other learnt items an attitude is goal-oriented with positive or negative quantum of affect and direction.
Attitudes are shared by the members of a group. They are formed in relation to social situations. The norms and values of a group are internalised through the formation of attitudes.

COMPONENTS OF ATTITUDES

As observed earlier, an attitude is conceived of having three components:

(a) a cognitive component of belief - described by the person's categorisations and the relationships between categories,

(b) an affective component or evaluation of belief - described by the way a person evaluates the objects which are included in a particular category, and

(c) a behavioural component which reflects the behavioural intentions of the person toward the objects included in a particular category.

FUNCTIONS OF ATTITUDES:

Why do people have attitudes? The reason is because attitudes:

(1) help them to understand the world around them, by organizing and simplifying a very complex input from their environment,
(ii) protect their self-esteem by making it possible for them to avoid unpleasant truths about themselves,

(iii) help them to adjust in a complex world, by making it more likely that will react so as to maximize their rewards from the environment, and

(iv) allow them to express their fundamental values.

This approach involves the so-called "functional analysis of attitudes" because it is concerned with the functions performed by attitudes "in the economy of personality". (Major theorists are Smith -1947, Smith, Bruner and White - 1956, Katz and Stotland - 1959, and Katz - 1960, in this connection).

SOCIAL ATTITUDES AND SOCIAL BELIEFS

Each one of us has developed a number of attitudes and beliefs in the course of one's life and experience. Some of these attitudes or beliefs are personal, others are social. My attitude towards replying to letters, towards my mother, my college and so on may be quite peculiar to me and personal. Such attitudes are my private affair. But there are attitudes and beliefs which I share with members of my group or even with a large number of people outside my group. These are social attitudes or social beliefs. My attitude/belief with reference to socialism, disarmament, economic planning, widow remarriage, social customs and reforms, etc. may be shared by others in my country and even outside it. They are social attitudes and concern a large number of other individuals. Leaders in political life, in business and
in administration must know how widely and strongly these social attitudes are held. Some of these attitudes or beliefs are not given any importance. What is the attitude of people towards their mothers, teachers, and railway property, honesty or corruption in their own personal life are not significant socially till there is a large-scale flouting of the authority of the parents by the teenagers, widespread corruption in all areas of work, frequent indiscipline and unrest and strikes in educational institutions and railway property being pilfered or damaged on a large scale. Social attitudes concern objects, situations, issues and problems known to the members of a group or a society, their research study and assessment are of much practical benefit to the society.

Such attitudes may be positive or negative depending on whether they provoke behaviour that is acquisitive or avertive, favourable or unfavourable, affirmative or negative toward the object or class of objects with which it is related. This double polarity in the direction of attitudes is often regarded as their most distinctive feature.

BELIEFS AND ATTITUDES

In order to make analytic use of beliefs and attitudes in the study of man's social behaviour, we must know not only their functional values for the individual and the way they display themselves in the momentary behaviours we call judgments, but also know many of their other characteristics. Since beliefs and attitudes are enduring organizations in the psychological
field, it is to be expected that the characteristics of beliefs and attitudes will be similar to those of perceptual organizations. However, there is some advantages in rephrasing those characteristics so as to make them directly applicable to these higher order structures. In addition we shall find that certain characteristics apply only to these higher order organizations.

The characteristics of beliefs and attitudes can be grouped into four categories: (i) referring to the nature of the objects involved (i.e., in kind of content), (ii) referring to the nature of the cognitive structure involved (i.e., in precision and specificity), (iii) referring to the strength and importance of the beliefs or attitude, and (iv) referring to the characteristic of verifiability.

On the basis of last characteristic of verifiability social psychologists refer to belief in terms of 'knowledge', 'faith' and 'opinion'. Thus, those beliefs which the individual conceives of as being verifiable and verified he refers to as knowledge. He believes (i.e., has knowledge) that an unsupported body will fall, because he has observed this phenomenon repeatedly in his own experience. Those beliefs of the individual which he himself recognises as intrinsically unverifiable are referred to as matters of faith. Thus, he believes (i.e., has faith) that an omnipresent, all-knowing God exists, although he himself may never, in the very nature of his conceptions about God, 'prove' the validity of his belief to his own satisfaction. Somewhere intermediate on the scale of verifiability are those beliefs we call opinions. Opinions have neither the proved property of
of knowledge nor the intrinsically unverifiable property of faith. From the point of view of the individual, calling his belief an opinion is a recognition on his part that the belief is still to be verified. It is also a recognition that other people may entertain other opinions, about the same object and that the relative validity of the various beliefs (or opinions) is not yet fully determined. When, for the individual, the opinion is verified, then it becomes a matter of knowledge; when it is accepted completely without verification and he no longer recognizes that opposite opinions may be just as valid, then his former opinion becomes a matter of faith. Although, all three of these are beliefs and as such will play a determining role in man's social behaviour, nevertheless it is important to know whether any specific belief is a matter of knowledge, faith or opinions. They will affect man's behaviour differentially, and the proper methods of changing them will vary according to which type of belief is involved.

ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS

As noted above, an opinion, according to common usage, is a judgment or belief based on grounds short of proof, provisional conviction founded on probable evidence. There are several kinds of beliefs some are held with conviction because of the authority on which they are based, and some are based on true knowledge. But there are other beliefs which concern about a controversial issue, and these are opinions. Opinions arise when our reactions to an issue have to be varied. Take for example,
the problem of family planning. Some of us may go all out for it, others may express themselves totally against it, still others may wish the programme to be postponed till people are better or more educated. These are opinions. An opinion is not a sentiment for a sentiment is an emotional disposition related to some object or situation. There is nothing controversial about the object of a sentiment while an opinion involves an element of controversy. The distinction between an attitude and an opinion is sometimes indicated by saying that the former is a tendency to act and behave and the latter is a verbal expression of it. And sometimes the enduring and lasting character of attitudes is contrasted with the variable and transient character of opinions. The former approach will place opinions as verbal counterparts or expressions of attitudes while the latter will define opinions as less significant than attitudes. The relation is not very accurately defined and the distinction seems to be arbitrary. In other words, the concept 'attitude' refers to the sum total of a person's inclinations, prejudices, ideas, fears, convictions about any specific topic - person, situation, event, object, etc. Opinions are verbal expressions of attitudes.

SUPERSTITIONS, DELUSIONS, PREJUDICES AND STEREOTYPES

The confusion that must follow from describing psychological processes (beliefs) in terms of objective analysis (facts) has resulted in the misunderstanding of the significance of many different so-called types of beliefs - superstitions, delusions, prejudices and stereotypes.
What we call 'Superstitious beliefs' are those which (a) have been demonstrated to be at variance with the objective facts; (b) are likely to be shared among many members of a society; and (c) frequently involved a disposition to ascribe phenomena that admit of a natural explanation to such occult or super-natural cause as 'fate', 'luck', and the 'devil'. It should be noted that, as stated, the concept is essentially an objective and statistical one, stressing as it does the fact of incidence in a society of a set of erroneous beliefs and measuring them by such cultural phenomena as the commercialization of 'charms', hotels with missing thirteenth floors, dream books for lottery games, etc. From a purely psychological point of view, such beliefs are not unique. Superstitious beliefs admit of the same description and the same explanation as all others types of beliefs - knowledge, faith, opinion. That they are set off by a special name is largely the result of the viewing of them by an external observer. As such, they may be useful for certain sociological analysis, but not for psychological analysis. A so-called primitive who treasures his own toe-nail clippings for fear they will fall into the possession of other people who will then be able to harm him, may not regard this belief as of a different order from his belief (knowledge, or faith or opinion, as the case may be) that if he eats of a certain poisonous fruit, he will die. And a farmer who plants his potato crop in the moonlight considers this precautions no more peculiar than rotation of crops. He may 'know' both to be valid - he may have observed the poorness of neighbour's crop and remembers that his neighbour planted it in the day time.
Delusions are deeply rooted, often morbid beliefs and attitudes which depart widely from the objective facts. But here again, as with superstitions, these delusions are explicable in the same psychological terms as other forms of beliefs and attitudes. To the external observer it may sometimes seem incredible that a person can entertain a strong belief or attitude that serves to govern a great part of his behaviour; a belief that he is a subject of a plot, that people are out to get him, that he is being constantly followed, that he is a victim of planned persecution, when as far as the external observer can judge, this belief is entirely unfounded on fact. Yet from the perspective of the deluded person himself, such a deep-seated belief is confirmed by his perceptions. He loses his job; his friends fail to invite him to a party; there are always people behind him when he walks along the street, but when he looks closely at them, they pretend to pay no attention to him; and when he sits in a restaurant, he observes people whispering about him. And sometimes these people are all 'communists' or 'harijans' or 'Brahmins' conspiring together. All these perceptions are 'facts and obviously go to support his firm conviction that he is indeed the victim of a plot.

Strictly speaking, prejudice means pre-judgment; a man who has prejudices has beliefs that are established prior to the revelation of the pertinent objective facts and that by their strength tend to predetermine the way in which new perceptions will emerge. But in a very nature of the case, all beliefs partake to some degree of prejudice. It could not
be otherwise. Commonly in social psychology, the term prejudice is used more specifically to refer to attitudes and beliefs that serve to place the objects of the attitudes and beliefs at an advantage or disadvantage. For example, the notion of prejudiced beliefs and attitudes stress the consistent direction of the discrepancy between objective and perceived facts. When people are 'prejudiced' against the women or the harijans, it means that the perceptions they have about the women or the Harijans will tend to deviate in an unfavourable direction from the objective facts. In any event, their prejudices, psychologically considered, must be understood like all beliefs to be matters of knowledge, faith or opinion and not something psychologically unique.

The concept of stereotype, which has been influential in the thinking of many social scientists, refers to two different things: (a) it may refer to a tendency for a given belief to be widespread in a society. This is a sociological and statistical concept and can be illustrated by the studies that count the number of people who believe, for example, that blondes are less intellectual than brunettes or that workers are more honest than capitalists, and (b) the concept may refer to a tendency for a belief to be oversimplified in content and unresponsive to the objective facts. This is a psychological concept. But as we have seen, all organizations show the levelling and sharpening effects and therefore, all beliefs are to some extent stereotypes.

From the point of view of the psychologists, superstitions, delusions, prejudices and stereotypes are matters of knowledge, faith or opinion and must be understood and analyzed as such.
Some social psychologists (Shukla, 1972) have pointed out that attitudes cannot be measured directly, but can be inferred from one’s behaviour. This behaviour is in the form of responses to a situation, event or an object. It can be measured through the evaluation remarks and verbal expression of a person. It is rather very difficult to observe the absence of an individual in any direct and systematic way, though at times there is no alternative left besides this when we want to find out as to what is its significance to the individual concern. However, if such judgments are based on individual’s oral or written statements, the task becomes easier and more systematic. This can be done by interviewing the individual, but the use of paper-pencil tests and questionnaires make it more precise, simpler and systematic. In spite of some disadvantages, the social psychologists have given their preference to the paper-pencil instruments for measuring attitudes/beliefs/opinions because of some obvious advantages that it has. Through such questionnaires, a great deal of information is collected in a short time. The instrument can be refined and expanded to a very high degree. The data collected can be easily analysed statistically.

An attitude involves belief or disbelief, acceptance or rejection and favouring or not-favouring some aspects of the environment. In order to measure attitude, scales have been constructed consisting of short statements dealing with several aspects of some issue or institution under consideration. The
statements involved favourable or unfavourable estimations, acceptance or rejection. Consequently, the central problem of the measurement of attitudes is the scaling of test items. It is presumed that a series of statements can be made which serve as the marks of a yardstick for the measurement of attitudes. Each statement will represent a specified degree of acceptance or rejection of a belief or attitude. Further, these statements have been to be equally spaced throughout the entire range of attitude continuum from complete acceptance of a belief to its complete rejection or a continuum from strong agreement to strong disagreement with the attitude or belief. Several techniques have been developed for measuring or scaling attitudes. Some major ones have been summarised below:

**Thurstone’s method**

L. L. Thurstone developed more systematic and refined instruments between 1929 and 1931 with the aid of E. J. Chave and others. These were scales for the measurement of opinions and beliefs of groups of individuals concerning a variety of issues, such as, war, church, negroes, capital punishment, birth control and so on. These scales later came to be known as ‘Thurstone’s equal appearing interval scales’, which are constructed using specific attitude statements, given specific value following specific methodology, described in any book on techniques of measuring attitudes (Edwards, 1957). While preparing such scales it is essential that following precautions are taken: The wording of every statement should be distinct, definite and clear. The number of judges evaluating each statement
should be large enough to indicate clearly the position which should be given to the opinion expressed. It should comprise of those statements over which there is a complete unanimity among the judges.

**Likert method of Summated Rating**

In 1932, Rensis Likert developed a different type of scale for measuring attitudes of human groups regarding imperialism, internationalism, and Negroes. The main steps involved in the construction of such a type of scale are as follow:

A number of single statements related to the person, object or situation, the attitude towards which is to be studied, are prepared or/and collected. They are then presented to the respondent; but instead of merely asking him whether he agrees or disagrees with the statements, he is asked to choose any one of the five following alternatives, viz., (i) strongly agree, (ii) agree, (iii) undecided, (iv) disagree, and (v) strongly disagree. Sometimes, he is given a scale of only three options, viz., (i) approve, (ii) undecided, and (iii) disapprove. These alternatives are awarded 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 points (if positive statement) or 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 points (if negative statement), as the interpretation may be, on a five-point scale or 3, 2, 1 on a three-point scale. The statements are then submitted to a group of respondents to respond and select the alternative according to their feelings for each of the items. The results are then submitted to statistical analysis, where items that have
the highest \textit{item} correlation with the total score on all the items taken together are retained, eliminating the others including the items which have negative correlations. The purpose of the procedure is to obtain a group of items which measure the same attitude or a complex of attitudes. This results in a very high degree of internal consistency. This in turn shows significant difference between those who have developed positive or favourable attitudes and those who have developed negative or unfavourable attitudes. The present author has followed this Likert's Scale to study the attitudes on beliefs of individuals towards some social issues under the study.

\textbf{Guttman's Scale}

Luis Guttman introduced another method for measuring in 1950. He developed this method while studying the level of morale among American soldiers. Guttman's Scale possesses the following main elements:

Any affirmative answer to any one of the statements assumes an affirmative answer to all the others ranging below it on the scale. The questions concerning any one problem have to vary in such a manner as to determine that the opinion of the respondent is always consistent. Hence the constructor of the scale has to determine carefully whether any statement can be shown on the scale or not. While phrasing the statements which have to be pretested to determine whether it satisfies this criteria, care has to be taken to see that the consistency of every statement is determined on a 'Specially prepared Scialogram'. The
The resulting instrument is said to be highly reliable and consistent. However, Guttman's scale has been bitterly criticised by Festinger (1947).

Semantic Differential Scale

This is one more type of scale for measuring attitudes. The respondent here is required to rate a person, an object or an event on the number of bi-polar scales, such as, good-bad, hot-cold, etc. The method has been used for measuring effective aspects of the meanings of words.

Free Response Techniques:

There are many other techniques which can be put under the category of 'Free Response Techniques'. They are either instruments using paper-and-pencil or are verbal in nature. The techniques are mostly used for getting information on highly significant attitudes that respondents conceal if more direct forms of questions are used. For example, if one has some problem in love-affairs, he or she would not come forth to give out but if a direct question is put, but in such a case if a suitable film is shown or is discussed, the respondent will easily say that the whole problem is that of love affairs which then makes further investigation possible. The greatest advantage of such method is that respondent here is allowed to mention freely some salient attitudes which otherwise would perhaps be misused by the investigator. There are some disadvantages of this method also. Here, it is rather difficult to score and the results do not possess the high degree of statistical precision.
Method of Rating Scale

Another quite different approach to the measurement of beliefs and attitudes is the method of rating, in which the quantification of the belief, belief or attitude is based upon the judgment of an expert or an interviewer. The sources of data for rating are various, such as, (i) non-verbal behaviour towards the object, (ii) verbal statements relating to object, (iii) secondary expressive cues, (iv) responses in clinical type interviews, (v) personal documents, (vi) responses on projective tests, (vii) immediate experience, etc. Self-ratings are again uniquely important, but they may be especially susceptible to biasing effects due to needs, subjective frame of reference, etc.

The Rank-Order Method

For comparisons of the relative negativity or positivity of attitude or opinion toward a set of similar objects, such as nationalities, political ideologies, it is possible to employ this method. By this method the individual ranks the objects from most favoured or approved to least favoured, or approved. This method is particularly useful when it is desired to obtain relative attitudes or opinions among a whole set of objects. This method is limited to cases that permit such a meaningful ranking of a number of comparable objects.
Method of Paired Comparisons

This method is related to the method of rank-order. In this method the individual makes a series of judgments as to the relative favour, approval or agreement of a number of objects taken in a pair at a time. The subject would require a judgment of which of the two is held in higher favour.

Behavioural Measures - Actions and Clues to Attitudes

Over and above the self-report measures, it is often possible to learn much about the attributes of others by observing their behaviours. Sometimes individual's attitudes are revealed through their actions in a very obvious and dramatic manner. For instance, they may join various demonstrations, picket their employees, attend political rallies at which they shout their approval or rejection of various candidates, or donate large amount of money to causes their support. Even if they do not reveal their feelings in such a dramatic ways, however, much can be learned from careful study of their actions. They might reveal their true reactions through subtle cues as facial expressions, body position or posture and expressive gestures.

The notion that other's emotions are often revealed in their facial expressions is far from new. Shakespeare in his famous play Macbeth wrote lines "your face is a book where man may read strange matters." On the physiological basis, attitudes can be observed. Cooper (1969) and Woodmansee (1970) have obtained positive findings in their experiments.
The concept of "Social distance" was utilised by the sociologist Park in dealing with the observed fact that the relative intimacy and understanding between members of a given group and members of other groups vary. On this basis, Bogardus developed social-distance scale with his observations that individuals could rank various groups in terms of friendliness or antipathy; he devised a list of statements representing varying degree of social intimacy or distance and asked the subjects to mark those classifications to which they would willingly admit members of a given group. The statements were:

1. To close kinship by marriage,
2. To my club as personal chums,
3. To my street as neighbours,
4. To employment in my occupation,
5. To citizenship in my country,
6. As visitors only of my country,
7. Would exclude from my country.

These categories were listed across the top of the form and on one side list of 39 national and ethnic groups was given. The subjects' task was to mark the statements he considered appropriate for each group. Then the ratings can be ranked in descending order to give a picture of social distance for that group towards various out groups.

Social scientists use this scale widely to check social-distance on friendship or prejudice toward various groups.
PROBLEMS IN THE INTERPRETATION AND USE OF ATTITUDE SCALE

While interpreting and using various attitude scales, it is necessary to consider certain problems involved in it, viz.: the equality of units on the scales, the zero point of the scales, the unidimensionality of the scale. The Thurstone Scale attempts to ensure equality of units on the scale by having the original judges make their judgments in terms of equal-appearing intervals. But no scale can be assumed to have real equality of units; hence care must be taken in the manipulation and interpretation of scale scores. The zero-point of a scale is the place where no attitude exists or where the opinion is either entirely neutral or is nonexistent. The zero-point cannot be determined unambiguously from the scale itself. One independent method of establishing the zero-point is to locate it at the point on the scale where the intensity of feeling of the certainty of opinion is to a minimum. To be most useful, scales should be unidimensional, i.e., they should measure only one attitude or opinion at a time. Many attitude scales fail to be unidimensional and include within them irrelevant and confusing sources of variation. Scales should be simplified and purified until they are unidimensional and measure only the psychological object to which they are supposed to pertain.