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Social change is an incontestable feature of cultural reality. It is another thing that its pace varies from age to age, culture to culture, and from one area of culture to that of another. For a variety of reasons the pace of social change has been rather slow in earlier cultures, chief reasons being: the hold of authoritarianism, religion, illiteracy etc. With the

1 "Based on the finds in stone work the development of material culture of the Chellean period to the Acheulean and the Acheulean to the Monsterian required an interval of about 25000 years each.... From Neolithic times to the historic period on, the changes in material culture have been much more rapid. At the present time both the change and the accumulation of material culture are quite rapid and may be measured in such brief intervals as generations or even decades." W.F. Ogburn, Social Change (New York: Viking Press, 1922), pp. 73-79.

2 "In static societies relatively few social changes will occur over a period of several generations. Here one discovers no awareness or expectation of change and therefore no attitude towards it. In Western Europe and America, on the other hand, technological, economic and social changes have been accelerating in the last few hundred years." S.S. Sargent & R.C. Williamson, Social Psychology (New York: Ronald, 1956), p. 509.

3 "The ancient Greeks made great contributions to art and learning but little to technology.... No society has been equally dynamic in all aspects, and its values determine in which area art, music, warfare, technology, philosophy or religion -- it will be inventive." P.B. Horton and C.L. Hunt, Sociology (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), p. 463.
decline of authoritarianism and religion and with the rise of science, technology and industry with the attendant fast means of communication and travel, the process of social change has been accelerated. Rounds of political revolutions beginning with the French revolution have culminated in giving a filip to the forces of freedom and democracy, thus pushing forward social and political change.

Not in all societies is social change equally controlled. In some cultures it comes about when people are hardly prepared for it or even conscious of its significance. By and large, it is given only to a few persons of understanding who can comprehend the process of social change and put forward a plan for its manipulation. Since it brings in its train new ways of life threatening the old ones, it constitutes quite a problem to a mass of people who are pitchforked in a certain way of life. If, therefore, a radical social change is imposed on or sweeps a culture, the people are likely to become tension-ridden, for they cannot readily adjust themselves to the new patterns. That is why perhaps, "Societies revere the old and fear the new or the unknown. The history of attempts at a repression of ideas is a long one. Its pages are dotted with figures of martyrs, inquisitors, torturers,"
fanatics and bearers of false witness. 4

In order to have controlled social change to the extent possible in contradistinction to the run-away one, it is important that more and more of the population understand the process of social change and involve themselves in it consciously and meaningfully. In advanced countries the chances of promoting and controlling social change are high on account of the comparative absence of the forces of resistance to social change. Comparatively, the significance of social change in these countries is either built into the structure of education or becomes a part of conscious national goals. In the developing countries however, social change comes limping owing to cultural anaemia. To remedy the social pathology of developing countries, including India, it is very essential to fully grasp the cultural bases of a particular country and to be able to relate them to new forces. In particular it is profitable to recognize in proper proportion and perspective, the factors that resist and accelerate social change.

Amongst the prominent factors that resist social change, mention may be made of a few: inertia, fear of the new, ignorance, traditions, ethnocentrism,

vested interests etc. Psychologically, the resistance to social change is understandable, for one has to change the entire personality outfit; which is most difficult if one has not prepared himself for it. To be sure, it is the whole set of attitudes and values that is threatened with new modes of culture, and since this constitutes a serious violence to the individual's identity and security, it is at any rate initially resisted. The fate of any new idea or innovation, its acceptance or rejection, would primarily depend on the attitudes the people hold. As Dube too, writing on the goals of change says, "...endeavour will have to be made to inculcate a set of attitudes and values, that are conducive to economic development and modernization."

"The average American who usually takes a coldly rational, thoroughly unsentimental view of economic activities, finds it hard to appreciate the sentiments and values of non-Western people. He is irritated by Biaga of Central India, who refused to give up their primitive digging sticks for the far superior Moldboard plow. Why? The Biaga loved the earth as kindly generous mother; they would gently help her with the digging stick

---

to bring forth her yield, but could not bring themselves to cut her with knives.  

"The American is annoyed by Ettawah Indians' unwillingness to adopt green manuring.... But to this Indian, green manuring involves a very cruel act of plowing under the sanhemp leaf of stalk before they are ripe. This act involves violence."  

"To us change seems normal and most Westerners pride themselves upon being progressive and up-to-date. By contrast the Tobriand Islanders off the coast of New Guinea have no concept of change and do not even have any words in their language to express or describe change."

It follows therefore that so long as people's attitudes remain rigid, social change hardly issues, or if it does come through imposition or imitation, it is not assimilated and remains foreign to the mass of people, thus causing, as it were, cultural dyspepsia. For example, a wholesale borrowing of finance, knowledge

-----------------------------


and technology by a developing country may not amount to much, if the people have not been led to reconstruct their attitudes and feel the necessity of viable social order. Jacob too, in the foreword of the book on *Indian Villages in Transition* by Sinha aptly says, "Economists emphasize the providing of the necessary inputs to improve the productivity of our agriculture. Rural sociologists and psychologists tell us that in addition to providing the necessary inputs, a social and psychological change should also come about in the rural masses to accept the new methods and tools given to them by our developing technology." 

apparently seems coming, it does not come by so rapidly, because the forces of retardation keep pulling it back. And sometimes when it looks like that any social change is a near impossibility, it comes with a bang, because people were wanting and waiting for an opportunity to shake off the old ways and adopt new ones.

We have seen that conflict in some form or another is an inescapable feature of social change. Some other features of the process of social change may also be identified such as imitation, assimilation, diffusion and acculturation. For example, it is easier for the people of a developing country to imitate the externals such as dress of an advanced country, but it is not as easy for them to develop their social and political ethics. As such, imitation wins at best social change of rather non-significant nature. Consequently, it touches only on the periphery and does not go into the heart of the society. It is another thing that even these changes in the external may lead in the long run to disturbing the settled ways of people, and in collaboration with other factors may bring about significant changes. In any case the fruits of this type of change, if any, lie in the remote future and not in the immediate present.

Discussing the processes of social change,
mention may be made of diffusion, the process whereby a trait spreads from one culture to another. Most of the cultural elements in the societies are the result of such processes as diffusion. Ralph Linton once estimated that no culture owed more than 10% of its total stock to originations made at home. Communities themselves reach out to borrow time-tested fragments traits from many cultures. These, they combine into unique forms to fill their needs. India's constitution derives from the written or unwritten constitutions of Britain, Canada and Ireland, our own bill of rights inspired those sections that cover fundamental rights. Economic, political and religious institutions have travelled far and wide through the process of diffusion, as is also true of conflicting ideologies such as democracy, socialism and communism.

The other process closely related to diffusion is acculturation, which plays a prominent role in bringing social changes. The term acculturation is "... widely accepted among American anthropologists as referring to those changes set in motion by coming together of societies with different cultural traditions. This is generally referred by British anthropologists

as culture contact." In the words of Keesing, "Acculturation may be defined as that process of culture change, in which more or less continuous contact between two or more culturally distinct groups results in one group taking over elements of the culture of the other group or groups. It does refer to one broad type of process through which culture change is accomplished."

Another process closely related to acculturation is assimilation, which has led to many a social change. According to Park and Burgess, "Assimilation is a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons or groups acquire the memories, sentiments and attitudes of other persons or groups, and by sharing their experiences and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life."

The problem of social change which apparently

---


seems to be external is in the final analysis internal, i.e. intimately related to and issuing from the core of human personality. It is, therefore, a study of human personality in its different dimensions in relation of course to the society that is called for. The play of personality on social processes is interesting and dramatic.

Sociological studies of social change do reveal the external factors and the process of social change, but do not throw much light on the dynamics of human personality, that bring to bear on the process itself. There are innumerable releases and inhibitions, both in the conscious and the unconscious mind of an individual, which impede or accelerate social change. It is not possible in this brief study to refer to all the forces of conscious and unconscious mind, bearing on the acceptance or rejection of social change. It will be too unwieldy to go into the whole range of the dynamics of human personality which only in its totality completely answers the phenomena of social change. An attempt has therefore been made to select a small area of personality and study it in relation to attitudes towards social change. The present study is concerned with certain personality correlates of attitudes towards social change.
"The social psychologist has usually approached the empirical study of attitudes with a two-fold objective. One of these has been to describe and/or measure the phenomenon we call an attitude. The second, more interesting psychologically, has been to discover the determinants or correlates of particular attitudes that have proved amenable to description and measurement."

The present study too has the two-fold objective and follows the trait-attitude correlational approach.

Need of the Study

Until the advent of scientific method and rise of social sciences, social problems were not very much recognized, and occasionally taken for granted. At best social issues were dealt with by arm-chair thinkers. As a result, the course of society could not be very much controlled. Whatever direction there was to social process, it was due to a set of certain more or less rigid traditions which themselves were not scientifically examined. Time has come when both in the developing and advanced cultures there is great need to study the factors which retard or accelerate social change. In the developing countries overweighted with age-old and unexamined traditions with the attendant consequences

of confusion and cultural inertia, it is imperative that scientific study be directed to the problem of social change.

In India, we are presently passing through a crucial period of social change as never before. Old social order is being challenged by the new modes of life. Cormack\(^\text{15}\) did research on Indian college and university students' conscious awareness of and attitude towards social change related to "traditional" India becoming "modern". On the basis of her research she concluded that "Social change is taking place more rapidly than most realize." In understanding this confrontation of the old and the new and in solving new and complex problems of our time we have to change our personality outfit considerably. Kuppuswamy and Mehta discussing about the transformation of Indian society from traditional to modern one say, "This involves not only enormous and economic changes but also a basic change in the personality structure of the individual from a dependent to an autonomous person."\(^\text{16}\) "In a country where tradition extending to thousands of years

\[^{15}\text{M.L. Cormack, } \textit{She Who Hides a Peacock} \text{ (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1961), p. 21.}\]

\[^{16}\text{B. Kuppuswamy and P. Mehta, } \textit{Some Aspects of Social Change in India} \text{ (Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1965), p. 1.}\]
of the primitive past are controlling the behavior of the mass, you cannot expect to push the most up-to-date socio-political ideas without changing the existing attitudes and mental make up of people." To the nineteenth century Western observers, the binding force of usage or tradition seemed to be the most remarkable characteristic of Indian society. The Hindu, writes Monier-Williams wonderingly, "... sleeps and wakes, dresses and undresses, sits down and stands up, goes out and comes in, eats and drinks, speaks and is silent, acts and refrains from acting, according to ancient rules."  

Determining as attitudes do our ways of life, they become pivotal to social change. For any new pattern of living would be assimilated in a culture, only if people's attitudes are ripe for it. It is, therefore, of considerable significance that social psychologists should be able to lay bare the attitudes of the people, in order to understand the trends and possibilities in a social process. The formation of attitudes is a result of long process of acculturation.


into which have gone many a complicated factor. As such attitudes cannot be read as a writing on the wall, but have to be deciphered with careful codes of psychology. To be sure, they are not independent sector in human personality, but are inextricably mixed up with the other areas of personality. Emphasizing the close relationship between attitude and personality Murphy writes, "The psychology of attitude begins with the psychology of set, the readiness to move in one direction or another. And since personality is likewise in large measure a matter of readiness to move in one way rather than another, we need to explore the relations between attitude and personality."\(^1^9\) It is essential therefore to attempt to see the relationships of attitudes to other elements of personality. It may be that strongly formed attitudes sometimes overwhelm the personality, but it is perhaps more significant to find that certain personality traits have tremendous influence on the formation of attitudes. Which of the personality traits and to what extent they influence the growth of attitudes, can be revealing of the phenomenon of social change. Taking conservatism-radicalism as important aspect of human personality, it would be both interesting

and instructive to figure out as to which set of traits goes with one or the other.

Many investigators like Adorno et al., McClosky etc., tried to see the relationship between radicalism-conservatism and personality traits. They started with the assumption that radicals and conservatives would differ on various personality traits.

To have an intimate and comprehensive understanding of attitudes, one has to comprehend the intricacies of personality. "Although social psychology may be defined as the study of social behavior, and personality psychology as the study of personal characteristics, psychologists agree that an understanding of personality variables is essential for a meaningful attack on the complexities of social interactions." This view gains strength with the publication of the journals such as, The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology started in 1965 by the American Psychological


As early as 1925, Moore raised the question "Is there such a thing as temperamental predispositions towards conservatism-radicalism? What characteristics of native mental equipment will be found so much stronger or weaker in a group of radicals, as to establish the presumption that amount of these traits have some influence, in disposing a person to bias in one or the other of these directions." McClosky remarked, "Conservatives and liberals are found to be sharply distinguished on clinical-personality variables." Crutchfield formulates the problem, "Assuming that we are indeed measuring conformity tendencies which are fundamental in a person, the question is, what traits of character distinguish between those men exhibiting much conformity behavior in our test and those exhibiting little conformity." Kretch et al. findings


25 McClosky, p. 27.


offer strong support for the proposition, that conformity tendencies are significantly related to enduring personality factors in individual.

In spite of the fact that psychologists have from time to time asserted the relationships of personality traits and attitudes, there have been few studies in this particular area. Compared with the volume of research done in the general field of attitudes, research into this field has been very little. As Stagner says, "It is unfortunate that so few studies have been made correlating attitudes with more general trait measures."\textsuperscript{28} Murphy et al. surveying this field said, "It is remarkable that so little has been learned concerning relationship between attitudes and objective measures of personality. Such personality equations as that, which identify "radicalism" with emotional maladjustment, are commonly asserted but rarely investigated."\textsuperscript{29}

In the view of Adorno et al. "Situational factors, chiefly economic condition and social group membership, have been studied intensively in recent


\textsuperscript{29}G. Murphy et al., \textit{Experimental Social Psychology} (New York: Harper, 1937), p. 94+.
researches on opinion and attitude, while the more inward, more individualistic factors have not received the attention they deserve. Much research remains to be done concerning new patterns of conservatism, concerning the psychological dispositions, making some individuals more receptive to one pattern, others to another.\textsuperscript{30}

Inspired by the singular importance being given to the relationship of attitudes and personality, many researchers on different campuses have seriously started examining personality traits of radicals and conservatives. "It has been assumed that there is radical-conservative distinction measurable and ranging from one extreme to another, with most individuals lying in between. While some research has been done on the question, evidence on several traits seems entirely lacking or else conflicting, so it seems worthwhile to investigate in an objective way."\textsuperscript{31}

There have been few studies in this field during the last 15 to 20 years. But, unfortunately many of these studies yielded contradictory results, leaving the problem of relation of attitude and personality

\textsuperscript{30}Adorno et al., p. 10.  

unsettled. Regarding the contradictory results, Singh says, "Recently many investigators have become interested in personality correlates of conformity behaviour, but so far, the available information is equivocal."32 Sanai33 too supports the above opinion.

There is dire necessity of probing into this area, as few studies that have been done in this area have yielded contradictory results or have failed to find any relationship between attitudes and personality. This lack of relationship was reported by Moore,34 Symington,35 Sanai and Pickard,36 Crown,37 Grace


34Moore, pp. 234-244.


Rubin-Rabson, 38 Appley and Moeller, 39 Sundby, 40 etc. Barocas and Gorlow too say, "A review of the not inconsiderable research literature lends credence to the belief that reliable relationships between individual differences in conformity and individual differences in personality have yet to be demonstrated. Studies of this issue have been equivocal and inconclusive." 41

Though purely on a priori grounds, the likelihood of relation between personality traits and attitudes can be admitted; however the limitations of such relationships have to be kept in mind. Attitude and personality being largely the result of cultural influences, the relation will not be highly invariant or persistent. The possibility of variation of relationship between personality traits from one culture to another is understandable. Every culture has its own


elan, own history, own processes of conditioning socialization, and an overall outlook on life, which together press for certain specific traits within a particular culture. With these traits in all probability go certain attitudes. Murphy et al. write, "Such relations would perhaps differ from culture to culture, so that at best, if found to exist, they would hold good for a particular culture. For a different culture, their nature would probably be different. However this is an interesting problem, which should be investigated empirically. Importance of this field can hardly be exaggerated in political, social and economic life." Libo too doubts the possibility of making generalizations for all cultures saying, "When a correlation is found to exist between a social attitude and a personality trait, the question arises as to the nature of the population, in which the relationship was found and whether the finding can be readily generalized to other populations." Barring a few studies, most of them have been done outside India, from which it is difficult to generalize for Indian population. It is doubtful if

42 Murphy et al., p. 913.
the replication of studies done abroad will yield similar results in India, having a different social and political set up.

In the light of the previous findings, it is evident that some sort of relationship exists between personality traits, conservatism and radicalism. If we want people to be sufficiently receptive to social changes and want to change their conservative attitudes, a thorough analysis of personality is called for. Since the attitudes emanate from certain personality traits in course of socialization, it is these traits which need be manipulated in order to manage the attitudes. If therefore radical attitudes have to be developed in preference to conservative ones, the personality traits will have to be nursed from early stages in that direction.

It is of all the more concern, when investigators have painted a very gloomy picture of conservatives. For example, McClosky in his paper says, "Figures make plain that conservatives tend to score more at the "undesirable" ends of the distribution of personality tests.... The extreme conservatives are easily the most hostile and suspicious, the most rigid and compulsive, the quickest to condemn others for their imperfections or weaknesses, the most intolerant, most easily moved to
scorn, inflexible and unyielding in their perceptions and judgments.... Defensive for their own ego needs... poorly integrated psychologically, anxious, often perceiving themselves as inadequate, they seem inclined to project onto others the traits they most dislike or fear in themselves." 

It goes without saying that to venture into the complicated task of changing attitudes, favorable personality traits have to be developed. For this, it is essential to know as to which personality traits go with radicalism and conservatism respectively.

The knowledge of the foregoing can be profitably plowed back for rearing personalities that would be less resistant to social change. As such the strain of change may be considerably reduced and the pace of change correspondingly stepped up. Even if the situation of a particular culture necessitates putting a brake to the wayward social change, once again the trait of resistance has to be pressed into service with intelligent maneuvering. However, this conditioning and manipulation of traits in the service of desirable social change belongs in another place. The purpose of the present study is a scientific understanding of the relation of personality traits to attitudes towards social change without any value judgment.

McClosky, pp. 37-38.
To be sure, the rate of social change is on the ascendance due to multiple factors referred to earlier. Now, whether man can adapt himself and his social life adequately and in time to changing needs and demands following in the wake of social change is an important issue. It is important not only because it is helpful in the reconstruction of society but also because it can save an individual many an enervating mental disturbance.

It will bear repetition to say that the atomic age is fast causing a traditional way of life to fall out of step with the ever mounting social change. In a traditional society the customs of the people were long enduring and underwent a change only gradually. Consequently the adjustment on the part of the people was never much of a problem. Not only did that give a stability to the society, but also made for better mental health, whatever other deficiencies the society might have been suffering from. But our times are witnessing a speedy process of almost perpetual renovation of culture. As a result the twin problems to be tackled are: how to impart a certain degree of stability to society and how to assure an individual a sense of security and belongingness to the society. Many a thinker has called attention to a situation, when
particularly in highly technological and industrialized society, an individual stands self-alienated and in search of identity. In this context a study by Alexendar in regard to American scene reveals, "On every hand we see evidence of social maladjustment. One out of every two hospital beds occupied by a mental patient, 4 million alcoholics, 5 million sleeping pills sold each day, 8 million people getting psychiatric treatment."45

Although the conditions causing social maladjustment in advanced countries are not exactly paralleled by those in the developing countries, yet a cue cannot be missed that with rapid social change leading to high level industrialization, the problem of social maladjustment would become ever more acute in these countries. As such any study which relieves the problem of attitudinal adjustments and maladjustments in the context of social change can go some way in helping the individual and the society in the task of personal and social reconstruction respectively.