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It has already been discussed in the foregoing chapter how intricately the process of social change, personality, and attitude are interwoven. Before delving into methodological or technical aspect of the study, it would be desirable if one arrives at semantic clarification of the concepts involved in the study namely, personality, attitude, and social change.

Personality

The term personality is too variable in usage to be serviceable in scientific discussion unless its meaning is very carefully defined for a given context. Attempts to define personality are always tentative, calling for criticism and inviting agreement. Since the term personality is the most comprehensive of those in psychologist's vocabulary, clarification of its connotation to the satisfaction of a majority, even of psychologists, is difficult. Writing on personality Super aptly remarks, "The field of personality is one of the most popular, challenging, important and confused in contemporary psychology. The main obstacle to the clarification of the concept of personality is the lack
of agreement about a definition of personality."¹

Psychologists have defined personality in a variety of ways, emphasizing one aspect or another, and this has created a good deal of confusion. Some define personality as a stimulus, some in terms of reaction to others, and some consider it to be response including the total behavior. Allport too says, "Personality has dozens of different meanings: legal, grammatical, ethical, religious, economic and psychological."² There have been different approaches to the study and understanding of personality i.e. philosophical, psychological, sociological, physiological and psychiatric etc. But there is a growing realization among the thinkers of these various disciplines that for the clear understanding of personality there has to be an interdisciplinary approach. The present trend is to regard the individual himself as a major focus of interest. This emphasis on the individual has brought with it a need for a clear understanding of the nature of personality.

In an attempt to find out an operational definition of personality for this study, a few definitions


would be analyzed. The problem of defining personality is complicated by one major contemporary issue — where is personality or the correct locus of personality?

To this question three outstanding answers have been given in the last two decades, (A) Personality is in the organism (B) Personality is in the brain (C) Personality is in the organism-environment relationships. These views are expressed respectively by Allport, Murray and Kluckhohn and Murphy.

Trying to clear confusion regarding the definition of personality, Hall and Lindzey provided a very general definition, "Personality consists concretely of a set of values or descriptive terms which are used to describe the individual being studied according to the variable or dimensions which occupy a central position within the particular theory described." Thorpe and Schmuller say, "An adequate definition of personality needs to emphasize the point that the individual is a human being enmeshed in a social order -- and symbolic culture -- which

---

3Allport, p. 48.
Some definitions look at personality from the standpoint of an individual in question, giving weightage to his unique qualities and characteristics. Vernon says, "We mean by it, simply, what sort of a man is so and so, what is he like?... while a man's intelligence, his bodily strength and skills are certainly part of his personality, yet the term refers chiefly to his emotional and social qualities, together with his drives sentiments and interests."\(^8\) Stagner\(^9\) is more concerned about the person's inner system and defines personality as an inner system of beliefs, expectancies, desires and values.

Cattell equates personality with the individual aspects of behavior and directs his attention to the behavior of individual and maintains that it should have predictive power. His definition runs as follows, "Personality is that which permits a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation.... Personality is concerned with all the behavior of the individual, both

---


overt and under the skin."\textsuperscript{10}

Lewin,\textsuperscript{11} Murphy\textsuperscript{12} and Murray\textsuperscript{13} have given explicit attention to the field within which behavior takes place. Explaining his basic formula \( B = f (PE) \), Lewin says, "... to understand or predict psychological behavior (B) one has to determine for every kind of psychological event... the momentary whole situation, that is, momentary structure and the state of the person (P) and the psychological environment (E). \( B = f (PE) \)."\textsuperscript{14} Murphy's\textsuperscript{15} theoretical position is one that combines and extends the concepts of many different systems of psychology in a single theory of personality. He emphasizes both the social and the biological heritage of man and has consolidated these two heritages in his comprehensive "bio-social" theory. This bio-social approach covers a new field in personality theory. He emphasizes the importance of studying "the full reciprocity of inner and outer events." He holds that the total


\textsuperscript{12}Murphy, 1947.

\textsuperscript{13}H.A. Murray, Explorations in Personality (New York: Oxford University Press, 1938).

\textsuperscript{14}Lewin, p. 79.

\textsuperscript{15}Murphy, 1947.
personality is an organism-environment field of distributed energy, with regions of high and low energy concentration. He maintains that life process is itself an interaction of the organism and the environment. According to Murphy, "A personality is structured organism-environment field, each aspect of which stands in dynamic relation to each other aspect. There is organization within the organism and organization within the environment, but it is the cross organization of the two that is investigated in personality research." He further remarks that, "... this concept of a unitary field of organism environment is important for personality study." His view of personality seems to be fluid.

Murray's views on the structure of the personality have been heavily influenced by psychoanalytical theory. The concept that is most closely associated with Murray's name is "need", and in most of his practical experimental work, he has focussed his attention on this concept. Adorno et al. too, describing personality in terms of needs, say, "The forces of personality are primarily needs, which vary from the individual to another in their quality, their intensity, their modes of gratification and the objects of their attachment and

\[^{16}\text{Murphy, 1947, p. 8}\]
\[^{17}\text{Ibid.}\]
\[^{18}\text{Murray, 1933.}\]
which interact with other needs in harmonious or conflicting pattern.\textsuperscript{19} There are primitive emotional needs, there are needs to avoid punishment and to have social approval, there are needs to maintain harmony and integration within the self.

Eysenck defined personality, "... as more or less stable and enduring organization of a person's character, temperament, intellect and physique which determines his unique adjustment to the environment."\textsuperscript{20} He distinguishes four sectors of personality: (I) A cognitive sector (intelligence) (II) A conative sector (character) (III) An affective sector (temperament) (IV) A somatic sector (constitution).

Eysenck's view of personality seems to be particularly congruent with that of Allport.\textsuperscript{21} Allport has championed and elaborated a thesis that rests firmly on the foundation of individuality, uniqueness and the personal experience of the single organism as the most meaningful subject matter for the explanation of the personality. He made an extensive survey of the literature,

\textsuperscript{21}Allport, 1937.
extracted about 50 definitions, classified them into a number of broad categories and finally formulated his own definition. According to him "Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environment." 22

For the present study for the measurement of directly measurable aspects of personality, this has been accepted as working definition of personality. Allport's definition, to be sure, is eclectic, comprehensive, functional, personalistic and humanistic as well as holistic. It is most thorough-going in its stress upon the importance of giving a full consideration to individuality by using the term "unique adjustment". The approach is humanistic as it demands full recognition of all aspects of man's being, including his potential for becoming more than he is. His approach is personalistic in the sense that its goal is to understand and predict the development of the concrete, individual person. It also seems to be more appropriate because:

(I) It recognizes the dynamic nature of personality i.e. becoming.
(II) It emphasizes the integration of inner psychological system and supports that

22Allport, p. 48.
this integration is unique in each individual.

(III) It takes into consideration the response of the individual to the challenge of the environment.

(IV) It provides basis for the social stimulus value of personality.

(V) It stresses both analytical as well as synthetic point of view.

(VI) It also provides a useful basis for making generalizations regarding groups of individuals with common characteristics and thus helps in making group comparisons.

Then there is a problem of assessing personality. A question suggests itself as to what units should be employed for the assessment of personality? In looking for a model for describing the personality organization, one finds two claimants in the field, namely, the concepts of "type" and "trait".

Eysenck views type, "... as a group of correlated traits just as a trait was defined as a group of behavioral acts or action tendencies. According to this view, then, the difference between the concepts of trait and type lies not in continuity or lack of continuity of the hypothesized variable, but in its form of distribution but in the greater inclusiveness, of the type concept." The

\(^{23}\)Eysenck, p. 13.
relationship between the two concepts is presented diagrammatically as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type level</th>
<th>Introversion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait level</td>
<td>Persistence, rigidity and shyness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Habitual Response Level.
Specific Response Level.

Type is a higher order concept and trait is the second order concept. Traits are the building stones of higher order concepts in the analysis of personality. One of the pioneers of trait theory is Allport who regards trait to be, "... a generalized and focalized neuropsychic system (peculiar to the individual), with the capacity to render many stimuli functionally equivalent, and to initiate and guide consistent (equivalent) forms of adaptive and expressive behavior." Comparing the concept of trait and type and favoring the former he says "Type includes more than is in the individual. Traits on the contrary, are considered wholly within the compass of the individual.... Many kinds of typology flourish.... Whatever the kind, a typology is always a device for exalting its author's special interest at the expense of individuality of the life which he ruthlessly dismembers.... All typologies place boundaries, where

---

24 Allport, pp. 295-296.
boundaries do not belong. They are artificial categories.\textsuperscript{25} He is of the view that even if some information is to be gained by filling a person to one typology or another, it will be much more significant if his traits are analyzed. Thorpe and Schmuller consider trait as "... a legitimate structure of personality which can provide us with insight into the dynamics of individual behavior.... Traits are, it follows, independent modes of behavior manifested in the frame-work of what we call personality. They have acquired motive force with which to set other modes of behavior in action."\textsuperscript{26} Stagner\textsuperscript{27} uses the term trait to refer to a consistent feature of personality which has some emotional or ideational content.

Strangely enough, many psychologists have vehemently criticized the attempts to analyze personality into traits for special investigation. The ground for this objection is that personality is an organized whole and that any form of analysis changes its quality. But in the words of Stagner "This objection is invalid, since it is based on false analogy. Psychological traits are not substances, such as water, which can be analyzed into its components, hydrogen and oxygen, only by destroying the material analyzed."\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{25}Allport, pp. 295-296.
\textsuperscript{26}Thorpe and Schmuller, p. 249.
\textsuperscript{27}Stagner, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{28}Ibid.
Personality in terms of traits has been measured by various inventories and tests. A generation ago we were content with one test for ascendance-submission or a test for introversion-extraversion and so on. But now multiphasic instruments, manifaceted and omnibus inventories and multiple factor devices are in vogue, which measure and involve different type of units. Allport has tried to classify these units as follows: (I) Intellectual capacity, (II) social attitudes, (III) interests and values, (IV) expressive traits, (V) stylistic traits, (VI) pathological trends, (VII) factorial clusters, (VIII) syndromes, (IX) temperament and (X) unconscious motives.

In the last few decades many authors, like Hathaway and McKinley, Guilford-Zimmerman, Lovell,  

---


30 S.A. Hathaway and J.C. McKinley, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (New York: Psychological Corporation, 1943).


Leary,³³ and Cattell³⁴ etc., to mention a few, have constructed omnibus personality inventories, aiming at measuring different traits of personality. Reviewing the multiphasic inventories, it was clear that personality traits are numerous and assessment has to be selective.

Attitude

In 1935, Allport termed attitude as "... the most distinctive and indispensable concept in contemporary social Psychology."³⁵ Few of the most influential works in this field have been done by Adorno et al.,³⁶ Katz,³⁷ and Saranoff,³⁸ who made an extensive application of psychodynamic concepts in the analysis of attitudes toward


³⁶Adorno et al.,


minority groups. Besides psychologists, the sociologists have added significant dimensions to the concept of attitude and have given it the richness that makes it so popular in contemporary social psychology. In one of the most influential social science books, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, Thomas and Znaniecki give a new accent to social psychology and equate it with the scientific study of attitudes. Their contention is that it is necessary to understand the nature of attitudes, and in that context the differences between individuals, in order to understand social change.

Reviewing the definitions given by various social psychologists such as Thomas and Znaniecki, Allport, E.S. Bogardus, Kretch and Crutchfield, Sherif

\[\text{\footnotesize \begin{align*}
  \text{\cite{ThomasZnaniecki:1927}} & \quad \text{W. I. Thomas and F. Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, 2 Vols., 2nd ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927).} \\
  \text{\cite{Allport:1960}} & \quad \text{Ibid.} \\
  \text{\cite{Bogardus:1922}} & \quad \text{Allport, p. 810.} \\
  \text{\cite{Bogardus:1942}} & \quad \text{E.S. Bogardus, *Fundamentals of Social Psychology* (New York: Appleton, 1942), p. 65.} \\
\end{align*}\]
and Sherif\textsuperscript{44}, Young\textsuperscript{45}, Anderson and Fishbein\textsuperscript{46}, Rokeach\textsuperscript{47} etc., attitudes can be defined as: an enduring organization of evaluative beliefs and a learned tendency to react positively or negatively, varying in degree, to certain class of objects, which determine the actual and potential responses of an individual. As individual grows, his cognitions, feelings and action-tendencies with respect to various objects in his psychological world become organized into an enduring system, called attitudes.

Green\textsuperscript{48} mentions about various dimensions of attitudes, namely (a) favorableness (b) intensity (c) salience (d) generality. There are cognitive, behavioral

\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{46}\textsuperscript{46} L.R. Anderson, M. Fishbein, "Prediction of Attitude from number, strength and evaluative aspect of beliefs about the attitude object: A comparison of summation and congruity theories," \textit{J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.}, II (1965), 437-443.
\item\textsuperscript{47}\textsuperscript{47} M. Rokeach, "Attitude change and behavior change," \textit{Pub. Opin. Quart.}, XXX (1966), p. 529.
\end{enumerate}
and affective components in attitudes (Kretch et al., Secord and Backman). Each of the three components of an attitude may vary in valence and in degree of multiplexity. They are construed as varying in quality and intensity on a continuum from positive through neutral to negative (Kretch et al., McGrath, and Newcomb et al.). Qualitative variation of the attitude is represented by the valence (positive or negative) and the intensity of the attitude is represented by the extremity of the position occupied on the continuum.

Generality is one of the important dimensions mentioned by Green. "Specificity or generality refers to the extent to which one can predict one belief from a knowledge of another within an attitude organization, e.g., from a belief about desegregating the Negro in education to a belief about desegregating the Negro in

---


54Green, pp. 335-369.
housing, or one attitude from another (from attitude toward Jew to attitude toward the Negro), or non-verbal behavior from the verbal expression of a belief or attitude.\textsuperscript{55}

In the words of Allport "The issue which is involved in this lively controversy of generality and specificity of attitudes is of the greatest practical and theoretical importance, for upon its solution depends not only proper choice of methods investigating attitudes, but likewise the theory of mental organization."\textsuperscript{56} McNemar too remarks, "The scores on an attitude scale are most meaningful when it is known that only one continuum is involved. Only then it can be claimed that individuals with the same score or rank order are qualitatively similar in their attitude towards a given issue."\textsuperscript{57} Suppose a test of radicalism-conservatism consists of three types of issues, like economic, social, and political, two individuals can have the same numerical score on this test but by different routes. Meaning of


\textsuperscript{56} Allport, 1935.

the scores based on such a composite would seem to some, questionable. This leads to the issue of general versus specific attitudes.

Usually persons have internally consistent, overall attitudes. It is a reflection of their generality of attitudes. Some people can be labelled as radicals or conservatives because they have consistent attitudes towards a wide range of objects, such as religion, government, education etc. Knowing whether a person is radical or conservative, fairly accurate predictions can be made about his attitudes towards a wide variety of issues. Now the question arises as to whether a person who is conservative in one area of social change will be conservative in other areas too or not? This question of generality or unidimensionality of social attitudes has intrigued a number of researchers. Lot of controversy centers around it.

Several factor analytical studies have tackled this question of generality and specificity of attitudes. Many authors like Dewey\textsuperscript{58}, Allport\textsuperscript{59}, Vetter\textsuperscript{60}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{58}J. Dewey, \textit{Human Nature and Conduct} (New York: Holt, 1922).
\item \textsuperscript{59}G.W. Allport, "The comparison of political attitudes," \textit{Amer. Jour. Socio.}, XXXV (1929), 22-38.
\item \textsuperscript{60}G.W. Vetter, "The measurement of social-political attitudes and the related personality factors," \textit{Jour. Abn. and Soc. Psychol.}, XXV (1930-1931), 149-189.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Faris, Likert, Kulp, Alpert and Sargent, Sanai etc. found considerable generality and internal consistency in radicalism-conservatism. Stagner discovered that radical, conservative and economic attitudes of college students act as a common factor or frame of reference, underlying racial prejudice, nationalism, pro-fascist sentiment and attitudes towards forceful solution of problems.

Likert, working with Murphy, has treated this

---

67 Likert, No. 140 (1932).
question of generality and specificity of social attitudes. On the basis of correlations, he is compelled to admit that there is probably a general factor running through these scales which look suspiciously like radicalism or conservatism. So it can be assumed that a group or general factor exists in social attitudes. The study reported \( r \) ranging from \( .22 \) to \( .52 \) with average \( r \) of \( .40 \). They are all significant. On this basis alone it can be assumed that there exist both "general factors" and "group factors" in social attitudes.

Reviewing the above mentioned studies, it seems reasonable to assume that a person with deep-seated attitude of radicalism will show this radical tendency by taking sides for or against most new controversial issues as they appear.

But as it is, this issue of generality of attitudes is not all that simple as it appears to be. Ferguson,\(^6\) focussing on the inconsistencies and seeing low correlations, doubted the existence of general attitudes. Many authors such as Symonds\(^6\), Hartshorne\(^7\),


Bogardus, Grace Rubin-Rabson, Broen etc., question the generality of attitudes and consider them to be specific in nature, meaning thereby that a person who is being conservative in one area of social change may not be the same in other areas.

Kerr concludes on the basis of his study that "Liberalism-Conservatism is shown to be not a unitary dimension of personality but a complex group, relatively independent continuua, five of which are separately identified as political, economic, religious, social and aesthetic." Bogardus too strongly believes in specificity of attitudes and says, "Attitudes are as numerous as the objects to which a person responds."

---

71 Bogardus (1931).


75 Bogardus, p. 65.
Conservatism-Radicalism in the Context of Present Study

People differ in their attitudes towards social change. One person may greet every change with joy, considering it a step towards a better society. He dreams of a future social order in which life will be entirely satisfactory for everyone, and he is not skeptical of the measures proposed to realize his dreams. There are other type of people who dread changes. They look back to the good old days. These differences in attitudes tend to fall somewhere along a conservative-radical continuum, somewhere between opposing and favoring social change. The present investigator feels that there are certain advantages to be gained from attempting to classify individuals as approximately radical or conservative and then wishes to raise the question, whether underlying these attitudes there are any discoverable traits of personality which may be related to radicalism-conservatism. Since these two concepts have been used in the study, an attempt to formulate rough working definition is a must.

The concepts of radicalism-conservatism usually have been associated with the arena of politics, that is having political meaning. In this sense the terms conservatism-radicalism may be used to divide the vast array of political ideologies into two gross categories.
of right and left. In general, ideologies of right support the status quo and emphasize the importance of tradition, stability and hierarchical social order. Ideologies of the left are critical of the prevailing system and seek major institutional change toward increased social and economic equality. In this study, the conservative and radical terms are used to cover social attitudes, and otherwise also, political attitudes cannot be altogether dissociated from social attitudes. Levinson says, "A political ideology is an overarching conception of society, a stance, that is reflected in numerous sectors of social life. It deals not only with political issues in the narrow sense, but also with economic policy, social stratification, methods of social change, civil liberties, civil rights, international relations, religion, relation of religious institutions to political institutions."76

The term conservatism connotes a disposition to preserve things as they are, "Conservative is a person who clings to the status quo, opposing all changes on the assumption that anything new is going to be worse.... He reveres his past and is the one believing that, "nothing should be tried for the first time," who learns

nothing and forgets nothing."\(^7\) A conservative tends to attach sacredness to tradition and from force of habit and economic reasons, gives logical idiom to his rationalizations for defending the past. In the words of Burke, "... a conservative outlook is that man's traditional inheritance is rich, grand, endlessly proliferated and mysterious, deserving of veneration and not to be cast away lightly in favour of the narrow uniformity."\(^7\) "Unless it is necessary to change, it is necessary not to change."\(^9\)

As is clear from the above discussion, conservatism denotes resistance to social change. At the opposite pole is a radical who favors changes in social order. "Radicalism generally has been held to be the advocacy of ideas and beliefs at variance with those of the majority of the group, community or society."\(^8\) To be sure, radicalism is conspicuous departure from


deeply established social habits, which have the stamp of social approval. More scientifically of course, radicalism designates social ideas which purport to go to the root of things and work from drastic and sweeping changes in the existing institutions. In terms of the processes of social change, the frame and attitude of mind called radicalism is a style which develops as a reaction to the diehard orthodoxies of the past and the present.

A conservative is rather security-minded and cautious person, who likes to play safe. He feels at home with the traditional ways of life which involve hardly any social risk, nor make a call on his ingenuity and adventure. He likes to wallow in the warmth of his traditional self walled up against the sea of social changes around.

A radical on the other hand is a daring person whose flexibility stands him in good stead in welcoming and negotiating social change. He may innovate and companionate social change with ease. As a general rule, a radical person is far more flexible than a conservative one. But a case can be made out to show that extreme radicalism is capable of degenerating into a sort of conservatism and dogmatism when for example, a radical is sold on a particular ideology and is so deeply
conditioned by it that he virtually becomes a prisoner of it; his mind gets closed and he refuses stubbornly to see another point of view, however rational or relevant. In any case in this study the sample is more representative of university level radicals who though have radical fervor are not yet so deeply conditioned by radicalism. As such they are, so to say, a rather mild brand of radicals or liberals who theoretically may swing to radical programs without generally taking to any radical action or movement. They are rather raw radicals.

The image of radical emerging in this study may significantly be contrasted to a sort of pseudo-radical who joins the forces of destruction and hopes for change more out of frustration and feeling of inadequacy than out of well-reasoned ideological premises. This distinction is very essential to make because any one who falls in with the forces of destruction passes as a radical, and consequently a good deal of confusion prevails in different societies as to who is radical and what is radicalism.

Measurement of Attitudes

To use the concept of attitude in understanding and predicting action, we need reliable and valid measures.
In order to rank individual with respect to attitudes, various techniques of measurement of attitudes have been devised.

Following the taxonomy of Cook and Selltiz, five general categories of attitude measures can be distinguished. Inferences regarding attitudes can be drawn from (1) self report of beliefs, behaviors etc., (ii) observation of ongoing behavior in a natural setting, (iii) individuals' reactions or interpretation of partially structured stimuli, (iv) performance of objective tasks and (v) physiological reactions to the attitudinal object or representation of it.

Green distinguished three kinds of attitude universe to represent three different classes of individual responses to sets of social objects or situations. These are: (1) elicited verbal attitudes, (2) spontaneous verbal attitudes, (3) action attitudes. The present study is concerned with the first kind of attitude universe i.e. elicited verbal attitudes.

As already mentioned, the concept of attitude involves the notion of two extremes, between which

---


\(^{32}\) Green, pp. 335-369.
individuals vary — extremes of favoring or opposing the same issue. It, therefore, becomes necessary that the two extremes of attitudes should be measured by some sort of scale.

Attitude scale is designed to appraise an individual's favorableness towards some group, social institution or social concept. In essence the method of scaling requires that the individual react verbally or with expression of approval or disapproval, agreement or disagreement, to a set of carefully standardized statements. In terms of subjects' awareness, the attitude scales are direct techniques of attitude measurement as they do not disguise their aim. Kretch et al. remark, "Of all the methods for the measurement of attitudes, by far the most widely used and the most carefully designed and tested is the so called attitude scale." Adams too is of the same view. Scales differ markedly in type and in method of construction, but in every case the objective is identical — to assign to an individual a numerical position along a scale that extends from one extreme of agreement to the other extreme of disagreement.

The earliest device for investigating attitudes

Kretch et al., p. 147.

through direct or undisguised means was developed by sociologist Bogardus\(^5\) in mid twenties, to study social distance among various ethnic groups. The real impetus of attitude scale development began with Thurstone,\(^6\) who in 1928 was the first one to adopt the methods of psychophysical scaling, originated by Fechner for the scaling of judgments of favorableness- unfavorableness towards various objects. With the aim of overcoming some of the weaknesses of Thurstone technique, Likert\(^7\) developed an alternative method of scale construction known as "Method of Summated Ratings." After this, Guttman\(^8\) invented his novel method of Scalogram Analysis, which has been subject of legitimate criticism by Festinger\(^9\), Edwards\(^10\), Clark and Kriedt\(^11\).


\(^{7}\) Likert, No. 140 (1932).

\(^{8}\) L. Guttman, "A basis for scaling qualitative data," Amer. Socio. Rev., IX (1944), 139-150.


and Kilpatrick, Smith etc.

Coombs evolved a technique known as "The Unfolding Technique" to measure attitudes. Osgood et al. evolved a technique known as "The Semantic Differential Technique" which calls for direct evaluation of the attitudinal object.

So far, the procedures discussed have been concerned with more or less direct technique. It has been argued that respondents hesitate to respond freely either out of fear of disapproval or because of the feeling that their privacy is being invaded. To try to overcome this reluctance, many techniques have been proposed to hide or disguise the purpose of the measuring device. Few of the disguised techniques are: The Error Choice Technique, Sentence Completion Technique...


Campbell critically reviewed the literature on the disguised methods of attitude measurement and concluded that there is no evidence that the disguised technique is more valid than the more direct approaches. He also found that the more direct instruments uniformly have higher reliabilities than the disguised.

The contribution of the scale models for attitude measurement by Thurstone in 1928 and Likert in 1932 are two of the most influential works in this field and the methods developed have become the most widely used. To quote Edwards and Kenney, "Although various techniques for the measurement of social attitudes have been suggested, the most frequently used methods are probably the "Method of Equal Appearing Intervals" developed by Thurstone and Chave and the "Method of Summated Ratings," developed by Likert."

The relative advantages and disadvantages of both the scales have been discussed by Ferguson, Edwards and Kenney, Eysenck and Crown etc.

Social Change

It is not possible to include in this thesis even a brief survey of the various theories of social change as propounded by philosophers and sociologists. Yet it is desirable to keep these theories at the back of mind to be able to grasp the various facets of social change and to be able to relate the problem of attitudes to the process of social change. As such a bird's eye-view of some of the significant theories of social change may be attempted here.

No society whether historic or pre-historic has ever remained absolutely static, no matter what the pace and tempo of social change. The inevitability of social change is emphasized in the profound saying of an ancient Greek philosopher Heraclitus: "You cannot


102 Edwards and Kenney, pp. 72-83.

step twice into the same rivers, for fresh waters are ever flowing in upon you."\footnote{104} Closer to our times, Dewey too remarks, "Change is the primary social fact as motion is the primary physical fact."\footnote{105}

Although social change is an incontestable feature of all societies, past and present, yet as a term carrying a definite scientific connotation, it has come into use very recently. The concept bears relationship to and is the outgrowth of the earlier concepts such as social progress and evolution, which had moral overtones and implied the inevitability of change for the better. The need for a term free from dogmatic or moral implication explains the present day preference for the expression social change, which suggests value free, objective description.

For the clarification and understanding of the process of social change we may consider the definitions given by some of the scholars. According to Moore, "Social change is the significant alteration of social structures (that is, of patterns of social action and interaction), including consequences and manifestations


\footnote{105}{J. Dewey, "Progress," \textit{Jour. Ethics} (1916).}
of such structures embodied in norms (rules of conduct); values, cultural products and symbols. This definition encompasses small-scale change, such as the gradual development of a leadership in a small, task-oriented group, cyclical patterns of social change, such as the succession of centralization-decentralization in administrative organizations; and revolutionary change, such as the overthrow of a political party. It includes short-term changes in wages of labourers as well as long-term changes in family structures, both growth and decline in membership size of social units; continuous processes such as specialization and bureaucratization and discontinuous processes such as particular social inventions. Any alteration to be a significant social change has not only to be accepted by the majority but has to be properly integrated in the society, so that it endures. Thus transitory changes like fads and fashions are not included under significant social changes.

Ogburn in his discussion of social change includes both material and non-material changes. He emphasizes the importance of changes in material culture and its impact on the non-material culture. Freedman

---


defines social change as "... any non-repetitive alteration in the established modes of behavior in a given group or society." It is a new way modifying or replacing the old modes of living of the people or of the operations of a society. It includes modifications in social techniques, relationships, behavior patterns, folk-ways, mores and institutions, sometimes leading to change in philosophic outlook.

The sociologists use the term social change to designate primarily alterations in the non-material culture, i.e. values, mores, institutions and social behavior. Such changes often follow technological and other innovations. These social changes are caused by alterations in various factors, i.e. economic, political, social etc. and are the consequence of various processes like diffusion, innovation, acculturation, assimilation, transculturation etc.

The problem of social change has exercised the minds of many philosophers, sociologists, psychologists, anthropologists, historians and economists. Their quest of knowing the nature, causes, rate and direction of social change has given birth to many theories. These theories fall in a very wide range as will be evident from the following:

A. Evolutionary theories (Comte, Spencer, Darwin, Marx etc.)

B. Cyclical theories, i.e. standard rise-and-fall, collective reincarnation, challenge and response etc.

C. Particularistic theories, i.e. Diffusionism, geographic determinism, etc.

---


biological determinism, technological determinism, religious determinism, etc. D. Sociological theories i.e. assimilation, social ecology, social lag, cultural acceleration etc. E. Multiple causation theory.

Each of these theories, to be sure, is not of
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a piece but has many nuances as per emphasis or interpretation of the various supporters of the theory. All these theories within their respective ranges and limitations throw light on the different aspects of social change historically or contemporaneously. But it is difficult to accept any one of them as final, because ever new findings by the social scientists in the field of social change put us under obligation to re-construct our concept of social change from time to time. Many of the revolutions that have taken place since the sixteenth century ushering in fast social changes, and particularly the political and technological revolutions which are taking place in the modern day world call for a closer study of the causes and the consequences of social change. The more the social scientists are able to come to grips with this problem, the better will they be able to help in guiding the society and improving social engineering. It is in place to say that the study and examination of attitudes and their bearing on the social phenomena and vice versa turns out, on any showing, as one of the most significant aspects of the problem of social change.

For the present study, the concept of social change is meant to include those alterations in the institutions of society which affect its social system, including values, attitudes and patterns of behavior of individuals and groups.