DOCTORAL DISSERTATION SERIES

PUBLICATION: 7601

AUTHOR: Myron Ford Barlow, Ph. D., 1954
University of Michigan

TITLE: SECURITY AND GROUP APPROVAL AS VALUE SYSTEMS RELATED TO ATTITUDE CHANGE

University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan

SECURITY AND GROUP APPROVAL AS VALUE SYSTEMS RELATED TO ATTITUDE CHANGE

by

Myron Ford Barlow

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Michigan
1953

Committee in Charge:

Professor Theodore M. Newcomb (Chairman)
Professor Daniel Katz
Assistant Professor Josephine J. Williams
Doctor Robert L. Kahn
Doctor Allen T. Dittmann

Security and Group Approval as Value Systems

Related to Attitude Change

by Kyron Ford Barlow

The theoretical emphasis of this study was on value systems and their relation to attitudes. The experiment itself incorporated two related objectives, one of which was to test several hypotheses pertaining to this relationship, particularly with respect to the exploitation of value systems as a means of inducing attitude change. This objective derived from the hypothesis that attitude change is a function of the range of values brought to bear, and the approach used was to increase the number of values involved in the manipulation process, from one treatment to another, as a means of varying the pressure to change. In addition two other hypotheses were formulated which proposed that there would be increased attitude change on the part of individuals when there was (a) high awareness of conflict between an attitude and a related value, or (b) high value salience. All but the first of these hypothetical predictions were supported by the findings. Although significant attitude change occurred in two of the three variations in which value influences were brought to bear, the change did not vary in amount with number of values experimentally manipulated--probably because of "interference effects" resulting from the several different values. However, the predictions pertaining to increased attitude change as a function of high value salience or high awareness of conflict were both significantly confirmed.

The other, and major objective of this study, which was incorporated within the same theoretical framework, was to explore further the determinants of the relationship between attitude and perceived group consensus. The principal concept dealt with was that of "tolerance for non-conformity," operationally defined as the discrepancy between an individual's attitude position and his perception of the position of group consensus. The experiment tested several hypotheses pertaining to this concept:

(a) The stability, over time, of the relationship between own position and perceived consensus.

(b) Differential attitude change of individuals who have "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity.

(c) Perception of own position in relation to a perceived group norm, as affected by differential tolerance for non-conformity.

(d) The effect of differential tolerance for non-conformity on autistic displacement of a group norm.

(e) Tolerance for non-conformity as a basic personality characteristic.

This concept was fitted into a value theory framework by viewing "attraction of the group" as a reflection of the value an individual places on group approval. Such a formulation views the "value of group approval" and "attractiveness of the group" as the "internal" and external" correlates of essentially the same thing. Justification for this theoretical position rests on the belief that tolerance for non-conformity, as a concept, takes on increased stability by relating it more directly to personality characteristics of the individual. This stability, which the results of this experiment substantiate, is ascribed to the proposition that tolerance for non-conformity represents a manifestation of personality, rather than just a situational phenomenon.

All of the predictions designed to test these hypotheses were substantially confirmed. The findings, it is believed, fully justify placing this concept within a value theory framework, by viewing it as an overt or behavioral manifestation of the value of group approval. As far as is known, this study represents the first attempt to relate tolerance for non-conformity to independent personality measures of conformity. The significant relationships that were found to exist with two independent conformity tests--which are thought to measure conformity at deeper levels of personality organization--provide considerable support for giving tolerance for non-conformity, as measured, some status as a personality variable. It is therefore proposed that "tolerance for non-conformity" represents an operationally defined personality characteristic at the overt or behavioral level, which is related to the value of group approval by reason of incorporating elements of conformity at more basic levels of personality organization.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am especially grateful to Dr. Daniel Katz, who served as my committee chairman during the greater part of the time this study was in progress. His support and guidance were invaluable in making this study possible. To Dr. T. M. Newcomb, I also owe a debt of gratitude for taking over the chairmanship of my committee in Dr. Katz's absence. The generous aid which he gave and his valuable comments were most helpful. The assistance extended by the other members of the committee is likewise appreciated.

I also want to thank Dr. Irving Sarnoff, Charles McClintock and John Caylor for their constructive suggestions and assistance in analysis of the results. The study, of course, would not have been possible without the help of the following colleagues who served as group leaders in the experiment and to whom I am indebted. They are: Lee Danielson, Harry Dillingham, Walter (Hob) Crockett, Byron Groesbeck, Glen Mellinger, Robert Davis, Joseph Patton, Earl Carlson, Gerald Gurin, Homer Cooper and Irwin Goffman.

Finally, to my wife Sue, I am sincerely grateful for her continuous support and encouragement, not to mention the endless check-coding and typing which she did.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. THEORETICAL ASPECTS	1
II. HYPOTHESES AND METHODOLOGY	20
III. RESULTS	32
IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	80
APPENDIX	87
BIBLIOGRAPHY	106

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Comparison of attitude change of subjects whose value of national and personal security is "more salient" with those whose value is "less salient"	34
2.	Pre-measure to post-measure differences, by treatment, on the Stereotype Questionnaire. . .	36
3.	Pre-measure to post-measure differences, by treatment, on the Segregation Questionnaire. . .	37
4.	Pre-measure to post-measure differences, by treatment, on the National Security Statement. .	39
5.	A comparison of the attitude change of subjects having "high awareness" of the conflict between Negro prejudice and the value of national and personal security with those having "less awareness"	43
6.	Consistency of the pre- to post-measure discrepancy between attitude and perceived consensus on three items for 100 subjects in eight discussion groups	46
7.	Consistency of the pre- to post-measure discrepancy between attitude and perceived consensus on three items for 55 subjects in three lecture groups	46
8.	Consistency between attitude and perceived consensus in terms of change from pre- measure to post-measure on three items for 100 subjects in eight discussion groups	47
9.	Consistency between attitude and perceived consensus in terms of change from pre-measure to post-measure on three items for 55 subjects in three lecture groups	48
10.	Comparison of pre- to post-measure relationship of attitude to perceived consensus on three statements, for 100 discussion group subjects dichotomized as having "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity	51

Table | Page

11. Comparison of pre- to post-measure relationship of attitude to perceived consensus on three statements, for 55 lecture group subjects dichotomized as having "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity 51

12. Numbers of subjects that remain in the two categories, using four successive measurements to identify those having "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity, starting with 103 group discussion and 55 lecture group subjects 54

13. Comparison between subjects having "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity with respect to numbers showing change in either direction of at least 3 points and 2 points respectively on either Stereotype or Segregation Questionnaires, following the lecture treatment 57

14. Comparison between subjects having "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity with respect to numbers showing change in either direction of at least 3 points and 2 points respectively on either Stereotype or Segregation Questionnaires, following group discussion treatments. . . . 57

15. Difference between subjects having "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity, with respect to direction of perceived consensus in relation to own position, as shown on the pre-measure of the third session for three statements having consensus measures 60

16. Difference between subjects having "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity, with respect to perception of the relationship of own opinion to that of the group norm 63

17. Comparison of scores obtained on the F Scale for subjects who have "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity 70

18. Comparison between subjects who have "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity, with respect to scores obtained on the "conventionalism" and "submission to authority" dimensions of the F Scale and also a conformity index which combines the two dimensions 71

19. Comparison of scores on a conformity index derived from the Michigan Sentence Completion, for subjects having "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for conformity 72

CHAPTER I

THEORETICAL ASPECTS

The theoretical framework of the experiment to be reported is essentially that of "value theory." Generally, the theory pertains to the interrelationship of values and attitudes in the psychological organization of the individual. A major portion of this experiment deals with "perceived group consensus" and its relationship to attitudes, which is also construed within a value theory framework. In this connection, the principal concept to be dealt with will be "tolerance for non-conformity," which pertains to the relationship between attitude position and perceived group consensus. The purpose of this section is to give a little of the background and to discuss briefly the theoretical aspects of the several concepts with which this experiment deals. The attitude concept will be taken up first since attitudes are viewed as components of more inclusive value systems. After that, the value concept will be discussed and related to attitudes in terms of psychological organization as well as attitude change. Finally, perceived group consensus and its relation to attitude position will be outlined and discussed within a value theory framework.

I. The Attitude Concept

There have been many theoretical approaches to "attitude." Although the differences among them are in part verbal and semantic, there are nevertheless genuine differences in emphases. For example, Krech and Crutchfield, taking the gestalt approach, emphasize the organizational aspects and view "attitude" as representing "an enduring organization of motivational, emotional, perceptual and cognitive processes with respect

to some aspect of the individual's world" (10, p.152). In this formulation, attitude is a very dynamic construct which possesses drive strength as well as directionality and pretty well subsumes the other psychological processes. By contrast, McClelland (14) in his formulation, uses the concept schema, which, with certain reservations, is similar to that of attitude. He objects to the term "attitude" on the grounds that it implies a "conscious awareness" and carries the connotation of having a tendency <u>toward</u> an object, or of being <u>for</u> or <u>against</u> something. The concept is not that limited of course, as used by Krech and Crutchfield (10). With respect to schemata, McClelland says experience tends to get organized into something which is simpler than the original. "This 'something' may be called a schema, a hypothesis or conception. These schemata have been found to be of great importance at all levels of experience, sensation, perception, memory and thinking" (14, p. 254). Although the cognitive process (experiencing and structuring) is the primary factor in McClelland's formulation of "schema," an individual's needs, e. g., affiliation, aggression, etc., play an important role in shaping these organizations of schemata. The concept itself as used by McClelland appears to be less inclusive and less dynamic than the concept of attitude as used by Krech and Crutchfield.

In viewing behavior as a function of personality and environment—B = f (P, E), McClelland places the following in the personality part of the equation: Habit, Schema, Motive and (self-schema). Behavior then, within the personality part of the equation, is a function of three basic personality variables—habit, schema and motive; with the self-schema emerging and exerting an influence when the situation becomes defined as ego-involving. McClelland feels that no one of these personality variables is more important than another. That is, depending on the situation,

"motive" may be the decisive determinant in a behavior sequence, and in other situations "habit" or "schema" may be the decisive determinants. Just what the relationships are between these variables continues to be a focal question. McClelland, although he does make some suggestions, feels it is premature to attempt to specify definitely what the relationships are, in the absence of more experimental evidence.

Another line of theorizing about attitudes is based on the "frame of reference" concept as developed by Sherif (23) in his experiments with the autokinetic effect. In addition, Helson (9) has also carried on significant basic research in this area through his work on "adaptation-level" (Sherif would call it "reference point"). His theory is designed to predict what an individual's judgment of a given stimulus will be, based on a knowledge of the person's "adaptation-level" for that particular class of stimuli. Judgments are made with respect to the pooled effects of stimuli, i. e., based on adaptation-level. This formula predicts the response to individual stimuli, <u>provided</u> the adaptation-level can be determined and the stimuli are objectively specifiable. Unfortunately, the stimuli involved in the more complicated social situations are not objectively specifiable at this time; and it is those attitudes which are developed in social situations that are of primary interest to the social psychologist. Therefore, for the purpose of generalization to social situations, Helson's formulation, although helpful on the perceptual or cognitive side, is not adequate because it does not take sufficient account of motivational factors.

Newcomb, in his use of the term attitude, relies largely on the "frame of reference" concept as a foundation: "to a considerable extent, the processes of attitude formation are determined by the principles of

perception" (17, p. 210). He views an attitude as pertaining to a state of the organism, "a learned direction-set toward something." That is, "an individual's attitude toward something is his predisposition to perform, perceive, think and feel in relation to it" (17, p. 118). In this view, although attitude and motive are interrelated, attitudes possess no drive or energy properties. Rather, they provide a persistent common direction and thus influence the way in which a person will be motivated.

The problem of how to put perception and motivation together meaningfully has been bothering psychologists for years. As long as fifty years ago Külpe, one of Wundt's students, did work on perceptual selectivity and tried to take systematic account of a factor that he called "set" in the behavior of his subjects. Külpe's "set" factor might be termed a rough approximation of the present day concept of attitude, except that it represented more of a temporary, rather than a persistent predisposition. His primary concern was that of trying to work the motivational component into the behavioral determinants. Since that time, there has been a great deal of work showing the effect of motivation (or need) on perception. The work on projectives is an example. The recent work of Bruner and Postman (4), et al., is also important in this area. Likewise, the psychoanalytic approach lays great stress on motivation.

The attitude concept in all its variations (set, hypothesis, expectation, predisposition, schema, etc.) probably took root and grew because it provided a conceptual device for bridging the relationship between the perceptual and motivational processes in psychological functioning. Being something of an "amalgamation" construct, it has served to provide for greater refinement and flexibility in understanding behavior. With regard to differences of theoretical approach, perhaps an analogy to chemistry and the properties of "elements," "compounds" and "mixtures" would

be appropriate. Is attitude an "element" in its own right, possessing properties not derived from other sources, and exerting a separate influence in behavioral causation? Or—is attitude a combination of more basic elements which form a "compound" that may change as relative amounts of certain more basic elements change? Or—is attitude merely a convenient term for a "mixture" and as such, is superficial insofar as any basic properties are concerned? It is believed that many theorists could be fitted into the various parts of this analogy based on where they stand with respect to the attitude concept. In the final analysis, however, the decision will eventually rest with the formulation that does the best job of predicting and understanding behavior.

With reference to the foregoing analogy, the writer finds it convenient to conceptualize attitude as being a "compound" or organization of more basic elements, which may change as relative amounts of the basic elements change. The principal elements in this organization are considered to be perceptions (which give rise to cognitive structure) and motivation. The term motivation as used here follows McClelland's (14) formulation, wherein motivation represents an anticipation of change in affective state. That is, based on past experience with certain cues, motivation constitutes the anticipation of an increase or decrease in pleasure or pain over the present state. Anticipations may be conscious or unconscious. For the other component, i. e., the perceptual process, the term cognition is more appropriate, because it implies the structuring of a range of stimuli. Of these two components (motivation and cognition) one may be more important than the other in determining attitude position, depending on the situation and the circumstances. However, this is an interrelated process in which needs affect cognitions, and cognitions may

affect or change needs. In the concept of attitude these processes are bound up and form the basis for the assumption that an attitude represents a relatively stable organization of cognitive and affective processes which serves to provide the individual with a "definition of the situation" with respect to a given object or referent.

II. The Value Concept

Terms such as "value," "value system" and "sentiment" are generally used to refer to cognitive-affective organizations which are more complex than in the case of attitudes. These complex organizations constitute a vital force in energizing and channelizing behavior because they represent goals around which the individual's overall behavior is focused. In addition to being more complex, another important respect in which values may differ from attitudes is that their affective component is generally more heavily loaded and hence they have more of a driving effect on an individual's response to a class of objects. Newcomb calls them "dominant frames of reference which have the right of way over other frames of reference" (17, p. 217).

The historical roots of the concept go back to A. F. Shand (22), a British writer, who used the term sentiment and made an important contribution in the 1880's to its development as a psychological concept. He emphasized the organization of tendencies around a single object, e. g., the singleness of purpose of a mother's varied behaviors toward her child. He also highlighted the feeling or emotional component of this organization. Thus, Shand saw behavior as being the resultant of a psychological organization, rather than as single and fixed responses to specific conditions, which was the then prevalent view of that day. Following Shand, McDougall (15) expanded the concept and gave it a central place in his theoretical system.

In discussing the background of the sentiment concept French (6) points out that when McDougall's instinct psychology went into disrepute, with it went the theory of sentiments. However, there has been a resurgence and the concept is again "respectable" in most psychological circles. Among others, French's (6, 7, 8) work on the structure of sentiments is a recent contribution in this area. Unpublished investigations at the University of Michigan have continued this line of thought. Rosenberg (20) has shown that attitudes can be predicted from a knowledge of the individual's hierarchy of values and his perceptions of the way in which the object of the attitude aids or hinders the achievement of these values. Carlson (5) found that attitudes can be changed by changing the perception people have of the degree to which the attitude-object aids or hinders the attainment of these values.

III. Value Systems in Relation to Attitudes

The theoretical framework offered here corresponds essentially to that used by Daniel Katz, which he will outline in greater detail in a forthcoming publication. In conceptualizing the relationship between attitudes and values in the psychological field of the individual, the following definitions are used:

(a) An attitude is a fairly stable organization of cognitive and affective processes around some object or referent, which helps to provide the individual with a "definition of the situation" with respect to the object or referent.

(b) A value is a complex and stable cognitive-affective organization embodying a broad personal goal. Within this complex various attitudes, beliefs and ideas are organized as a system, and function

instrumentally in the service or support of the value. Having goal properties, a value has strong affective characteristics. Hence, when a situation becomes defined in terms of a particular value, the value serves to motivate the individual through anticipation of a change in affective state.

Attitudes and their associated objects are thus conceptualized as being incorporated within a value system which has content as well as organization. A value system, being a more or less integrated higher-level organization, imposes a congruence on the elements (attitudes) within the overall structure so that they function in support of the value. For example, if a person placed a high value on the approval of a particular reference group which considers Negroes to be inferior, the individual's "value of group approval" would probably operate as a factor in shaping his attitude toward Negroes.

In addition to the organizational properties of values, they also serve to energize and channelize behavior so that the goals represented by the various value systems will be maximized. Although values may be considered as generally hierarchical in nature, their degree of salience (i. e., centrality or strength) may vary according to the individual and the way he defines the situation. Further, there may be varying degrees of conflict between value systems, both conscious and unconscious. If there were such a thing as a completely integrated personality, it would be one in which the value systems were all mutually reinforcing and non-conflicting. In order for this to be possible, however, the values involved in any particular situation would always be operating in the same direction. Fortunately or unfortunately, such is not the case; if it were, there would be no occasion for conflict between such values as, for example, bravery and personal security.

To elaborate a little further, it is proposed that since a value system may incorporate a varying number of attitudes, there would be a like number of cognitive objects represented. Using "national security with its personal security implications" as an example of a value system, attitudes and related cognitive objects imbedded therein might include, among others, the following: a very negative attitude toward Russians; a definite liking for American soldiers (even to the point of buying them drinks when the value is activated); and possibly, even a somewhat positive attitude toward taxes. On the other hand, it also happens that a cognitive object may be imbedded in more than one value system and hence be viewed within differing frames of reference (attitudes), depending on the situation. Taxes, in relation to the values of national security versus a higher standard of living, would be an example of this.

IV. Value System Approach to Attitude Change

In attempting to change attitudes, one approach is to exploit or activate a dominant value, and by relating a conflicting attitude to the value, cause it to become integrated in, and take on the same sign as the value. Long range attitude change, through this method, would require that the cognitive object be thereafter rather consistently perceived within this or related value systems. This general approach is frequently used in advertising. For example, people don't buy Cadillacs just to get around in; they have prestige value as well. However, there is generally not much negative affect involved in the objects with which advertising appeals are concerned. On the other hand, changing social attitudes is a more difficult proposition, because it is harder to create a desire to change. This is because most people have very strong reasons for not

changing due to such things as social pressure and the value they place on group approval.

Notwithstanding the above, in using this approach to change social attitudes, and with reservations, change should be possible to the extent that an individual accepts or can be brought to awareness that a given attitude constitutes a block to the attainment of a particular goal or value which he considers important. In the clinician's terms this represents "awareness of conflict." This awareness of conflict should create an instability, with a pressure toward change of attitude in conformity with the activated value. Change, of course, should be increasingly difficult to the extent that a particular attitude served as a primary support to some other value which might be more salient to the individual. An example would be an individual with high ego defense needs, where the attitude served as a defense mechanism, thus supporting his most central value—the ego. The term "salience," as used here, refers to strength or centrality. With respect to the matter of salience, individuals for whom a particular value is more salient would be expected to maximize the related goal more than would those for whom the value is less salient. From this it follows that when an attempt is made to change attitudes through relating them to an appropriate value, individuals for whom the value is more salient should show the most change. With respect to change generally, if other forces can be brought to bear in the form of additional values being exploited, greater change should take place as these forces are increased.

If one's thinking is oriented in terms of value theory, it can be seen that the work of Lewin (11) and his colleagues in the "group

decision" area fits into a value theory framework. Lewin conceptualized social habits and social attitudes as being anchored in a "relationship" between individuals and various group standards or norms. He found that group discussion and group decision were more effective in changing the attitudes and behavior of group members than were other methods such as a lecture treatment. It should be noted that his lecture variation did not involve a "request for a decision" as part of the influence attempt, whereas the group discussion treatment did. Lewin conceptualized group discussion as means to provide greater involvement of the members, as well as an opportunity to express motivations which enabled the "airing" and resolution of obstacles. The resolution of obstacles paved the way for a group decision. This act of reaching a decision, he believed, caused the positive alternative to become dominant by reducing the potency of other alternatives to zero. In terms of causation, it was assumed that the principal reason for the greater effectiveness of this approach was that, in many instances, people only change when they perceive the group as changing. Hence, in a group discussion situation the interaction of the members may serve to facilitate the development of a new group norm. Therefore, since most individuals seem to be unwilling to depart too far from an established group norm, one of the reason for the results obtained—and perhaps the most important of all, might be ascribed to the widespread salience among people of the "value of group approval."

Bennett (3) investigated this problem further in an effort to determine more specifically what factors were responsible for the greater effectiveness of group discussions. Using both lecture and discussion treatments, she separated out the following component parts in order to analyze their effect on the results obtained: (a) the process of group

discussion itself; (b) the process of bringing people to a decision point; (c) the fact of their making a public commitment (i.e., a statement in the presence of other people) about their future behavior; and (d) the degree of perceived group consensus, i. e., the degree to which other people in the group were perceived to be in agreement on the issue. Her experimental manipulation involved an attempt to increase the willingness of University of Michigan students in beginning courses in psychology to volunteer to serve as subjects in psychological and sociological experiments. The findings of this experiment did not confirm the superiority of group discussion—in itself, over lecture presentation. However, two variables found to be significantly related were: (a) an individual's perception that there was high group agreement (consensus) on the issue, and (b) individual commitment to action. Thus, if individuals saw that the group was in agreement about the problem and if they had committed themselves by making a decision (whether public or private), the experimental influence produced the desired action whether they were in discussion or in lecture groups.

The question arises as to what happens in the psychological organization of the individual in connection with the processes of group discussion, group decision (consensus) and commitment. The numerous studies of the effect of "suggestion" on the attitudes and behavior of individuals have a bearing on this problem. In reviewing the literature in this area, Krech and Crutchfield believe there is evidence to indicate that there are two different sequences which characterize the effect of suggestion: "(1) prestige suggestion leads to changes in judgments which lead, in turn, to changes in perception, and (2) prestige suggestion leads to changes in perception which lead to changes in judgment" (10, p. 341). In other words, a person may: (1) accept an induction, which will in turn lead to

cognitive restructuring or, (2) an induction may cause cognitive restructuring which then paves the way for acceptance of the induction. In this connection, group discussion can be looked at as a process which may facilitate the "unfreezing" of the old cognitive structure and at the same time serve to relate and structure new material in the person's thinking. In addition, group pressure may be viewed as a force having differential "suggestive" influence. Therefore, depending on the individual and his needs, group decision and commitment as related to the "suggestive" influence of group pressure, may serve as aids to cognitive restructuring in either of the two ways mentioned above. If this is the case, it seems logical that sequence (1) above might apply more often with those who place a high value on group approval, whereas sequence (2) would apply more generally for those who value group approval less. Generally speaking, it is believed that the effectiveness of group decision lies in the fact that in connection with the establishment of a group norm, pressure is created which serves to structure and channelize a person's thinking. The process of commitment, wherein a person is required to take a stand on an issue, serves the added purpose of crystallizing the person's thinking and thus prepares the way for action.

Asch's (2) experiments in the area of suggestion and group influence are pertinent here. In his study of "independence" and "yielding" behavior in a group setting, he found that a unanimous majority was capable of influencing not only an individual's judgments and actions, but his perception of reality as well. Further, he was using a stimulus which was very unambiguous--judgments of the length of lines, against a standard. Where there was a unanimous majority against a minority of one, the critical

subject showed "yielding" behavior in about a third of the cases. By contrast, he also found that where the critical subject was reinforced by just one other group member, the "yielding" behavior disappeared almost completely. Further, in practically all instances cognitive restructuring was not a prelude to the yielding behavior. Rather, the yielding was a response of expediency to group pressure. This would not necessarily have been the case, of course, if the stimulus had been of a more ambiguous nature. Asch suggests that, "the independent person possesses certain sources of strength within himself that enable him to bear a brief ordeal, whereas the yielding person can find safety only by merging anonymously with the group" (2, p. 498). The writer suggests that Asch's results indicate the differential value which individuals place on group approval.

One of the objectives of the experiment to be reported involved an attempt to utilize the variables of "consensus" and "public commitment," within the framework of a value system approach to attitude change. Conceptually, these two variables are viewed as relating to the value of group approval. In this portion of the experiment, the other value system utilized was that of "national and personal security." It was this latter value system around which the influence attempt was organized in an effort to induce attitude change toward Negroes.

V. "Perception of Group Consensus" in Relation to Attitude

A content area in which Newcomb (18) has been instrumental in developing a body of theory concerns the relationship of attitude to "perceived group consensus." This is the area with which the major portion of this dissertation deals, and in many respects, the formulation given here follows Newcomb's.

"Perceived group consensus" is a person's estimate of the majority attitude position of a particular group, with respect to a given attitude object or referent. For the individual, this represents his perception of the group norm and constitutes one item of "social reality." Further, if it is found that a consistent relationship exists between an individual's attitude and his perception of group consensus, this should normally serve to indicate the presence of group influence or pressure. Therefore, where such a relationship does exist, the indications are that the individual places some value on the approval of the particular group.

Newcomb (18) posits two principal factors as affecting the degree of relationship between attitude and perceived consensus: (a) attraction toward the group, and (b) opportunity for group members to observe expressions of one another's attitude. From this it follows that individuals who are strongly attracted to the group (place a high value on group approval) will show less discrepancy between own attitude and perceived consensus than those who are not so strongly attracted. Also, as "opportunity for information" is increased, the less will "lack of information" be a contributing factor to the discrepancy between attitude and perceived consensus.

Tolerance for Non-conformity

The amount of discrepancy between an individual's attitude and his perception of group consensus may be viewed as a measure of "tolerance for non-conformity." This would only be true, of course, to the extent that the limits of a person's tolerance for non-conformity had been tested. For example, a person with a large tolerance for non-conformity could actually, with respect to a particular attitude, show no discrepancy between own position and perceived consensus. Such a measure then would not represent a good test of the maximum extent of tolerance for non-conformity, since the correspondence would be due

more to coincidence, rather than to little tolerance for non-conformity. On the other hand, a given discrepancy would indicate that a person had at least that much tolerance for non-conformity.

Within the limits of tolerance for own non-conformity, a person should be reasonably free to alter his position in relation to perceived consensus so long as he doesn't exceed his limit. In other words, an individual with high tolerance for non-conformity should be content occupying a greater range of positions in relation to perceived consensus, than should a person with little tolerance for non-conformity. That is, those who place a lower value on group approval are less tied to perceived consensus, and hence are more free to vary their own position autonomously. If the above assumption is correct, then the relationship between attitude and perceived consensus should be reasonably consistent over time—but even more so for those having little tolerance for non-conformity. Further, when change takes place, this consistency of relationship should also be manifested in co-variation of attitude and perceived consensus. Here again, there should be greater consistency in the case of those having little tolerance for non-conformity. White's (24) findings in this area showed the overall consistency, but not the differential.

Tolerance for Non-conformity and Attitude Change

The varying amounts of tolerance for non-conformity shown by different individuals within a positive reference group are assumed to be due primarily to the differential values which they place on group approval. Those having greater tolerance for non-conformity are the ones for whom the group is not as attractive and hence they are less subject to the influence or pressure of the group. Being less subject to group pressure

these individuals are more free to change their opinion or attitude on a subject which is relevant to a group norm, without being as concerned about where the group as a whole stands. Consequently, in a lecture treatment aimed at changing attitudes, where there is no group process involved and hence no opportunity for group members to observe the effect on others, there should be a differential amount of change between those having greater and lesser tolerance for non-conformity. The autonomy of individuals having greater tolerance for non-conformity should enable them to change more freely as well as to generalize the change to related areas. Those with little tolerance for non-conformity should show more of a tendency to remain at their old equilibrium, since they are more tied to perceived consensus. However, the above expectation would not necessarily apply in a group discussion situation. Here, those with little tolerance for non-conformity might show more change than those having greater tolerance, depending on how they perceived the group as going. White's (24) findings showed that in a situation where a group norm was presented, those with little tolerance for non-conformity tended to show more change than those having greater tolerance for non-conformity.

Autistic Displacement

As indicated previously, the position an individual ascribes to the group (perceived consensus) may be influenced by "attractiveness of the group," as well as "opportunity for information." Therefore, provided there has been adequate "opportunity for information," "attractiveness of the group" as reflected in the value the individual places on group approval should be the principal causative factor in any displacement that takes place. The term "autistic displacement" refers to the discrepancy between an individual's perceived group consensus and the <u>actual</u> group norm (i.e.,

inaccuracy of judgment). From the above it follows that if opportunity for information is equalized, the amount of autistic displacement should vary inversely with the amount of tolerance for non-conformity. For example, individuals having high tolerance for non-conformity and adequate information on where the group stands, should show little autistic displacement. On the other hand, those having little tolerance for non-conformity should show more of a tendency to distort or displace the group position, which enables them to satisfy their need for being in tune with the group and at the same time maintain a deviant attitude. In other words, the influence of need on social perception is greater for those having little tolerance for non-conformity.

Tolerance for Non-conformity as a Basic Personality Characteristic

Throughout the discussion, "tolerance for non-conformity" as measured by the discrepancy between own position and perceived consensus, has been conceptualized as being closely related to the value an individual places on group approval. It has been assumed that those who have little tolerance for non-conformity are the ones for whom the group is more attractive or who place a higher value on group approval and hence are more subject to group influence. However, the fact than an individual shows a given relationship between attitude and perceived consensus on a certain subject, with respect to a particular group, does not mean that he would invariably show a similar relationship on another subject—or with a different group. It is possible, depending on the attractiveness, that an individual could have little tolerance for non-conformity in one group and greater tolerance in another. However, other things being equal, persons having little tolerance for non-conformity in one group should exhibit a

similar relationship in other groups since they are viewed as normally being less autonomous--perhaps "other-directed" in Riesman's (19) terms, and generally placing a higher value on group approval.

There is no intention of implying that tolerance for non-conformity represents a "pure" measure of a basic need to conform. There are probably numerous forces, both external and internal, which could affect a person's attitude position in relation to that of the group. Thus, in maintaining an attitude position close to that of the group, a person might be satisfying some need other than that of basic conformity. Therefore, a person showing little tolerance for non-conformity might not have a strong basic need to conform, but rather the measure could reflect other needs or forces which cut across it. Hence, tolerance for non-conformity, as measured, may reflect the operation of other needs and forces in addition to basic conformity.

Notwithstanding the above, it is proposed that tolerance for non-conformity, as measured, may be representative of something of a personality syndrome. If this is so, it should show some relationship to a conformity rating derived from the results of an independent personality measure. Such a conformity rating would be in a broader, more generalized context, but even so, there should be a relationship between the two separate measures if they are tapping the same basic variable. It is believed that this study represents the first attempt to relate tolerance for non-conformity to separate personality measures of conformity.

CHAPTER II

HYPOTHESES AND METHODOLOGY

Objectives of the Experimental Design

This experiment incorporates two related objectives, both of which fit within a value theory framework. Using varying treatments, one objective was to assess the effect on attitudes (in terms of change) following the differential exploitation of value systems. The approach used here was to increase the number of values involved in the manipulation process, from one treatment to another, as a means of varying the pressure to change. In addition, two other hypotheses relating to the theory were tested. These pertain to attitude change based on value salience and awareness of conflict.

The other objective was to investigate further the relationship between attitude and perceived group consensus. An effort was made to assess this relationship and its implications more fully, as well as to determine the effect on attitude change.

Hypotheses and Predictions

Listed below are the hypotheses and predictions which were tested in this experiment. The theoretical basis for each of the hypotheses is outlined in sections IV and V of the preceding chapter.

Hypothesis I

Attitude change through the exploitation of a value system should produce change more frequently, in the direction of the influence attempt,

with those for whom the value is more salient, than with those for whom the value is less salient.

> Prediction 1.—Those subjects for whom national and personal security is a more salient (i. e., central) value, will more frequently show positive attitude change toward Negroes as a result of an influence attempt which exploits this value, than will those for whom national and personal security is not so salient a value.

Hypothesis II

Generally speaking, attitude change may be viewed as a function of the range of values brought to bear. Therefore, if an influence attempt has the effect of showing that an attitude constitutes a barrier to the attainment of a particular value, pressure to change should occur, with subsequent restructuring of the attitude more in line with the value. Further, if other forces are brought to bear in the form of additional values being exploited, greater change should take place as these forces are increased, provided the forces are operating in the same direction.

> Prediction 2.—Through exploitation of the value of national and personal security, there will be attitude change toward Negroes in the direction of the influence attempt. Further, the extent of attitude change will be in ascending order in accordance with the following three treatments: (1) lecture; (2) group discussion-consensus; and (3) group discussion-consensus and commitment.

Hypothesis III

Attitude change through the exploitation of a value system should produce change more frequently, in the direction of the influence attempt, on the part of those who have greater awareness of the conflict between an attitude and a pertinent value, than with those having less awareness of the conflict.

> Prediction 3.—Those subjects who have greater awareness of the conflict (or relationship) between Negro prejudice and the value of national and personal security will show change more frequently, in the direction of the influence attempt, than those who have less awareness.

Hypothesis IV

In positive reference groups (i.e., where the group has value for the person) there should be a tendency for a consistent relationship to exist, over time, between an individual's attitude on a particular subject and his perception of the group's position (perceived consensus). That is, the discrepancy between own position and perceived consensus (tolerance for non-conformity) should tend to be consistent.

Prediction 4.—There will be a tendency for a consistent relationship to exist, over time, between sorority members' attitudes on a subject which is relevant to a group norm (attitude toward Negroes) and their perception of group consensus.

Prediction 5.—The discrepancy (or relationship) between own attitude and perceived consensus will, over time, be more consistent in the case of individuals who have little tolerance for non-conformity than for those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

Prediction 6.—In a lecture treatment where there is no group process involved, individuals who have greater tolerance for non-conformity and who are therefore more autonomous, will more frequently show change in the target area as well as generalization to related areas. Those who have little tolerance for non-conformity will, on the other hand, show more of a tendency to remain at their former equilibrium.

Prediction 7.—When the initial perceived position of the group (perceived consensus) and the influence attempt are in the same direction from the position of the individual, those with little tolerance for non-conformity will show positive change more frequently than those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

Hypothesis V

On a subject which is relevant to a group norm, individuals with little tolerance for non-conformity should more frequently perceive their attitudes as conforming to that of the group norm than will those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

Prediction 8.—Individuals who have little tolerance for non-conformity will more frequently perceive their views and opinions regarding Negroes to be the same as those of the majority of the group, than will those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

Hypothesis VI

Those with little tolerance for non-conformity should show more autistic displacement of the actual group norm (i. e., inaccuracy of judgment) than those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

> Prediction 9.--Individuals with little tolerance for non-conformity will, with respect to attitude toward Negroes, show more autistic displacement of the group norm in the direction of their own position than will those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

Hypothesis VII

Tolerance for non-conformity, as measured by discrepancy between own position and perceived consensus, should bear a relationship to a conformity rating derived from the results of an independent personality measure. Those with little tolerance for non-conformity should likewise, on an independent conformity measure, tend to show a higher degree of conformity than those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

> Prediction 10.--On conformity indexes derived from the F Scale and the Michigan Sentence Completion those with little tolerance for non-conformity will tend to score in the upper range (more conformity) more frequently than those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

Experimental Methodology

This experiment was integrated within a larger experimental program which used members of sorority and women's dormitory groups as subjects.[1] These groups were located at Ypsilanti State Normal College of Ypsilanti, Michigan. Much of the data reported in this experiment was collected in connection with the third and last session with the subjects, using only the sorority group portion of the total experimental population.

---

[1]The overall program which was directed by Daniel Katz involved an experimental approach to attitude change and was supported in part by the United States Air Force, under contract #AF33 (038)-26646, monitored by the Human Resources Research Institute, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama.

However, for certain hypotheses and predictions, data is incorporated from all three sessions, using the total experimental population.

The framework used for testing the hypotheses of this experiment was that of a value system approach to attitude change. One objective of the experiment involved an attempt to produce attitude change toward Negroes through exploiting what is conceived of as a value commonly held by individuals, i. e., "national security with its implications for personal security." Three varying treatments were used. The attempt to induce change was in the context of having the subjects consider the implications of discriminatory practices resulting from Negro prejudice, in relation to how they threaten maximization of the value of "national and personal security." In certain groups, for the purpose of producing increased attitude change, other forces, which are viewed as components of the "value of group approval" were brought to bear. This involved utilizing "group decision (consensus)" and "public commitment" as means of creating added pressure to change.

The three treatments which were given to different groups were as follows:

1. Lecture treatment.—Lectures consisting of identical subject matter were given to three different sorority groups comprising 14, 18, and 23 subjects. Two of these had been given an influence attempt in the second session, as part of the larger study. The other group had previously been used as a control group. The content of the lecture consisted of material designed first to evoke the value of "national and personal security," which was then followed by information showing how discriminatory practices resulting from prejudice threaten this value. There was no group process involved and the lectures themselves varied from 28 to

32 minutes in length. As a means of evoking the value system, material concerning the present insecure state of world affairs and the Communist long range program of world domination was used. Information was then presented on the five points shown below, followed by the expressed conclusion that discriminatory practices do have serious implications for our national and personal security. The material used was obtained from numerous sources, but primarily from Rose (20) and Myrdal (16). Appendix A contains the material as arranged for group discussion purposes. For the lecture treatment, it was rewritten and converted to fit a lecture presentation. The five points on which the lecture elaborated are shown below:

a. The various kinds of discriminatory practices (economic, political, legal, social), with examples of them.

b. The reaction of Negroes to discriminatory practices is one of dissatisfaction and frustration.

c. Communists use racial discrimination and disaffected people as a wedge for infiltration.

d. Discriminatory practices damage our Good Neighbor Policy and alienate other nations.

e. Discriminatory practices harm internal solidarity by making for internal strife and wastage of manpower. Corrective action is up to the majority group.

2. Group Discussion - Consensus Treatment.—With four sorority groups consisting of 18, 14, 16 and 11 subjects, leader-centered discussions (Appendix A) were conducted. These were held in class rooms with the tables arranged in semi-circles. Information brought out was essentially the same as provided in the lecture treatment, with the same material being placed on the blackboard. At the end of the discussions, which varied from 55 to 63 minutes, group decisions were asked for, in the form of a showing of hands, on the following question: "Do discriminatory practices have serious implications for our national and personal

security?" Thus, following group discussion, this treatment involved an attempt to utilize the process of group decision or consensus as a supplementary means of reinforcing or creating added pressure to change in line with the logic of the reasoning developed in the discussion.

3. Group Discussion - Consensus and Commitment Treatment.—Four other sorority groups consisting of 10, 14, 14 and 16 subjects were given treatments similar to 2 above. However, after obtaining a consensus on the question of discriminatory practices having serious implications for national and personal security, an attempt was made to add further pressure to change. The procedure followed was that of getting a showing of hands on four questions concerning "personal willingness" to see certain discriminatory practices eliminated as follows: separate restaurants, separate schools, separate hotels and separate residential areas. In addition, a showing of hands was also asked for on "personal willingness" to exert a greater effort to try and eliminate any discriminatory behavior on the individual's own part. Thus, in this treatment, an attempt was made to utilize "commitment" as an additional means of reinforcing or creating pressure to change. For these groups the same amount of time was utilized as for those who received the "consensus" treatment.

Attitude Measures Used

Three different types of questionnaires were used to measure subjects' attitudes toward Negroes.[1] These questionnaires were developed for and utilized throughout the overall study. They were:

(1) A Negro Stereotype Questionnaire (Appendix B), consisting of 21 statements pertaining to Negro stereotypes, 15 of which were negative stereotypes, and the only ones analyzed for the purpose of this experiment. These stereotype statements are primarily

---

[1]These measures were pre-tested for the purpose of identifying and discarding those items which did not discriminate. Extensive reliability checks were not run, however.

on the perceptual or ideational level without having much direct relation to behavior of the subjects.

(2) A Negro Segregation Questionnaire (Appendix C), consisting of ten items pertaining to various kinds of segregation or disciminatory practices. This questionnaire contained more behavioral or action implications for the subjects than the one above.

(3) In addition, a modified Bogardus Social Distance Scale was given. However, the results were not analyzed for the purpose of this experiment.

National Security Items and Measures of Perceived Group Consensus

In addition to the above schedules, there were two statements pertaining to discriminatory practices in relation to national security and international relations (Appendix D). The influence attempt itself was organized around the statement pertaining to discriminatory practices in relation to national security which read as follows: "Discriminatory practices arising out of prejudice against minority groups (Negroes, for example) constitute a threat to our national security." The statement dealing with international relations was a compound one and results indicate that it was often misinterpreted. It was not therefore used in the analysis. Both of these statements had consensus measures attached, i. e., responses were obtained on what the individual thought the majority of the group's opinion was on the particular statement. In addition two of the statements contained in the Segregation Questionnaire mentioned in (2) above also had accompanying consensus measures. The two statements pertained to "separate hotels and restaurants" and "separate residential areas." Only three consensus items are used in the analysis, since the fourth pertained to a faulty question.

Scoring of Attitude Measures

The schedules mentioned above, except for the Bogardus Social Distance Scale, were answered and scored in the same manner as the F Scale (1). The range of possible answers to each item was as follows: +3 (agree very much); +2 (agree pretty much); +1 (agree a little); -1 (disagree a little); -2 (disagree pretty much); -3 (disagree very much). The scoring was on a six-point scale--1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7. Thus, for the fifteen negative stereotype statements, a maximum possible anti-Negro score would be 105 and the maximum possible pro-Negro score would be 15. For the ten statements in the segregation questionnaire the maximum possible anti-Negro score would be 70 and the maximum possible pro-Negro score would be 10.

Experimental Design

As mentioned previously, this experiment was integrated within a more comprehensive experimental program entailing three sessions with sorority and women's dormitory groups during the spring of 1953. The total experimental population was approximately 300, with attrition reducing the number to about 250 between the first and third sessions. The sessions were conducted in the evening after the various groups had had their weekly meetings.

During the first session, a battery of personality tests was administered. Among others, the following were included, whose results were used in this study: (a) the F Scale of Authoritarian Character Structure (Appendix E) and (b) the Michigan Sentence Completion Test (Appendix F). In addition to the personality measures, the several attitude scales mentioned above were also administered during the first session.

During the second session, one week later, two treatments (influence attempts) were administered to different groups in the form of written materials which were read by the subjects. One treatment (direct interpretation) which used a case study approach, was designed to show how attitudes may function as ego defenses. By outlining the psychological explanations of behavior, the objective was to see if any insights could be provided which would be carried over into attitude change. The other treatment used a rational approach and presented information about Negroes within a framework of cultural relativity and cultural causation; e. g., Negroes are not inherently inferior, rather their shortcomings stem from lack of education, low economic status, etc. All groups, except for two control groups, received one of the two treatments, and all groups were again administered the several attitude scales.

With respect to this immediate experiment, much of the data were collected during the third session which took place six weeks after the second session. Only sorority groups were used, and the experimental design for this study was as follows:

1. Pre-Measure. All groups were again administered the several attitude scales previously described.

2. Influence Attempt. The influence attempt consisted of three different variations as follows:

   a. Lecture Treatment. Three groups totaling 55 subjects were used, of which one group of 23 subjects comprised a former control group which had not received a previous influence attempt.

   b. Group Discussion - Consensus Treatment. Four groups totaling 49 subjects were used.

   c. Group Discussion - Consensus and Commitment Treatment. Four groups totaling 54 subjects were used.

3. Post-Measure. The same attitude scales were again administered after the treatments outlined in 2. above. In addition another schedule was administered which contained questions concerning the subject's reactions during the influence attempt.

With two exceptions, the above groups were "split" groups. This was necessary in order to reduce the numbers to discussion group size. Where groups were split, each half received the same "treatment," except for one group in which only half of the members were used in connection with this immediate experiment. The amount of time used in treatment 2a (lecture) was approximately 30 minutes. The amount of time for treatments 2b and 2c (discussion groups) was approximately 60 minutes. Essentially the same content material was covered in all three treatments.

Training of Lecture and Discussion Group Leaders

Eight discussion group leaders and three lecturers conducted the 11 groups which were used in this part of the experiment. All were male graduate students or Ph.D.'s in psychology and sociology. In addition they had all had previous teaching experience or training in group dynamics. For the group discussion leaders, a total of six hours was devoted to training sessions. The major purpose of these training sessions was to develop a common orientation to the subject matter, which had been previously prepared, so that there would be as much uniformity as possible. Part of the time was spent in reviewing democratic leadership procedures as outlined by Maier (12), such as: handling hostility, being acceptant, supporting deviants, encouraging discussion, etc. Schedules were also established for the amount of time that would be spent on each point and the material that would be placed on the blackboard. The discussion group leaders also spent

additional time outside the training sessions to increase their familiarity with the material. For the three lecturers, there was less training time involved, since their's was a straight-forward presentation. All leaders, after conducting the influence attempt, submitted reports covering such items as: length of time spent on each point; numbers from which consensus and commitment were obtained; any critical incidents; and how the treatment went generally.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Hypothesis I - Attitude Change in Relation to Differential Salience of a Value

The first hypothesis asserts that attitude change through the exploitation of a value system should produce change more frequently in the direction of the influence attempt, on the part of those for whom the value is more salient, than with those for whom the value is less salient.

As outlined in Sections III and IV of Chapter I, it is assumed that there is a varying relationship between attitudes and values in the psychological organization of the individual. It is further assumed that a value system represents a more complex and stable cognitive-affective organization than an attitude. Thus, if an attitude which is at variance with a given value system can be brought into a closer relationship with the value, there should be a tendency for the attitude to become consistent with and take on the same sign as the value. If the value is particularly salient (strong or central), this tendency should be even more marked. The following prediction tests this hypothesis.

> Prediction 1.—Those subjects for whom national and personal security is a more salient (i. e., central) value will more frequently show positive attitude change toward Negroes as a result of an influence attempt which exploits this value than will those for whom national and personal security is not so salient a value.

The pre-measure of the third session contained two questions which were designed to get at the relative salience, for the subjects, of the

value of national and personal security. These questions were:

> How concerned would you say you feel about the present state of world affairs and the possibility of another large scale war involving the U.S.? (1) very much___, (2) pretty much___, (3)a little___, (4) not at all___.
>
> In the event of another large scale war involving the U.S., how much do you think your personal safety would be endangered? (1) very much___, (2) pretty much___, (3) a little___, (4) not at all___.

Individuals who checked answer (1) on both questions were operationally defined as having a "more salient" value of national and personal security. Those who checked any other combination on both questions were categorized as having a "less salient" value of national and personal security. Thus, subjects were dichotomized as "more salient" or "less salient" with respect to this value. Positive or negative attitude change (difference from pre-measure to post-measure of the third session was defined in terms of a change of at least 3 points on the Stereotype Questionnaire and 2 points on the Segregation Questionnaire. Thus, in all three treatments, only those were included who changed in at least the above amounts (positively or negatively) on either questionnaire. Using a change criterion of 3 points and 2 points serves roughly to make equivalent change on the two questionnaires, since one (the stereotype) contained fifteen questions and the other (the segregation) ten questions. Also, lesser amounts of change were considered to be more in the nature of chance variations. Table 1 shows the difference in attitude change of subjects dichotomized as having a "more salient" and "less salient" value of national and personal security.[1]

---

[1]It was the intent of this study to make as few assumptions as possible regarding the characteristics of the data. In keeping with this purpose, and since much of the data obtained yields categorical information, the statistical techniques used in the analysis are primarily non-parametric in nature. The chi square method of testing differences is the principal technique used for analysis in this experiment. Further, significance tests are one-tailed (13) whenever direction is specified.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE CHANGE OF SUBJECTS WHOSE VALUE OF NATIONAL AND PERSONAL SECURITY IS "MORE SALIENT" WITH THOSE WHOSE VALUE IS "LESS SALIENT"

	Stereotype Questionnaire		Segregation Questionnaire	
	Negative Change	Positive Change	Negative Change	Positive Change
"More salient" subjects	10	23	8	21
"Less salient" subjects	34	28	24	37
	$X^2 = 5.21$ $p < .02$		$X^2 = 1.19$ $p < .15$	

On the Stereotype Questionnaire those having a "more salient" value of national and personal security did show change in the direction of the influence attempt in significantly greater numbers than those whose value is "less salient." On the Segregation Questionnaire the results are in the predicted direction, but only at about the 14% level. As previously pointed out, the influence attempt itself dealt with various discriminatory practices and was aimed directly at certain of the items appearing on the Segregation Questionnaire. It is therefore logical, as the results indicate, that there would be a broader, more general positive change on this questionnaire than on the Stereotype Questionnaire, which was not the direct target of the influence attempt. Therefore, the difference in significance between results on the two questionnaires may be an indication that a salient value also facilitates generalization to and cognitive reorganization in related areas. Such an assumption would certainly be in line with value theory. There is also a finding in connection with Hypothesis III which supports this.

Hypothesis II - Attitude Change as a Function of the Range of Values Brought to Bear

It was hypothesized that, if an influence attempt has the effect of showing that an attitude constitutes a barrier to the attainment of a particular value, pressure to change should occur, with subsequent restructuring of the attitude more in line with the value. Further, if other forces are brought to bear in the form of additional values being exploited, greater change should take place as these forces are increased, provided the forces are operating in the same direction.

> Prediction 2.—Through exploitation of the value of national and personal security, there will be attitude change toward Negroes in the direction of the influence attempt. Further, the extent of attitude change will be in ascending order in accordance with the following three treatments: (1) lecture, (2) group discussion - consensus, and (3) group discussion - consensus and commitment.

This order was posited on the assumption that the group discussion treatments would provide increased change over the lecture presentation because of the utilization, in the one case, of the process of "group consensus," with "public commitment" being added and utilized in the other. It was considered that "consensus" and "commitment" which are viewed as components of the value of group approval would constitute supplementary means of reinforcing and/or creating added pressure to change in line with the logic of the reasoning developed in the discussion. In all of the three treatments, an attempt was made to evoke the value of national and personal security as a means of creating pressure to change. However, in the two group discussion treatments there should be added pressure to change due to the utilization of "consensus" in the one instance and "consensus and commitment" in the other.

The prediction was tested by determining the significance of the difference between pre- and post-measure means for each treatment on the Stereotype Questionnaire, the Segregation Questionnaire and the National Security Statement. In addition, the difference between treatments was also computed. As previously stated, only the 15 negative stereotype items of the Stereotype Questionnaire were used, for which a maximum anti-Negro score would be 105 and a maximum pro-Negro score 15. On the post-measure, the range of scores was from 15 to 76. The maximum change shown, from pre- to post-measure, was 33 points in the pro direction and 24 points in the anti direction. Table 2 shows the results, by treatment, on the Stereotype Questionnaire. For the purpose of this analysis, the results for only two groups within the lecture treatment are shown, since the third group was a former control group which had not been exposed to a prior influence attempt.

TABLE 2

PRE-MEASURE TO POST-MEASURE DIFFERENCES, BY TREATMENT, ON THE STEREOTYPE QUESTIONNAIRE

	2 Lecture Gps. N=32		4 Consensus Gps. N=49		4 Commitment Gps. N=54	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Before	43.78	19.16	40.84	15.12	37.30	20.28
After	42.37	19.44	42.63	18.29	35.39	21.02
Diff.	1.41	-0.28	-1.79	-3.17	1.91	-0.74
	t = 1.71 p = .05		t = .86 p N.S.		t = 1.87 p = .03	

The results shown in the above table indicate that two of the treatments (lecture and commitment) produced significant differences in the expected direction. For the consensus treatment, the difference, although

not significant, was in the opposite direction. With respect to the significance of the difference between treatments, the positive gains produced by both lecture and commitment treatments were significantly better (at the 4% level) than the consensus treatment, which showed a negative gain. The difference between lecture and commitment treatments was in the predicted direction, but was not significant. An examination of the individual scores shows that there was a considerable amount of shifting in all three treatments, but in most groups it tended to take place in both directions. There were several groups in which change was predominantly positive, but these were not analyzed separately due to the small numbers.

Table 3 below shows the results, by treatment, on the Segregation Questionnaire. For this questionnaire, which consisted of ten items, a maximum anti-Negro score would be 70 and a maximum pro-Negro score would be 10. On the post-measure the range of scores was from 10 to 57. The maximum change, from pre- to post-measure, was 14 points in the pro direction and 13 points in the anti direction.

TABLE 3

PRE-MEASURE TO POST-MEASURE DIFFERENCES, BY TREATMENT, ON THE SEGREGATION QUESTIONNAIRE

	2 Lecture Gps. N=32		4 Consensus Gps. N=49		4 Commitment Gps. N=54	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Before	26.66	10.69	22.53	9.33	21.15	10.94
After	24.41	12.62	22.22	9.67	19.89	11.21
Diff.	2.25	-1.93	0.31	-0.34	1.26	-0.30
	t=2.55 p= .01		t= .51 p N.S.		t=2.26 p= .02	

Results on this questionnaire show about the same pattern as the Stereotype Questionnaire, in that only the lecture and commitment treatments showed significant positive gains. This time the consensus treatment showed a change in the predicted direction, but not significantly so. With respect to differences between treatments, there is a significant difference between the lecture and consensus treatments, but in the opposite direction from that predicted. The difference between the lecture and commitment treatments is in the opposite direction also, but is not so great. The difference between consensus and commitment treatments is in the predicted direction, but only at the 12% level. As with the Stereotype Questionnaire,the individual scores show a good deal of shifting from pre- to post-measure, which is not entirely due to unreliability,because previous checks with control groups do not show nearly this variation.The implication seems to be that the treatments produced resistance in quite a few of the subjects which carried over tothe questionnaires.This is quite probable, since the post-measure standard deviations are higher in every instance. On the whole, the consensus treatment appeared to be hardly adequate in overcoming the resistance, whereas the lecture and commitment treatments created enough pressure to overcome the resistance, but not much more.

Table 4 shows the pre- to post-measure results, by treatment, on the National Security Statement. On this statement the post-measure range of scores was from 1 to 7, which represents the maximum and minimum possible for the question. The maximum change on this question from pre- to post-measure was 6 points in the positive direction and 5 points in the negative direction.

The results on the National Security Statement show a completely different pattern from those obtained on the two questionnaires. In this

TABLE 4

PRE-MEASURE TO POST-MEASURE DIFFERENCES, BY TREATMENT, ON THE NATIONAL SECURITY STATEMENT

	2 Lecture Gps. N=32		4 Consensus Gps. N=49		4 Commitment Gps. N=54	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Before	2.13	1.53	2.24	1.46	2.24	1.74
After	1.56	1.27	1.37	0.72	1.43	0.93
Diff.	0.57	0.27	0.87	0.74	0.81	0.81
	t=2.15 p= .03		t=4.06 p< .001		t=3.45 p< .001	

instance, the post-measure means are all significantly lower and in the predicted direction. In addition, both consensus and commitment treatments showed more positive gain than the lecture treatment; however, the differences are a little short of being significant. One interesting aspect of the results is the fact that the post-measure standard deviations decreased in all three treatments, whereas, without exception, they increased on the two questionnaires. The F ratio reveals that the variance was reduced significantly ($p < .001$) in both consensus and commitment treatments. For the lecture treatment the difference was a little short of being significant. The pre-measure variances for each of the three treatments showed no significant differences. However, there were significant differences between post-measure variances. The consensus and commitment post-measure variances were smaller than the lecture treatment variance at the p .001 and p .03 levels respectively. This difference between variances serves to indicate how a group discussion can facilitate the development of a

more compact norm. This is particularly so, as in this instance, when the subject is not too controversial and when prior cognitive differentiation is not extensive. The National Security Item was, of course, the statement around which the influence attempt was organized and on which the several treatments dealt primarily. Since the influence attempt was not specific to the content of the Stereotype Questionnaire, change on this measure would be more in the nature of generalization. It was, however, specific to parts of the Segregation Questionnaire, so change in this instance would not represent generalization to any great extent.

In summary, that part of the prediction was not confirmed which asserted that the lecture, consensus and commitment treatments would produce attitude change in ascending order. Although the results do not present a very clear pattern, the consensus treatment appears to be the least effective of the three treatments, as shown by the results on both questionnaires. On the Stereotype Questionnaire, the commitment treatment showed better results than the lecture, but not significantly so. On the Segregation Questionnaire the lecture treatment showed a better gain, but not significantly so. With respect to the two discussion group treatments (consensus and commitment), significantly better results were obtained on the commitment treatment, as predicted.

That part of the prediction which posited that attitude change would be produced through exploiting the value of national and personal security was confirmed by the results obtained in the lecture treatment. This was the only treatment in which the value of national and personal security was exploited exclusively. The other two treatments (consensus and commitment) involved components of another value, and failure to obtain the expected results may be due to the fact that the values were not

operating in the same direction in all instances. As previously stated, it is a condition of the hypothesis that in order to produce increased change, the added values must all be operating in the same direction. This does not always happen, particularly when one is dealing with a subject such as discriminatory practices and Negro prejudice generally, where attitudes are pretty well crystallized and strong rationalizations have been developed to support them. Hence, in a group discussion situation, when a person finds that he has support for his position, the amount of support in terms of numbers does not have to be great in order to constitute sufficient reinforcement. Asch's (2) studies on independence and yielding behavior show this very clearly.

Some additional support can, however, be mustered for the effectiveness of consensus and commitment in this experiment. For the two discussion group treatments it is possible to define operationally the success of the treatments in terms of those from whom consensus was obtained in the one treatment, and those from whom consensus and commitment were obtained in the other treatment. For the consensus treatment this amounts to taking those subjects who raised their hands on the consensus question: "Do discriminatory practices have serious implications for national and personal security?" There were 37 out of the total N of 49 in this category. For the consensus and commitment treatment, there were 37 out of 54 subjects who raised their hands on the same question, as well as on a majority of the five commitment questions. With success of the two treatments defined in these terms, the results are in the predicted direction of showing increased change for these categories, on both questionnaires, over the total groups from which they were extracted. Of course, increased change on the Segregation Questionnaire is to be expected from those who raised their

hands on the commitment questions. This is because the commitment questions which pertained to a "personal willingness" to see certain discriminatory practices eliminated, had a bearing on three of the ten items on the Segregation Questionnaire itself. However, the increased change on the Stereotype Questionnaire cannot be so ascribed, because the subject matter of the discussion did not deal with these stereotypes. It seems logical that any added change in this instance would be due to increased generalization.

Hypothesis III - Attitude Change in Relation to Differential Awareness of Conflict Between an Attitude and a Value

It is a maxim in clinical psychology that successful therapy cannot be accomplished without there first being an "acceptance" or "awareness" of the conflict on the part of the patient. Such an assumption is also pertinent in an attitude change context. It was therefore hypothesized that attitude change through the exploitation of a value system should produce change more frequently, in the direction of the influence attempt, on the part of those who have greater awareness of the conflict between an attitude and a pertinent value, than with those who have less awareness of the conflict.

> Prediction 3.--Those subjects who have greater awareness of the conflict (or relationship) between Negro prejudice and the value of national and personal security will show change more frequently, in the direction of the influence attempt, than those who have less awareness.

On the pre-measure, all individuals who checked "agree very much" on the statement: "Discriminatory practices arising out of prejudice against minority groups (Negroes, for example) constitute a threat to our national security," were operationally defined as having high awareness of the conflict between prejudice and the value of national and personal

security. The rest, who checked lesser degrees of agreement with this question, were defined as having less awareness of conflict between the attitude and the value. The same criteria for change were used as was followed in Hypothesis I, i. e., a pre- to post-measure change of at least 3 points and 2 points on the Stereotype and Segregation Questionnaires respectively. Table 5 shows the results for subjects dichotomized as having "high awareness and "less awareness," who changed in at least the amounts outlined above on either questionnaire.

TABLE 5

A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDE CHANGE OF SUBJECTS HAVING "HIGH AWARENESS" OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN NEGRO PREJUDICE AND THE VALUE OF NATIONAL AND PERSONAL SECURITY WITH THOSE HAVING "LESS AWARENESS"

	Stereotype Questionnaire		Segregation Questionnaire	
	Negative Change	Positive Change	Negative Change	Positive Change
"High awareness" subjects	9	28	9	25
"Less awareness" "	30	28	25	31
	$X^2 = 7.01$ $p < .005$		$X^2 = 5.16$ $p < .02$	

On both questionnaires, those showing "high awareness" showed change significantly more often in the direction of the influence attempt than those having "less awareness" of the conflict between prejudice and the value of national and personal security. Therefore the hypothesis that awareness of conflict facilitates attitude change may be accepted with some degree of confidence. In addition, it is noted that here we also have a situation similar to the findings shown under Hypothesis I, i. e., a difference in

significance between the results on the two questionnaires. The same reasoning applies here.

Hypothesis IV - Relationship Between Perceived Group Consensus and Attitude

This hypothesis asserts that in positive reference groups, there should be a tendency for a consistent relationship to exist, over time, between an individual's attitude on a relevant subject and his perception of the group's position (perceived consensus). That is, the discrepancy between own position and perceived consensus (tolerance for non-conformity) should tend to be consistent.

The two factors which are viewed as affecting the degree of relationship between attitude and perceived consensus are: (a) attraction toward the group; and (b) opportunity for information. Therefore, individuals who are strongly attracted to the group (place a high value on group approval) will show less discrepancy between own attitude and perceived consensus than those who are not so strongly attracted. Further, as "opportunity for information" is increased, the less will "lack of information" be a contributing factor to the discrepancy between attitude and perceived consensus. The amount of this discrepancy, provided it represents an adequate test, is viewed as a measure of "tolerance for non-conformity" and indicates the extent to which group pressure in the form of perceived consensus may operate as a causative factor in helping to determine attitude position. The amount of tolerance for non-conformity is thus viewed as being closely related to the value which the individual places on group approval.

In testing this hypothesis, it is assumed that the sororities represent positive reference groups for their members. It is further assumed

that the subject with which this experiment deals (attitudes toward Negroes) represents a "relevant" subject for sororities. As previously stated, the discrepancy between own attitude and perceived consensus may be due to both "opportunity for information" and relative "attractiveness of the group." However, opportunity for information is considered to be a more or less constant factor in this experiment, especially for the subjects in the group discussion treatments. This is due to the fact that the groups were sororities and, in view of the subject matter of the experiment, it is assumed that there had been fairly adequate communication--particularly since this was the third session with the subjects. The four predictions which follow relate to the above hypothesis:

> Prediction 4.--There will be a tendency for a consistent relationship to exist, over time, between sorority members' attitudes on a subject which is relevant to a group norm (attitude toward Negroes) and their perception of group consensus.

As part of the pre- as well as the post-measure, three items on which both "own position" and "perceived group consensus" were obtained are as follows:

a. It is a good idea to have some restaurants and hotels from which Negroes are excluded.

b. There should be separate sections in towns and cities for Negroes and whites to live.

c. Discriminatory practices arising out of prejudice against minority groups (Negroes, for example) constitute a threat to our national security.

For each of the three statements the possible variation between own position and perceived consensus was from 0 to 6 points. To test the prediction, the actual discrepancies between own position and perceived consensus on the pre-measure and the corresponding discrepancies on the post-measure, for each of the three statements, were put into tables. Following

an inspection of the results (discrepancies) which showed the same patterns of distribution, the tabulations for all three statements were combined in the same table. The pre- and post-measure discrepancies on the three consensus items are shown below, with the discrepancies being ordered into three categories, i. e., discrepancies of 0 to 1, 2 to 3, and 4 to 6. Table 6 is for the eight discussion groups combined, representing 100 subjects. Table 7 pertains to the three lecture groups comprising 55 subjects.

TABLE 6

CONSISTENCY OF THE PRE- TO POST-MEASURE DISCREPANCY BETWEEN ATTITUDE AND PERCEIVED CONSENSUS ON THREE ITEMS FOR 100 SUBJECTS IN EIGHT DISCUSSION GROUPS

		Pre-Measure—Discrepancy Between Attitude and Perceived Consensus		
		0 - 1	2 - 3	4-5-6
Post-Measure Discrepancy	0 - 1	186	27	23
	2 - 3	11	9	5
	4-5-6	10	7	22
			$X^2 = 63.49$ $p < .001$	

TABLE 7

CONSISTENCY OF THE PRE- TO POST-MEASURE DISCREPANCY BETWEEN ATTITUDE AND PERCEIVED CONSENSUS ON THREE ITEMS FOR 55 SUBJECTS IN THREE LECTURE GROUPS

		Pre-Measure—Discrepancy Between Attitude and Perceived Consensus		
		0 - 1	2 - 3	4-5-6
Post-Measure Discrepancy	0 - 1	108	21	6
	2 - 3	10	6	3
	4-5-6	4	2	5
			$X^2 = 13.12$ $p = .01$	

In reading Tables 6 and 7 it is necessary to keep in mind that the entries do not represent individuals, but rather discrepancies between attitude and perceived consensus. For example, the number 108 in Table 7 indicates that there were 108 instances in which discrepancies of from 0 to 1 on the pre-measure remained within that same range on the post-measure.

If from pre-measure to post-measure there had been but few subjects who changed, the results shown in Tables 6 and 7 above would be less interesting. There was a substantial amount of change, however, both positive and negative. Accordingly, the data were ordered to show how the relationship between own position and perceived consensus holds up in terms of change. "Own position" on each of the three items was coded in terms of whether there had been positive change, no change, or negative change from pre- to post-measure. The corresponding consensus measure relating to "own position" was coded in a similar manner. The results for the three items were again combined since they showed essentially the same pattern. Table 8 pertains to the eight discussion groups and Table 9 to the three lecture groups.

TABLE 8

CONSISTENCY BETWEEN ATTITUDE AND PERCEIVED CONSENSUS IN TERMS OF CHANGE FROM PRE-MEASURE TO POST-MEASURE ON THREE ITEMS FOR 100 SUBJECTS IN EIGHT DISCUSSION GROUPS

		Perceived Consensus—Change from Pre- to Post-Measure		
		Positive Change	No Change	Negative Change
Own position—Change from Pre- to Post-Measure	Positive Change	56	29	10
	No Change	63	86	25
	Negative Change	4	11	16
			$X^2 = 47$ $p < .001$	

TABLE 9

CONSISTENCY BETWEEN ATTITUDE AND PERCEIVED CONSENSUS IN TERMS OF CHANGE FROM PRE-MEASURE TO POST-MEASURE ON THREE ITEMS FOR 55 SUBJECTS IN THREE LECTURE GROUPS

		Perceived Consensus—Change from Pre- to Post-Measure		
		Positive Change	No Change	Negative Change
Own position—Change from Pre- to Post-Measure	Positive Change	30	16	1
	No Change	32	57	14
	Negative Change	4	8	3
			$X^2 = 16.18$ $p < .01$	

Again, the figures in Tables 8 and 9 do not represent individuals, but rather a relationship between sets of responses of individuals, i. e., own position and perceived consensus in terms of change from pre-measure to post-measure, on three items. For example, the figure 30 in Table 9 indicates that, in thirty instances, positive change in own position, from pre-measure to post-measure, was accompanied by change in the same direction of perceived consensus.

Tables 6 through 9 present strong confirming evidence for the assertion that there is a tendency for a consistent relationship to exist between attitude and perceived consensus. The showing is even more conclusive, in view of the fact that the results include three sets of measures for each subject. Tables 6 and 7 show that there is a tendency for a consistent relationship to exist, over time, with respect to the amount of discrepancy between attitude and perceived consensus. Tables 8 and 9 show

that when change takes place, there is a tendency for both attitude and perceived consensus to move in the same direction. It is necessary to keep in mind, of course, that there are other forces operative outside the immediate group which affect a person's attitude position. If this were not so, then the relationship between attitude and perceived consensus would presumably be much greater. Although it is not directly relevant to this hypothesis, it is also interesting to note that Tables 6 and 7 both show that, from pre- to post-measure, a convergence occurs between own position and perceived consensus responses. Thus, despite a marked stability there is also a trend in the direction of convergence. For example, Table 6 shows that on the pre-measure there were 50 instances in which the discrepancy between own position and perceived consensus was from 4 to 6 points. On the post-measure there were only 39 instances in which the discrepancy was that large. Further, of the 207 instances in which the pre-measure discrepancy was from 0 to 1, this number increased to 236 on the post-measure. This overall trend toward convergence is to be expected and is ascribed to the effect of the influence attempt.

In looking at the consistency of relationship between attitude and perceived consensus in terms of both size of discrepancy (Tables 6, 7) and concomitant change (Tables 8, 9) it is noted that, in both instances, the relationship is more significant with the discussion groups than with the lecture groups. This may represent support for that part of the theory which says that the discrepancy between attitude and perceived consensus is partially a function of "opportunity for information." The fact that the relationships were not as significant in the lecture groups may be due to their having had less opportunity for information concerning where the group stood. Since the discussion groups had more opportunity for

information, the influence of this factor should be diminished, thus providing purer measures of tolerance for non-conformity in the discussion groups.

> Prediction 5.--The discrepancy (or relationship) between own attitude and perceived consensus will, over time, be more consistent in the case of individuals who have little tolerance for non-conformity than for those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

As outlined in Section V of Chapter I, it is assumed that within the limits of tolerance for own non-conformity, a person should be reasonably free to alter his position in relation to perceived consensus so long as he does not exceed his limit. Therefore, an individual with high tolerance for non-conformity should be content anywhere within a greater range of positions in relation to perceived consensus than should a person with little tolerance for non-conformity. That is, those who place a lower value on group approval are less tied to perceived consensus, and hence are more free to vary their own position autonomously.

In order to test the above prediction, the following operational definitions of "little tolerance for non-conformity" (LT), and "greater tolerance for non-conformity" (GT), were established:

a. Little tolerance for non-conformity (LT): Those having a discrepancy of one point or less (maximum possible discrepancy is 6) between own position and perceived consensus on each of the three statements having consensus measures, as based on the results of the pre-measure of the third session.

b. Greater tolerance for non-conformity (GT): Those having a discrepancy of 2 or more points between attitude and perceived consensus on one or more of the three statements, as based on the results of the pre-measure of the third session.

Subjects were placed in the above categories based on the discrepancies shown on their pre-measure responses. Then the relationships of their post-measure responses to their corresponding pre-measure responses were coded as being "stable" or "variable." A "stable relationship" was defined as: any change in own position (on the post-measure) being

accompanied by a change in the same direction of perceived consensus or no change in both. A "variable relationship" was defined as: a change in opposite directions of own position and perceived consensus, or a change in one without change in the other. Categorizing the subjects in the discussion and lecture groups as having "greater" or "little" tolerance for non-conformity, and coding the pre- to post-measure response relationships for each of the three statements as "stable" or "variable" provides results as shown in Tables 10 and 11 below.

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF PRE- TO POST-MEASURE RELATIONSHIP OF ATTITUDE TO PERCEIVED CONSENSUS ON THREE STATEMENTS, FOR 100 DISCUSSION GROUP SUBJECTS DICHOTOMIZED AS HAVING "LITTLE TOLERANCE" AND "GREATER TOLERANCE" FOR NON-CONFORMITY

	Stable Relationship		Variable Relationship
Responses of 55 GT subjects	74		91
Responses of 45 LT subjects	88		47
		$X^2 = 11.12$ $p < .001$	

TABLE 11

COMPARISON OF PRE- TO POST-MEASURE RELATIONSHIP OF ATTITUDE TO PERCEIVED CONSENSUS ON THREE STATEMENTS, FOR 55 LECTURE GROUP SUBJECTS DICHOTOMIZED AS HAVING "LITTLE TOLERANCE" AND "GREATER TOLERANCE" FOR NON-CONFORMITY

	Stable Relationship		Variable Relationship
Responses of 30 GT subjects	39		51
Responses of 25 LT subjects	52		23
		$X^2 = 11.18$ $p < .001$	

Tables 10 and 11 indicate that subjects categorized as having little tolerance for non-conformity are significantly more consistent with respect to the relationship or co-variation of own position and perceived consensus than are those categorized as having greater tolerance for non-conformity. This serves to support the contention that those who have little tolerance for non-conformity are more tied to perceived consensus and hence less free to vary their own position autonomously.

Refining the Measurement of Tolerance for Non-conformity

As mentioned in Section V of Chapter I, the size of the discrepancy between a person's own position and perceived group consensus, on a particular subject at a given time, would represent an accurate estimate only to the extent that the measure adequately tested the limits of the person's tolerance for non-conformity. A measurement, at any one point in time, of the discrepancy between own position and perceived consensus is not entirely adequate, since one measurement does not always tell enough about the limits of a person's tolerance. For example, a person who, if properly categorized, would be one having "greater tolerance" for non-conformity, could show little or no discrepancy between own position and perceived consensus on a given measurement. Such a measure would not represent a good test of maximum tolerance for non-conformity, since the correspondence would be due more to coincidence, rather than to a marked susceptibility to group pressure. Such a measure would, however, show that the person had at least that much tolerance for non-conformity.

A more accurate identification of those having greater tolerance for non-conformity, as opposed to those having little tolerance, can be had by using more than one item to measure tolerance for non-conformity and to incorporate the results of measures taken over a period of time. In this way, by refining the measurement, one is able to get a better estimate of tolerance for non-conformity. The design of this experiment provided for obtaining four separate measurements on consensus items over a period of seven weeks. The first measurement included only two consensus items: (a) exclusion of Negroes from hotels and restaurants, and (b) separate residential areas for Negroes ahd whites. Whereas the three following measurements included not only the two items noted above, but also a consensus measure on the statement that "Discriminatory practices constitute a threat to national security." It will be remembered that the third and fourth measurements have been previously referred to as the pre- and post-measure of the third session.

By combining the results of measures of tolerance for non-conformity which were obtained over a period of time, it is possible to obtain a refined estimate. This enables more accurate identification of certain subjects as having little tolerance for non-conformity and others as having greater tolerance. Of course, in the refining process, attrition takes place with the result that a sizeable proportion of the subjects end up not being clearly identified as being in either category. It was necessary to do this, however, in order to increase the probability of obtaining two groups of subjects that differed with respect to amount of tolerance for non-conformity. The same definitions as previously given, of "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for

non-conformity were used, except that here the definitions are applied across each of the four separate measurements. Thus, the subjects finally categorized as having "little tolerance for non-conformity" are those who showed a discrepancy of one point or less between attitude and perceived consensus on each of the consensus items across all four measurements. Those categorized as having "greater tolerance for non-conformity" are the subjects who showed a discrepancy of two or more points during each successive measurement on at least one consensus item per measurement. Table 12 shows the amount of attrition that took place as the two categories "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity were refined through the four successive measurements.

TABLE 12

NUMBERS OF SUBJECTS THAT REMAIN IN THE TWO CATEGORIES, USING FOUR SUCCESSIVE MEASUREMENTS TO IDENTIFY THOSE HAVING "LITTLE TOLERANCE" AND "GREATER TOLERANCE" FOR NON-CONFORMITY, STARTING WITH 103 GROUP DISCUSSION AND 55 LECTURE GROUP SUBJECTS

		First	Second	Third	Fourth
Group Discussion Subjects					
	LT	48	31	22	17
	GT	55	36	33	18
Lecture Group Subjects					
	LT	25	17	11	9
	GT	30	22	14	11

The above table shows, for example, that of the 48 group discussion subjects who met the operational definition of little tolerance

for non-conformity on the first measurement, only 17 of the 48 consistently met this requirement across all four measurements. Of the total 158 subjects, the overall picture is as follows:

(a) 26 remained LT across all four measurements.

(b) 29 remained GT across all four measurements.

(c) 34 were LT on three measurements and GT on one.

(d) 36 were GT on three measurements and LT on one.

(e) 33 were LT on two measurements and GT on two.

Redefinition of "Little Tolerance" and "Greater Tolerance" for Non-Conformity

The predictions which follow will be tested with respect to subjects who meet the more rigid definitions of "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity, i. e., those who are LT and GT across all four measurements. Although this more rigid definition lowers the N considerably, it is theoretically sound and therefore justified as a means of generally increasing predictive power.

> Prediction 6.--In a lecture treatment where there is no group process involved, individuals who have greater tolerance for non-conformity and who are therefore more autonomous, will more frequently show change in the target area as well as generalization to related areas. Those who have little tolerance for non-conformity will, on the other hand, show more of a tendency to remain at their former equilibrium.

As previously stated, the varying amounts of tolerance for non-conformity shown by different individuals within a positive reference group are assumed to be due primarily to the differential value which they place on group approval. Those having greater tolerance for non-conformity are the ones who are less subject to the influence or pressure of the group. Being less subject to group pressure, these individuals are more free to change their opinion or attitude on a subject

that is relevant to a group norm, without being as concerned about where the group as a whole stands. In a lecture treatment aimed at changing attitudes, where there is no group process involved and hence no opportunity for group members to observe the effect on others, the autonomy of individuals having greater tolerance for non-conformity should enable them to change more freely as well as to generalize the change to related areas. Those with little tolerance for non-conformity should show more of a tendency to remain at their former equilibrium, since they are more tied to perceived consensus. However, the above expectation would not necessarily apply in a group discussion situation. Here, those with little tolerance for non-conformity could very well show more change than those having greater tolerance, depending on how well they perceived the group as going.

In testing this prediction, the criteria for "change" are the same as used in previous predictions, i. e., a change in either direction, from pre- to post-measure of the third session (third to fourth measurement), of at least 3 points and 2 points respectively on the Stereotype and Segregation Questionnaires. Change in lesser amounts is defined as "no change." Table 13 is a comparison between those lecture group subjects who showed "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity across all four measurements. The results indicate that in a lecture treatment, LT subjects do have more of a tendency to remain at their old equilibrium than do the GT subjects. This is more marked on the Stereotype Questionnaire than on the Segregation Questionnaire. Since the content of the Stereotype Questionnaire was not the direct target of the influence attempt, whereas the content of the Segregation Questionnaire was, the results lend support to the assertion

that individuals having greater tolerance for non-conformity are more free to generalize.

TABLE 13

COMPARISON BETWEEN SUBJECTS HAVING "LITTLE TOLERANCE" AND "GREATER TOLERANCE" FOR NON-CONFORMITY WITH RESPECT TO NUMBERS SHOWING CHANGE IN EITHER DIRECTION OF AT LEAST 3 POINTS AND 2 POINTS RESPECTIVELY ON EITHER STEREOTYPE OR SEGREGATION QUESTIONNAIRES, FOLLOWING THE LECTURE TREATMENT

	Stereotype Questionnaire		Segregation Questionnaire	
	No Change	Change	No Change	Change
LT Subjects	6	3	5	4
GT Subjects	3	8	4	7
	$X^2 = 3.10$ p = .04		$X^2 = .74$ p N. S.	

Table 14 shows a similar comparison with respect to change between subjects having "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity in the two group discussion treatments.

TABLE 14

COMPARISON BETWEEN SUBJECTS HAVING "LITTLE TOLERANCE" AND "GREATER TOLERANCE" FOR NON-CONFORMITY WITH RESPECT TO NUMBERS SHOWING CHANGE IN EITHER DIRECTION OF AT LEAST 3 POINTS AND 2 POINTS RESPECTIVELY ON EITHER STEREOTYPE OR SEGREGATION QUESTIONNAIRES, FOLLOWING GROUP DISCUSSION TREATMENTS

	Stereotype Questionnaire		Segregation Questionnaire	
	No Change	Change	No Change	Change
LT Subjects	7	10	6	11
GT Subjects	7	11	12	6
	$X^2 = .02$ p N.S.		$X^2 = 3.44$ p < .07	

A comparison of Tables 13 and 14 shows that the pattern of change for LT and GT subjects differs between lecture treatment and group discussion treatments. In the group discussion treatments the LT subjects show change significantly more often than the GT subjects, whereas the trend was in the other direction in the lecture treatment. This indicates that in the group discussion situation, where the reaction of group members can be observed, those with little tolerance for non-conformity tended more to fluctuate in accordance with the way they perceived the group as moving, than did those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity. Although the Stereotype Questionnaire showed no differences between LT and GT subjects in the group discussion treatments, a significant difference in the expected direction was obtained in the lecture treatment. It seems logical that there should also have been a difference in the group discussion treatments. On the whole, however, the results do confirm the prediction that in a lecture situation, subjects who have greater tolerance for non-conformity will more frequently show change and generalization of change, than will subjects who have little tolerance for non-conformity, whereas this is not necessarily so in a group discussion situation.

This prediction was also tested by placing in the "LT category" all subjects who were LT across all four measurements plus those who were LT on three of the four measurements; and by placing in the "GT category" all subjects who were GT across all four measurements plus those who were GT on three of the four measurements. When the less rigorous definitions of LT and GT were used, the results showed differences in the expected direction, but not significantly so.

Prediction 7.--When the initial perceived position of the group (perceived consensus) and the influence attempt are in the same direction from the position of the individual, those with little tolerance for non-conformity will show positive change more frequently than those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

This prediction is based on the assumption that the value of group approval is more salient with those having little tolerance for non-conformity. Therefore, in a situation where the influence attempt and perceived group consensus are in the same direction from own position, the greated susceptibility to group pressure on the part of LT subjects should cause more of them to change in the direction of the influence attempt than would be the case with GT subjects. In other words, the sum of the forces to change would be greater for LT than for GT subjects.

The base-line for testing this prediction was to be those instances (on the three items having consensus measures) in which LT and GT subjects perceived the group position to be more favorable than own position, as shown on the pre-measure of the third session. Then, a comparison of change in own position, as shown on the post-measure (following the influence attempt), was to be made between LT and GT subjects for those items on which they had previously perceived the group as being more favorable than themselves. Unfortunately, the results obtained in this study do not provide a means for testing this prediction. Throughout the eleven groups which were used in this experiment, the subjects show a singular propensity for overestimating the norms of their groups (perceived consensus) in the anti-Negro direction. This was the case with all three statements having consensus measures, i. e., separate restaurants and hotels, separate residential areas, and discriminatory practices as a threat to national security.

As previously shown there were a total of 26 subjects in the

eleven groups who showed little tolerance for non-conformity across all four measurements. On the pre-measure of the third session (third measurement), for the three items having consensus measures, there were only three instances (responses) out of a total of 78 in which the 26 LT subjects showed "perceived consensus" as being more favorable than "own position." For the 29 GT subjects there were 10 instances out of a total of 87 in which they perceived the group as being more favorable than "own position."

Table 15 shows a comparison of LT and GT subjects in all groups, with respect to direction of perceived consensus in relation to own position, as shown on the pre-measure of the third session, for the three statements having consensus measures.

TABLE 15

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SUBJECTS HAVING "LITTLE TOLERANCE" AND "GREATER TOLERANCE" FOR NON-CONFORMITY, WITH RESPECT TO DIRECTION OF PERCEIVED CONSENSUS IN RELATION TO OWN POSITION, AS SHOWN ON THE PRE-MEASURE OF THE THIRD SESSION FOR THREE STATEMENTS HAVING CONSENSUS MEASURES

	Own Position in Relation to Perceived Consensus		
	More Favorable	Same	Less Favorable
26 LT Subjects	21	54	3
29 GT Subjects	67	10	10
		$X^2 = 57.54$	
		$p < .001$	

Table 15 above shows why it was not possible to test this prediction--there were only 13 instances in which LT and GT subjects perceived themselves as being "less favorable" than the group on the three items having consensus measures. This unexpected empirical finding was

eleven groups who showed little tolerance for non-conformity across all four measurements. On the pre-measure of the third session (third measurement), for the three items having consensus measures, there were only three instances (responses) out of a total of 78 in which the 26 LT subjects showed "perceived consensus" as being more favorable than "own position." For the 29 GT subjects there were 10 instances out of a total of 87 in which they perceived the group as being more favorable than "own position."

Table 15 shows a comparison of LT and GT subjects in all groups, with respect to direction of perceived consensus in relation to own position, as shown on the pre-measure of the third session, for the three statements having consensus measures.

TABLE 15

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SUBJECTS HAVING "LITTLE TOLERANCE" AND "GREATER TOLERANCE" FOR NON-CONFORMITY, WITH RESPECT TO DIRECTION OF PERCEIVED CONSENSUS IN RELATION TO OWN POSITION, AS SHOWN ON THE PRE-MEASURE OF THE THIRD SESSION FOR THREE STATEMENTS HAVING CONSENSUS MEASURES

	Own Position in Relation to Perceived Consensus		
	More Favorable	Same	Less Favorable
26 LT Subjects	21	54	3
29 GT Subjects	67	10	10
		$X^2 = 57.54$	
		$p < .001$	

Table 15 above shows why it was not possible to test this prediction--there were only 13 instances in which LT and GT subjects perceived themselves as being "less favorable" than the group on the three items having consensus measures. This unexpected empirical finding was

characteristic of most of the subjects in this experiment and will be discussed later in the "Additional Findings" section of this chapter. With respect to the chi square of 57.54 shown in Table 15, it's size is partially due to the fact that it is based on the same measures which were used to operationally define the LT and GT categories. Therefore, it was expected, although not to the extent shown, that LT subjects would frequently perceive their own position at the same point as that of the group.[1] On the other hand, the GT subjects, as a function of the definition, characteristically perceive themselves as being different from the group. The hypothesis which follows, however, confirms the assertion that subjects categorized as LT and GT do perceive themselves as being the "same" and "different" respectively, with regard to the perceived position of the group, by using a measure somewhat independent from those which were used to operationally define the two categories.

Hypothesis V - The Effect of Differential Tolerance for Non-conformity on Perception of Own Position in Relation to a Perceived Group Norm

This hypothesis asserts that on a subject which is relevant to a group norm, individuals with little tolerance for non-conformity should, on an independent measure, more frequently perceive their attitudes as conforming to that of the group norm, than will those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity. This assertion is based on the assumption that those who have little tolerance for non-conformity place a higher value on group approval and hence have a greater need to perceive themselves as being in step with the group.

---

[1]Actually, it would not be mandatory that any LT subjects' own positions be exactly the same as perceived consensus as far as the definition is concerned. They could all be 1 point on either side of perceived consensus.

Prediction 8.--Individuals who have little tolerance for non-conformity will more frequently perceive their views and opinions regarding Negroes to be the same as those of the majority of the group, than will those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

By definition, individuals having little tolerance for non-conformity are those who show little or no discrepancy between own position and perceived consensus. Table 15 above showed that GT and LT subjects do differ significantly with respect to own position in relation to perceived consensus. However, this is not considered to be an adequate test of the above hypothesis since proof would then be resting on the definition of the two categories. Consequently, a separate or independent measure is needed. For this reason, a question was included in the post-measure of the third session which was designed to serve as an independent measure of the prediction. The question was as follows:

> In general, how would you say your views and opinion about Negroes compare with those of the majority of the other members of this immediate group? Much more liberal____; more liberal____; about the same____; less liberal____; much less liberal____.

As can be seen, the above question is in a broader, more generalized context that the statements on which consensus measures were taken. Table 16 shows a comparison of the results on this question for those subjects in both lecture and discussion groups who were consistently LT or GT across all four measurements. The results shown in this table, which represent a somewhat independent measure, add confirming evidence to the assertion that individuals who have little tolerance for non-conformity do more frequently perceive themselves as being in tune with the group than do those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity. For the purpose of a further check, the difference was computed by including those LT and GT subjects who were in other groups which were

TABLE 16

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SUBJECTS HAVING "LITTLE TOLERANCE" AND "GREATER TOLERANCE" FOR NON-CONFORMITY, WITH RESPECT TO PERCEPTION OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF OWN OPINION TO THAT OF THE GROUP NORM

	Own Opinion in Relation to Perceived Group Norm	
	About the Same	More Favorable or Less Favorable
26 LT Subjects	20	6
29 GT Subjects	10	19
	$X^2 = 9.96$ $p = .001$	

used in the larger experiment. This increased the LT subjects to 42 and GT subjects to 41. On this larger population the difference ($X^2 = 15$, $p < .001$) was even more significant than that computed on the smaller population. This prediction was also tested by placing in the "LT category" all subjects who were LT across all four measurements plus those who were LT on three of the four measurements; and by placing in the "GT category" all subjects who were GT across all four measurements, plus those who were GT on three of the four measurements. The differences is very significant ($X^2 = 9$, $p < .01$), but not as great as when the more rigorous definition of LT and GT is used.

Hypothesis VI - The Effect of Differential Tolerance for Non-conformity on Autistic Displacement

This hypothesis states that those with little tolerance for non-conformity should show more autistic displacement of the actual group norm than those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity. The discrepancy between an individual's perception of the group's position and the actual group norm represents autistic displacement, i. e., inaccuracy

of judgment. In discussing the theoretical basis for this hypothesis in Chapter I, it was proposed that the position an individual ascribes to the group is primarily influenced by two factors: (a) "attractiveness of the group," and (b) "opportunity for information." Provided there has been adequate "opportunity for information," then "attractiveness of the group," as a reflection of the value an individual places on group approval, should be the principal causative factor in any displacement that takes place. If opportunity for information is equalized, the amount of autistic displacement should vary inversely with the amount of tolerance for non-conformity. The implication is that the displacement will normally take place in the direction of the individual's own position. For example, individuals who have high tolerance for non-conformity and "adequate information" on where the group stands should show little autistic displacement. On the other hand, those who have little tolerance for non-conformity, by reason of placing a higher value on group approval, should show more of a tendency to distort or displace the group position in the direction of their own attitude. This enables them to satisfy their need for being in step with the group and at the same time maintain a deviant attitude in support of other needs. In other words, the influence of need on social perception should be greater for those having little tolerance for non-conformity.

> Prediction 9.--Individuals with little tolerance for non-conformity will, with respect to attitude toward Negroes, show more autistic displacement of the group norm in the direction of their own position than will those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

It was initially planned to test this prediction by comparing GT and LT subjects with respect to amount of discrepancy between perceived consensus and the statistical group norm. This would not

constitute an independent test, however, because "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity are defined in terms of a given relationship between own position and perceived consensus, LT subjects being those with a discrepancy of 1 point or less. Therefore, in instances where LT subjects' own positions are at a considerable distance from the norm, they will tend to show more discrepancy between perceived consensus and the actual norm than GT subjects occupying similar positions, since by definition, the perceived consensus of LT subjects is closely tied to their own position. Conversely, when LT subjects' own positions are close to the norm, they will, for the same reason, show less discrepancy between perceived consensus and the actual norm than will GT subjects. In short, autistic displacement (or discrepancy between actual and perceived consensus) varies with distance between own position and actual group norm. The data show this to be the case, and there is no difference between LT and GT subjects with respect to average discrepancy between perceived consensus and the statistical norm.

There are some data, however, that provide an independent, though indirect, means of confirming this hypothesis. The data, by implication, show that LT subjects displace the group norm in the direction of their own position more frequently than GT subjects. Prediction #8 (Table 16) showed that LT subjects perceived their views as being "about the same" as the group significantly more often than GT subjects. As will be recalled, this findings was based on the results of the following question: "In general, how would you say your views and opinions about Negroes compare with those of the majority of the other members of this immediate group?" Of the 26 LT subjects, 20 answered,

"About the same," whereas 19 of the 29 GT subjects indicated their attitude was "More favorable" or "Less favorable" than that of the group. Thus, on an independent measure, GT subjects characteristically perceived themselves as different, while the LT subjects characteristically perceived themselves as being the same as the group. From this it follows that the individual attitudes of the LT subjects should be closer to the group norm than those of the GT subjects, provided they have accurately perceived the group's norm. Such is not the case, however, because the average discrepancy between own position and the statistical norm, on the three statements having consensus measures, is just as large for LT as for GT subjects. For example, the average discrepancy shown on the post-measure of the third session (fourth measurement) was 1.50 points for the LT subjects and 1.48 points for the GT subjects. In other words, the actual attitudes of LT subjects are just as deviant as those of GT subjects except they do not perceive themselves as being deviant.

It is believed this finding lends substantial support to the assertion that those with little tolerance for non-conformity have more of a tendency to displace a group norm toward themselves than do those having greater tolerance for non-conformity. In this hypothesis the emphasis was primarily on the displacement that takes place in the direction of the individual's own position. Further, it was assumed that those with greater tolerance for non-conformity would not show much displacement in either direction. However, the data indicate that the GT subjects have a rather marked tendency to displace their perception of the group's position <u>away</u> from themselves. This displacement is principally in the direction of seeing themselves as being more favorable

toward Negroes than the group as a whole. Additional evidence of this is contained in Table 15, which showed that on the three statements having consensus measures, the 29 GT subjects perceived their own position as being more favorable than the group in 67 out of 87 instances. In 10 instances they perceived themselves at the same position as the group, and in the other 10 instances as being less favorable. Now, it is true that GT subjects, as a whole, do show a tendency to be a little more favorable than the group as a whole in their attitudes toward Negroes. But, the tendency is not as great as they perceive it to be. In other words, their "actual" difference from the group (in the favorable direction) is not as marked as their "perceived" difference. This leads to the conclusion that GT subjects may be expressing a need to see themselves as "different" from the group, whereas the LT subjects express a need to see themselves as "the same" as the group. If future experimentation confirms this, it will be necessary to revise the hypothesis to state that LT subjects will be more likely to displace a group norm "toward" themselves than will GT subjects.

Hypothesis VII - Tolerance for Non-conformity as a Basic Personality Characteristic

It is hypothesized that tolerance for non-conformity, as measured by the discrepancy between own position and perceived consensus, should bear a relationship to a conformity rating derived from the results of an independent personality measure. Those with little tolerance for non-conformity should also, on an independent conformity measure, tend to show more conformity than those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

Throughout the study, amount of tolerance for non-conformity has been conceptualized as being closely related to the value an individual places on group approval. However, as stated in Chapter I, there is no intention of implying that tolerance for non-conformity represents a "pure" measure of a basic need to conform. For example, in maintaining an attitude position close to that of the perceived group position, a person might be satisfying some need other than that of basic conformity. Thus, tolerance for non-conformity, as measured, may reflect the operation of other needs or forces in addition to basic conformity. Notwithstanding this, it is proposed that tolerance for non-conformity may represent something of a personality syndrome. If this is so, then it should show some relationship to a conformity rating derived from the results of an independent personality measure. Although such a conformity rating would be in a broader, more generalized context, there should still be a relationship between the two separate measures if they are tapping the same basic variable.

> Prediction 10.--On conformity indexes derived from the F Scale and the Michigan Sentence Completion, those with little tolerance for non-conformity will tend to score in the upper range (more conformith) more frequently than those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

As previously stated in the methodology section of Chapter II, a battery of personality measures, including the F Scale (Appendix E) and the Michigan Sentence Completion[1] (Appendix F) were administered to the experimental subjects as part of the first session. Two conformity ratings for each subject were obtained. One was based on the results from 9 items contained in the F Scale. The other was based on

---

[1]An unpublished projective test developed at the University of Michigan for use in the Veterans Administration research on selection of clinical psychologists.

8 items contained in the Michigan Sentence Completion. See Appendixes E and F for those items which were included.

The conformity index based on the F Scale was derived from results on those items which the authors (1) say pertain to two of the nine dimensions of the "authoritarian personality structure" namely: (a) conventionalism (3 items)--implying conformity to an external agency or rigid adherence to conventional middle class values, which relates to "rigidity" as a basic personality characteristic; and (b) submission to authority (7 items)--implying submissive, uncritical attitudes toward idealized moral authorities of the in-group, which indicates, as a basic personality characteristic, failure in the development of an inner authority. Of the 7 items pertaining to the "submission to authority" dimension, one of them is also used in the "conventionalism" dimension. All items in the F Scale are scored on a 6-point scale (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7), so the maximum possible range on the 9 item conformity index would be from 9 to 63. The actual range for the subjects in this study was from 16 to 58.

In addition to reporting the results on the conformity index, results will also be reported for the two dimensions separately, (i.e., conventionalism and submission to authority). Further, the results of the F Scale as a whole will be reported, since its theoretical assertions would be pertinent to a conformity index derived from it. The F Scale itself contains thirty items, and the range of scores for these subjects was from 51 to 173.

The conformity index derived from the Michigan Sentence Completion also represents a combination of two dimensions which were initially coded out separately. One was "need for authoritarian support"

and was based on three items. The other dimension was "conformity," which was based on five items. Each of the items was scored as 0 or 1, depending on whether or not the individual, in completing the sentence, showed evidence of the dimension being coded. The maximum possible range on this eight-item conformity index would be from 0 to 8. The actual range of scores was from 0 to 5.

In testing the prediction, all LT and GT subjects in the entire experimental population were used. This raised the number to 42 subjects who were consistently LT across all four measurements and 41 subjects who were GT across all four measurements. For the purpose of testing the difference between LT and GT subjects on the two conformity indexes and the other measures as well, the distributions of scores were dichotomized as nearly as possible at the median. The two parts of the distributions are termed "high" and "low" for the purpose of presentation.

TABLE 17

COMPARISON OF SCORES OBTAINED ON THE F SCALE FOR SUBJECTS WHO HAVE "LITTLE TOLERANCE" AND "GREATER TOLERANCE" FOR NON-CONFORMITY

	F Scale Scores Dichotomized	
	Low	High
42 LT Subjects	11	31
41 GT Subjects	24	17
	$X^2 = 8.65$	
	$p < .003$	

Table 17 indicates that the subjects who have little tolerance for non-conformity score significantly more often in the upper range of the F scale than do those with greater tolerance for

non-conformity. This difference is also shown in scores obtained on the "conventionalism" and "submission to authority" dimension, as well as the conformity index which combines the two dimensions (Table 18). It is logical that the difference should be more significant on the conformity index than on the two dimensions from which it was constructed. It was

TABLE 18

COMPARISON BETWEEN SUBJECTS WHO HAVE "LITTLE TOLERANCE" AND "GREATER TOLERANCE" FOR NON-CONFORMITY, WITH RESPECT TO SCORES OBTAINED ON THE "CONVENTIONALISM" AND "SUBMISSION TO AUTHORITY" DIMENSIONS OF THE F SCALE AND ALSO A CONFORMITY INDEX WHICH COMBINES THE TWO DIMENSIONS

	Conventionalism		Submission to Authority		Conformity Index	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
42 LT Subjects	18	24	22	20	17	25
41 GT Subjects	23	18	28	13	28	13
	$X^2 = 1.46$		$X^2 = 2.19$		$X^2 = 6.28$	
	$p = .12$		$p < .08$		$p < .01$	

also expected that the conformity index would show a greater difference than the F Scale as a whole, since it was believed the former would be more specific. However, the F Scale shows a little greater difference than the conformity index. The reason for this is not entirely clear, but it may be due to the fact that the greater number of items in the F Scale proper makes for greater differentiation.

This study yields an interesting finding which supports the relationship of tolerance for non-conformity to the F Scale. This finding is pertinent to that part of the F Scale theory which asserts that the "authoritarian personality syndrome" is manifested behaviorally in ethnocentrism and general prejudice against out-groups. On the three items having consensus measures, LT and GT subjects' "own positions"

were coded on the basis of whether they were above or below the group norm (i. e., the statistical mean). The results showed that the LT subjects were above the group norm (more prejudice) significantly more often (2% level) than the GT subjects.

The following table shows the results for LT and GT subjects on the other conformity index which was derived from the Michigan Sentence Completion.

TABLE 19

COMPARISON OF SCORES ON A CONFORMITY INDEX DERIVED FROM THE MICHIGAN SENTENCE COMPLETION, FOR SUBJECTS HAVING "LITTLE TOLERANCE" AND "GREATER TOLERANCE" FOR NON-CONFORMITY

	Conformity Index Scores Dichotomized	
	Low	High
42 LT Subjects	17	25
41 GT Subjects	29	12
	$X^2 = 7.47$	
	$p < .01$	

Table 19 shows the same consistent pattern as the two previous tables. Again, the LT subjects score in the upper range of this conformity index significantly more often than the GT subjects. With respect to the other subjects who were not consistently LT or GT across all four measurements, their scores on the two conformity indexes do not show a great deal of differentiation. That is, the differences between subjects who were LT on three of the four measurements and those who were GT on three of the four measurements shows a slight trend in the expected direction but no significantly so. The assumption is that

such individuals are less extreme with respect to tolerance for non-conformity, and that the conformity indexes are not powerful enough to bring out the difference.

The question arises as to whether the significant differences between LT and GT subjects, as obtained on both conformity indexes, stems from the fact that they contain common elements and are both measuring the same thing? If so, a significant relationship should exist between them. The relationship between the two conformity indexes was checked by breaking the distribution of scores for each conformity index at the median and entering the paired scores of the LT and GT subjects into a fourfold table. The result did not show a significant relationship as tested by chi square. Thus, it appears likely that the two conformity indexes do not contain common elements and are not measuring the same thing. An intensive investigation of the relationship of the F Scale to the various other personality measures used in the overall study, of which this experiment was a part, is scheduled to be made. There is no information available at this time, however.

The above finding implies that tolerance for non-conformity, as defined and measured, contains elements which are common to both conformity indexes. However, the element (or elements) which relate to one index are different from those that relate to the other. This is understandable and fits in with a theory that the F Scale is more specific to personality organization on an ideological level (social and political beliefs) rather than at a deeper level where basic personality mechanisms function, such as projection. On the other hand, a projective test such as the Michigan Sentence Completion may be considered as relating to a more basic level of personality organization.

If this is reasonable, then one conformity index may be viewed as pertaining to conformity on the ideological level, and the other to conformity on a still more basic personality level.

It is believed that the above findings adequately support the hypothesis that tolerance for non-conformity, as measured, does have personality implications which pertain to more basic levels of conformity. Although the amount of variance which is accounted for may not be great, there does appear to be a relationship. The findings are also viewed as supporting the conceptualization that "extent of tolerance for non-conformity" represents an overt manifestation of the value an individual places on group approval, since a high need to conform would imply a high value of group approval.

With respect to causality, the source and direction of influence is assumed to be from the more basic personality levels, with tolerance for non-conformity being primarily an overt or behavioral representation. This does not necessarily mean that individuals who have a strong need to conform and who value group approval highly will always reflect this in their attitudes and behavior. They are, of course, subject to other forces, both internal and external. One of the findings of this study was that subjects who have little tolerance for non-conformity do not actually conform, in their attitudes toward Negroes, any more than those with greater tolerance for non-conformity. This does not imply that the conformity measure was spurious, but rather that the individuals were subject to the pressure of other needs as well, which helped to determine their attitude positions. The fact that most of the LT subjects <u>thought</u> they were conforming is consistent with and supports their being classified as having little tolerance for non-conformity.

Additional Findings

There is one empirical finding of this study which merits particular mention. This relates to the fact that in relatively few instances did the subjects in the groups used for this experiment perceive themselves as being "less favorable" than their group, with respect to attitudes toward Negroes. In other words, throughout the eleven groups which were used, totaling 158 subjects, the group members as a whole exhibit a prevalent tendency to perceive their own position as being more favorable than that of the group. Thus, they were displacing the group norm in the anti-Negro direction. This was the case with all three statements having consensus measures. These statements pertained to: separate restaurants and hotels, separate residential areas, and discriminatory practices as a threat to national security. For example, using the post-measure results (fourth measurement) of the three items having consensus measures, there were only 41 instances in which the 158 subjects perceived their own positions as less favorable than the group. By contrast, there were 183 instances in which the subjects perceived themselves as being more favorable. In the remaining number of instances (250) they perceived themselves as being the same as the group.

This marked tendency to displace the group norm is brought out by comparing two types of means which were computed for the eleven groups separately. From both pre- and post-measure results of the third session, two kinds of means were computed for each of the three statements. One set of means represented the statistical norm or average of the group members' "own positions" with respect to each of the three questions. The other set of means constituted the average of the group

members' perceptions of group consensus on each of the three statements. Thus for each of the eleven groups the "statistical norm" and "mean perceived consensus" was computed on each of the three statements for both pre- and post-measure results. This yielded 66 pairs of means, i. e., 66 norms and 66 corresponding perceived consensus means. The results show that in 62 out of the 66 comparisons, the mean perceived consensus was higher (in the anti-Negro direction) than the corresponding group norm which represents the average of the members' actual positions. In one case the two were identical and in only three instaces did the actual group norm exceed mean perceived consensus. These four "reversals in form" all took place on the national security question, which is not as closely related to attitudes toward Negores per se, as the other two statements. The above finding represents a classic example of "pluralistic ignorance."

It has previously been shown (Tables 15 and 16), with respect to just the LT and GT subjects, that the LT subjects characteristically perceive themselves at the same position as the group and the GT subjects see themselves as being more favorable. However, for the groups as a whole, there is this overall predisposition to view oneself as being more liberal than the group. This may be a reflection of the fact that it is part of the culture nowadays, particularly in northern university circles, to strive to overcome prejudice. Evidence for this is provided by the results obtained on one of the questions which was put to the members of four groups that were given the "commitment" treatment. The question, on which a showing of hands was asked for, pertained to "personal willingness" to exert a greater effort to eliminate any

discriminatory behavior on the individual's part. In the four groups in which this question was asked, all subjects raised their hands without exception.

This predisposition for autistic displacement in the anti-Negro direction may, on the other hand, represent a resort to the mechanisms of projection and disavowal due to conflict between the way the person knows he ought to feel and the way he really does feel about Negroes. The autistic displacement may thus represent an inability to accept and recognize hostile feelings, with the result that they are projected onto the other group members. This line of thinking is of course contrary to a "reference group theory" which posits that the group forces operating in a cohesive group serve to dominate all the members with the result that they all acquire the same orientation. By contrast, there is the theory which emphasizes that although groups may "exploit" the group members, group members <u>also</u> "exploit" the groups to which they belong. On this basis, it is entirely plausible that some people may join groups as a means of supporting or reinforcing their hostile feelings. Thus, with respect to Negro prejudice, some group members may be rationalizing their real feelings by using the group as the "whipping boy." This gives them support by allowing them to think that it is the other members of the group who are prejudiced, rather than themselves.

Whatever the cause of this predisposition to perceive oneself as being more favorable than the group, this situation probably constitutes one of the reasons why the several treatments were not as effective in producing attitude change as might be expected. A block of subjects in each group perceiving themselves as already ahead of the group (more favorable) would serve as a drag in any effort to push them farther.

Summary of Results

Hypothesis I - Attitude change in relation to differential salience of a value.

Prediction 1.--Those subjects for whom national and personal security is a more salient (i.e., central) value will more frequently show positive attitude change toward Negroes as a result of an influence attempt which exploits this value than will those for whom national and personal security is not so salient a value.

Results: this prediction was significantly confirmed at the 2% level on one questionnaire, but only at the 14% level on another.

Hypothesis II - Attitude change as a function of the range of values brought to bear.

Prediction 2.--Through exploitation of the value of national and personal security, there will be attitude change toward Negores in the direction of the influence attempt. Further, the extent of attitude change will be in ascending order in accordance with the following three treatments: (1) lecture; (2) group discussion-consensus; and (3) group discussion-consensus and commitment.

Results: significant change was produced in two out of the three treatments. However, that part of the prediction pertaining to increased change according to treatment given was not generally confirmed. The "consensus and commitment" treatment showed better results than the "consensus" treatment. However, the "lecture" treatment produced results as good as the "consensus and commitment" treatment.

Hypothesis III - Attitude change in relation to differential awareness of conflict between an attitude and a pertinent value.

Prediction 3.--Those subjects who have greater awareness of the conflict (or relationship) between Negro prejudice and the value of national and personal security will change more frequently, in the direction of the influence attempt, than those who have less awareness.

Results: this prediction was significantly confirmed on two questionnaires.

Hypothesis IV - Relationship between perceived group consensus and attitude.

Prediction 4.--There will be a tendency for a consistent relationship to exist, over time, between sorority members' attitudes on a subject which is relevant to a group norm (attitude toward Negroes) and their perception of group consensus.

Results: this prediction was significantly conformed both with respect to consistency in size of discrepancy between attitude and perceived consensus and also with respect to concomitant change.

Prediction 5.--The discrepancy (or relationship) between own attitude and perceived consensus will, over time, be more consistent in the case of individuals who have little tolerance for non-conformity than for those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

Results: this prediction was significantly confirmed.

Prediction 6.--In a lecture treatment where there is no group process involved, individuals who have greater tolerance for non-conformity and who are therefore more autonomous will more frequently show change in the target area as well as generalization to related areas. Those who have little tolerance for non-conformity will, on the other hand, show more of a tendency to remain at their former equilibrium.

Results: this prediction was significantly confirmed on one questionnaire and was in the expected direction on the other.

Prediction 7.--When the initial perceived position of the group (perceived consensus) and the influence attempt are in the same direction from the position of the individual, those with little tolerance for non-conformity will show positive change more frequently than those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

Results: it was not possible to test this prediction since there were not enough subjects who perceived their own attitudes as being "less favorable" than the position of the group.

Hypothesis V - The effect of differential tolerance for non-conformity on perception of own position in relation to a perceived group norm.

Prediction 8.--Individuals who have little tolerance for non-conformity will more frequently perceive their views and opinions regarding Negroes to be the same as those of the majority of the group, than will those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

Results: this prediction was significantly confirmed.

Hypothesis VI - The effect of differential tolerance for non-conformity on autistic displacement.

Prediction 9.--Individuals with little tolerance for non-conformity will, with respect to attitude toward Negroes, show more autistic displacement of the group norm in the direction of their own position than will those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

Results: this prediction was tested indirectly and significantly confirmed.

Hypothesis VII - Tolerance for non-conformity as a basic personality characteristic.

Prediction 10.--On conformity indexes derived from the F Scale and the Michigan Sentence Completion, those with little tolerance for non-conformity will tend to score in the upper range (more conformity) more frequently than those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity.

Results: this prediction was significantly confirmed on both conformity indexes.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

General

The theoretical emphasis of this study is on value systems and their relation to attitudes. The experiment itself incorporated two related objectives, one of which was to test several hypotheses pertaining to this relationship, particularly as regards inducing attitude change through the exploitation of value systems. This particular objective proceeded from the hypothesis that attitude change is a function of the range of values brought to bear. The experimental procedure was that of progressively increasing the number of values involved in the manipulation process, from one treatment to another, as a means of varying the pressure to change. In addition, there was an evaluation of the influence of two other factors on attitude change, namely: differential awareness of conflict between an attitude and a related value, and differential value salience. The two corresponding hypotheses were that there would be increased attitude change on the part of individuals when: (a) there was high awareness of conflict, or (b) when there was high value salience.

The other, and major objective of this study, which was incorporated within the same theoretical framework, was to explore further the determinants of the relationship between attitude and perceived group consensus. The principal concept dealt with is "tolerance for

non-conformity." This concept is operationally defined as the discrepancy (or relationship) between an individual's own position on a particular attitude continuum and his perception of the position of group consensus. The experiment tested several hypotheses pertaining to this concept:

(a) The stability, over time, of the relationship between own position and perceived consensus.

(b) Differential attitude change of individuals who have "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity.

(c) Perception of own position in relation to a perceived group norm, as affected by differential tolerance for non-conformity.

(d) The effect of differential tolerance for non-conformity on autistic displacement of a group norm.

(e) Tolerance for non-conformity as a basic personality characteristic.

It is believed that this is the first time that this concept (i.e., tolerance for non-conformity) has been cast within a value theory framework. Normally it has been viewed primarily as a group factor or variable, with relative "attractiveness of the group" (which becomes translated into group pressure) being emphasized as the source of the effect of perceived group consensus on attitude position. That is, the extent of an individual's tolerance for non-conformity has generally been posited as being due primarily to the relative attraction which the group has for the individual. "Attraction of the group" is here viewed as essentially a reflection of the value an individual places on group approval. Thus, such a formulation places increased emphasis on the individual and views the "value of group approval" and "attractiveness of the group" as the "internal" and "external" correlates of essentially the same thing. Justification for this theoretical alteration rests

on the belief that tolerance for non-conformity, as a concept, takes on increased stability by relating it more directly to the individual. This stability, which the results of this experiment substantiate, is ascribed to the proposition that tolerance for non-conformity represents a manifestation of personality, rather than just a situational phenomenon.

Outcome of Predictions

The hypotheses outlined in paragraphs one and two above were all, with one exception, substantially confirmed. The exception was that prediction which asserted that attitude change, as a result of varying treatments which brought differential values to bear, would take place in ascending order in accordance with the three experimental treatments, as follows: (1) lecture, (2) group discussion with consensus, and (3) group discussion with consensus and commitment. It was a condition of the hypothesis, of course, that all values be operating in the same direction. Significant attitude change toward Negroes took place through exploiting the value of national and personal security in the lecture treatment. However, adding "consensus" and "consensus plus public commitment" (which are viewed as components of the value of group approval) in the two discussion treatments did not produce the expected effects. The results showed the consensus treatment to be the least effective of the three, with the other two being about equal. It is assumed that, in the consensus treatment particularly, the values were not all operating in the same direction. With respect to two predictions which asserted there would be increased attitude change as a function of both high value salience and high awareness of conflict between an attitude and a related value, the findings provided very adequate support.

Conclusions Regarding "Tolerance for Non-conformity"

The hypotheses dealing with the concept of tolerance for non-conformity constituted the primary focus of this study. As previously indicated, all the predictions within the area of this objective were substantially confirmed. These findings, it is believed, fully justify placing this concept within a value theory framework, since it may be viewed as an overt or behavioral manifestation of the value of group approval. As far as is known, this study represents the first attempt to relate tolerance for non-conformity to independent personality measures of conformity. The significant relationships that were found to exist with two independent conformity tests--which are thought to measure conformity at deeper levels of personality organization--provide considerable support for giving tolerance for non-conformity, as measured, some status as a personality variable. Therefore, in view of the findings of this study, it is tentatively concluded that "tolerance for non-conformity" represents an operationally definable personality characteristic at the overt or behavioral level, and which is related to the value of group approval by reason of incorporating elements of conformity at more basic levels of personality organization.

Integration of the Two Objectives of this Study

The foregoing discussion provides the rationale for having investigated the relationship of attitude position to perceived group consensus within a value theory framework. That is, this relationship (measured as a discrepancy) which is viewed as an indication of relative tolerance for non-conformity, provides a clue to the value an individual places on group approval. In studying tolerance for

non-conformity, we are dealing with an operationalized definition of conformity which relates to the value of group approval. Therefore, the major objective of this study was essentially that of investigating a behavioral manifestation of this value. This objective relates very closely to the other, which pertained to attitude change through the exploitation of value systems. For example, one of the findings, with respect to tolerance for non-conformity, showed that there was differential attitude change and generalization of change between those who have "little tolerance" and "greater tolerance" for non-conformity. In addition, the influence attempt variations which were used involved the processes of "consensus" and "public commitment" which are also viewed as being related to the value of group approval.

Suggestions for Further Research

In retrospect, the objectives of this study and the findings which were obtained point up various areas in which further research would be very desirable. One of these pertains to the cognitive process of generalization and the conditions under which it takes place. The findings of this study suggest that where there is high value salience or high awareness of conflict between an attitude and a related value, there will be greater generalization of change to related areas. This was brought out on the Stereotype Questionnaire, which was not a direct target of the influence attempt. In discussing these findings, it was tentatively suggested that high value salience and high awareness of conflict not only facilitate attitude change in the target area but also facilitate cognitive reorganization or generalization in related areas. In addition, the study showed some indication that those who

have little tolerance for non-conformity also generalize less than those who have greater tolerance for non-conformity. This may relate to a greater tendency toward rigidity on the part of subjects who have little tolerance for non-conformity, which is supported by the results shown on the F Scale. In connection with attitude change research, there is a need for more knowledge regarding the process of generalization.

There is also a need for the development of a way to get accurate estimates of tolerance for non-conformity by using only one session with subjects. This study used three sessions and four separate measurements to get a refined estimate of subjects' tolerance for non-conformity. It would be desirable if this process could be shortened and at the same time develop a more accurate estimate so that more than two categories could be identified. Perhaps this could be done by obtaining consensus measures on a fairly wide range of attitudes, rather than restricting it to two or three.

Another area which merits further study pertains to the conditions under which individuals who have varying amounts of tolerance for non-conformity change their attitudes. This study found that the lecture treatment, as an influence attempt, produced attitude change more frequently than group discussion with subjects who had greater tolerance for non-conformity. On the other hand, the group discussion treatment was more effective with those who had little tolerance for non-conformity.

Also provocative is the finding of this study which indicates differential displacement of a group norm with respect to subjects who

have "little" and "greater" tolerance for non-conformity. It was predicted that those who have little tolerance for non-conformity would displace the group norm toward their own position. However it was not anticipated that those with greater tolerance for non-conformity would displace the group norm away from themselves. The question arises as to whether these individuals are expressing a general need to see themselves as different, or whether the finding was peculiar to the particular situation. Perhaps the answer will lie in the suggestion which follows.

Finally, further research would be very useful to better determine the correlates of tolerance for non-conformity with respect to personality. The results of this study represent a beginning, but more extensive findings are needed. For example, the relationship to measures of "rigidity" and "need for affiliation" would be very helpful. In addition, and to better relate this concept to actual behavior, it would also be instructive to determine how individuals with varying amounts of tolerance for non-conformity behave in a situation which replicates the Asch (2) experiment on independence and yielding behavior.

APPENDIX A

INFLUENCE ATTEMPT AS ARRANGED FOR GROUP DISCUSSION TREATMENTS

Attitude Change through Exploitation of Value Systems

To evoke a salient personal value system (national and personal security) and to consider the implications of a given attitude (Negro prejudice and resultant discriminatory practices) in relation to how it obstructs the attainment of the personal value which has been activated; using leader centered discussion procedures to bring out pertinent information, as well as consensus and commitment as reinforcement devices.

Opening Statement

As you probably know, this is the third and last session of the Student Reaction Study for which you have been so generous in contributing your time. Your cooperation in making this study possible is greatly appreciated.

In addition to the feedback on the purpose and results of the study, which I will give you towards the end of the session, there are several other items on the schedule tonight. First, in order to see how you feel about the issues at the present time, we would like to have you answer a couple of questionnaires that you have filled out before. Then we would like to have you participate in a group discussion on a subject that I'll tell you about in a few minutes. After that, there will be a couple of more questionnaires and then the feedback. Incidentally, the reason for splitting up your group was to make the number smaller so a better group discussion could be held.

(Administer the pre-measures)

Introduction to Problem

Now, with your permission, the problem that I would like to open up for group discussion is an interesting and timely one which we would like to have the benefit of your thinking on. We would also like to see what the decision of the group will be regarding it. The problem relates to two of the statements in one of the questionnaires which you have just finished. These statements were:

(1) "Discriminatory practices arising out of prejudice against minority groups (Negroes, for example) constitute a threat to our national security." The other one was . . . .

(2) "The problem of prejudice or discrimination against minority groups in the U.S. is essentially a domestic (internal) one, and has little or no significance as far as our international relations are concerned."

(Put statements on blackboard in condensed form)

Do you remember them?

Presentation of Statement of Problem and Activation of Value System

Perhaps you have not previously thought about discriminatory practices in relation to national security. But, with the international situation what it is today--with Communist Russia's long range program of world domination--with the world pretty much divided into two armed camps--with wars going on in Korea and Indo-China and uprisings in Africa, this problem may be very timely.

When we think about the number of countries the Communists have taken over since WW II, the problem of our national security and solidarity assumes very serious proportions.

Incidentally, what are some of the countries Communist Russia has taken over since WW II? (Bring out that all countries that are now Communist except Russia--Balkan countries including Poland and Czechoslovakia, China, Tibet--also rumblings in France, Italy, South and Central American countries, etc.)

After looking at the number of countries the Communists have taken over, would you say that Russia is intent on world domination, including the U.S.?

I guess we can assume then, that as a group, we are genuinely interested in our national and personal security. So, the problem to be discussed is--are we jeopardizing our national security and even personal survival through discriminatory practices arising out of prejudice against minority groups?

(Write on blackboard: Do discriminatory practices undermine national and personal security?)

Incidentally, as we go along, I hope you won't mind if I add some information here and there, which you may want to consider, or take into account, as the discussion proceeds.

Group Centered Discussion

Point #1--Discriminatory Practices

In order to understand the main problem more fully, let us first take a look at what you consider some of the discriminatory practices against

minority groups to be. In order to be specific, let's think about discriminatory practices against a particular minority group--the Negro. Some of the other minority groups are, of course, Jews, Japanese, Mexicans, etc., but for the time being let's think in terms of the Negroes.

Perhaps we can develop a short list of the more common discriminatory practices. What are some of the various ways that Negroes are discriminated against?

(Place headings on the blackboard: economic, legal, political and social discrimination. Obtain responses from the members of the group, to include those shown below, and place under appropriate headings. Actual examples should be encouraged from the group.)

Economic Discrimination:

(1) Failure or refusal of employers to hire qualified Negroes.
(2) Failure or refusal to promote qualified Negroes to foreman or supervisory positions.
(3) Lower wages for Negroes.
(4) Refusal to provide adequate general or vocational education at the secondary or college levels, or segregation of Negroes into inferior schools.

Legal Discrimination:

(In general most legal discrimination in the U.S. takes the form of mis-application or violation of the law, rather than passage of discriminatory laws.)

(1) Partiality shown by public officials in applying the law, without violation of its letter.
(2) Use of violence or other extra-legal devices by law enforcement officials or by other persons against minority group members (lynching, e. g.) without being punished, because victim is a member of a minority group.
(3) Laws against mixed marriages.

Political Discrimination

(1) Restriction of Negroes' right to vote.
(2) Campaign against a candidate for public office on the basis of his being a Negro.
(3) Failure to appoint minority group members to appointive offices.

Social Discrimination:

(1) Exclusion from restaurants.
(2) Exclusion from schools.
(3) Exclusion from hotels.
(4) Barriers against the location of residence of Negroes in neighborhoods where persons of the majority group live.

Point #2--Negro Reaction to Discriminatory Practices is One of Dissatisfaction and Frustration.

Now that we have some of the discriminatory practices listed, how would you say that Negroes generally, as a minority group, feel about being on the receiving end of this sort of treatment? Do they resent it, or how does it affect them?

(Responses should be obtained or pertinent questions asked which bring out the following:)

Negroes, as a group, feel very strongly that they are dealt with unjustly and discriminated against. By being held at arm's length and treated as second class citizens, Negroes have a tendency to feel frustrated, insecure and disgruntled. It's only normal to expect that they would be dissatisfied since they are not willing to accept this "inferior" or "second class" label.

(Write on blackboard: Discriminatory Practices Cause Negro to be Dissatisfied and Frustrated.)

Point #3--Communists Use Racial Discrimination as a Wedge for Infiltration.

Through our discriminatory practices which alienate minority groups are we threatening our national and personal security by playing into the hands of the Communists? What are some of the groups the Communists work on? What do the Communists offer them?

(Responses should be obtained, pertinent questions asked and statements made to bring out the following:)

Communists seek their adherents from among dissatisfied elements seeking change. The Communist Party has an appeal because they have practiced social equality and have fought for the Negroes' interests. The Communists stress full social equality, and the Negro, as a socially excluded second class citizen, is a likely prospect for Communist revolutionary propaganda.

Next to activity in labor unions, the Communist Party has expended its greatest efforts in trying to gain adherents among Negroes. Two of the items listed under "Rights and Duties" on the membership card of the Communist Party in the U.S. are:

(1) To fight against all forms of national oppression, discrimination and segregation and all ideological influences and practices of "racial theories."
(2) To fight for full social, political and economic equality of Negro people, for Negro and white unity.

In the 1932 presidential election, the candidate for vice-president of the U.S. on the Communist Party ticket was a Negro (James W. Ford).

The Negroes were striving for equality long before the Communist Party sprang up. The Communists, being great opportunists, have tried to utilize and subvert this striving to their own devious purposes. However, in spite of the fact that Negro discontent over their mal-treatment and social exclusion in the U.S. makes fertile soil for Communist propaganda, the Communists have not so far succeeded in recruiting an appreciable following from among Negroes in the U.S. However, in the event of a strong revolutionary movement, such as in France and Italy, the Negroes might conceivably go Communist in droves.

As a group, Negroes are loyal citizens and their record during the last war bears this out--even though many Negro soldiers felt they were fighting abroad for something (freedom and equality) which was not being extended to them at home.

We must face the fact that Negroes are a potentially weak link in our solidarity and national security, so long as we, as a majority group, create the conditions which serve to alienate them. This is particularly true when there is an opposing ideology, such as Communism, which will exploit this weakness to the utmost, as a wedge to bore from within.

(Place on blackboard: Communists Use Racial Discrimination as a Wedge for Infiltration.)

Point #4--Discriminatory Practices Threaten National Security by Damaging our Good Neighbor Policy and Alienating Other Nations.

Looking at this problem from another approach, what do discriminatory practices and racial prejudice generally have to do with our international relations? How do they damage our Good Neighbor Policy and alienate other nations? What is the purpose of our Good Neighbor Policy?

(Responses should be obtained, pertinent questions asked and statements made to bring out the following:)

Purpose of the Good Neighbor Policy is to link together the American family of nations for greater common welfare and security. Some of its principles are: dignity of man, right of self determination and racial equality.

A large proportion of the population in the Latin American countries is Indian and Negro. For instance, Mexico is 85% Indian, and proud of it. The West Indies is more than 90% Negro. On the other hand, Brazil has a race structure similar to that of the U.S. These countries, however, do not practice race discrimination as a national habit, but they know we do. Consequently we are subjected to justified criticism for not practicing what we preach, i.e., giving lip service, only, to the principles of the Good Neighbor Policy.

Adolph A. Berle, Jr., a former Assistant Secretary of State, in an article on "Race Discrimination and the Good Neighbor Policy," cites some examples of how not to win friends and influence people:

> "A foreign minister of Haiti arrived in the United States on an important mission. It so happened that some years before he had been invited to this country, and he had had the experience of being thrown off a train in Alabama. An inter-American conference was called several years ago to meet at Biloxi, Miss. The duly accredited diplomatic delegate of one of the invited countries was excluded from the hotel in which the conference was being held. During World War II, the Allied forces drove Mussolini's invading troops out of Abyssinia, whose reconstructed government the United States promptly recognized. Envoys from Abyssinia reached Washington, and, until the State Department got to work, were denied admission to any first-rate living quarters. Not long after, the wife of the Governor of a great French territory on an official visit to the United States was refused admission to a dining car on her trip north to be entertained at the White House. A relative of the President of a neighboring republic went into a cocktail room in Florida; the management undertook to throw him out; in the ensuing fray he was killed."

Communists are now very active in Latin American countries and our racial discrimination and mal-treatment of minority groups in the U.S. provides very effective propaganda for the Communists to use to alienate these other American nations from us. Thus our discriminatory practices are made into very powerful propaganda against us.

Our string of naval and air bases, to guard the Caribbean area and the Panama Canal and for the common defense of the whole region, depend for their effectiveness on the friendly cooperation of the surrounding people.

Although our government may spend years and millions of dollars to build up a Good Neighbor Policy toward Latin America, Latin Americans will still question our good intentions so long as we practice racial discrimination and even look on minority group peoples in our own country as inherently inferior.

The colored nations of the world constitute 2/3 of the world's population and their influence is steadily rising. The treatment of the Negro in America has not made good propaganda for America abroad, particularly not among colored nations. The main international implication is, that American for its future security, both national and individual, needs to demonstrate to the world that American Negroes can be satisfactorily integrated into its democracy.

(Put on blackboard: Discriminatory Practices Damage our Good Neighbor Policy.)

Point #5--Discriminatory Practices Which Alienate Minority Groups Destroy National Solidarity--Corrective Action up to Majority Group.

It has been brought out that discriminatory practices serve to alienate rather than integrate our various minority groups. What effect does this have on our internal solidarity and strength as a nation?

(Responses should be obtained, pertinent questions asked and statements made to bring out the following:)

When peoples are dissatisfied, strength and efficiency are impaired through internal strife and lack of wholehearted cooperation.

Discriminatory practices make for inefficient use of manpower, through inadequate utilization and development of skills. Full and adequate utilization of manpower is most essential in a national emergency.

What are the Military Services finding out about the ability to live and work together of white and Negro soldiers? By integrating Negroes and whites, the Military Services are getting greater overall efficiency and finding that there is not nearly the strain that some people expected.

If discriminatory practices were to be abolished whose primary responsibility would it be to take the lead in corrective action--the majority or minority group? Why? Since the majority group has the balance of power in this matter, it would be their responsibility to take the lead in any corrective action. There would be greater solidarity if minority groups were integrated rather than alienated.

(Put on blackboard: Greater solidarity if minority groups were integrated.)

Summary of Discussion.

Well, we have covered quite a bit of territory; let's see if I can briefly summarize some of the principal points brought out in the discussion; they were about as follows: (work from the blackboard)

(1) The problem was discriminatory practices in relation to national and personal security. First, we listed some of the discriminatory practices arising out of prejudice against minority groups.

(2) It was pretty well agreed that people who are on the receiving end of these practices, Negroes for example, resent being treated as second class citizens. This makes them feel dissatisfied, frustrated and insecure.

(3) We saw that minority groups who are dissatisfied are a potential weak link as far as our national and personal security is concerned, particularly since the Communists are using this as a wedge for infiltration. So--we as the majority group are cutting our own throats, as it were--by creating the conditions which make it easier for the Communists to gain a toehold.

(4) It was also brought out that by not practicing what we preach, our Good Neighbor Policy is seriously damaged. And when you consider that 2/3 of the world's population is not white, world opinion can be influenced against us by pointing out our habit of "looking down" on other peoples.

(5) It was also shown that discriminatory practices, by causing internal strife and lack of wholehearted cooperation, impair our solidarity and strength. In addition, it was brought out that the Military Services are finding that Negro and white can live and work together effectively. Thus, greater solidarity is achieved if minority groups are integrated. And, since the majority group has the balance of power, it would be up to them to take the lead.

Group Decision A (Consensus)

Now, back to the problem that we started out with. With the international situation what it is today, how many think national security is an important problem at this time? After thinking about discriminatory practices in relation to national and even personal security, how many think discriminatory practices have real implications for national and personal security? How many think that they have serious implications?

(Get a show of hands on these questions.)

(For those groups where the discussion is only to be carried this far--close out the discussion and administer the dependent variable after this statement:) This evening, our consideration of discriminatory practices in relation to national and personal security may be an approach that some of you had not thought about too much before. In view of this approach and the information brought out in the discussion, we would appreciate your again completing some more forms which I am going to pass out. Although there are some differences, they are essentially the same as you filled out at the beginning of the session.

(The following is only for those groups receiving the Commitment treatment.)

Continuation--Reinforcing the Material by Developing Action Implications, Using Commitment.

It seems to be agreed that disciminatory practices against minority groups do have serious implications for our national and personal security. With this in mind, and since the majority group, having the

balance of power, would have to take the lead in any corrective action, how many think we would be better off as a nation, if discriminatory practices could be eliminated?

(Get a showing of hands.)

Let's go through the list here on the blackboard and see if there are certain ones of these discriminatory practices that you, as individuals, would personally be willing to see eliminated.

(Work through list on the blackboard and get a showing of hands on commitment of personal willingness to see the following discriminatory practices eliminated: restaurant exclusion, school exclusion, hotel exclusion, and residential area exclusion.)

Now one more question before we finish up. Since most of us, by our words and actions, support discriminatory practices to at least some extent--how many would personally be willing to exert a greater effort to try and eliminate any discriminatory behavior on their own part?

(Get a showing of hands on personal commitment.)

(Close out discussion and administer dependent variable after the following statement:)

This evening, our consideration of discriminatory practices in relation to national and personal security may be an approach that some of you had not thought about too much before. In view of this approach and the information brought out in the discussion, we would appreciate your again completing some more forms which I am going to pass out. Although there are some differences, they are essentially the same as those you filled out at the beginning of the session.

APPENDIX B

STEREOTYPE QUESTIONNAIRE

The following statements refer to opinions about which some people agree and others disagree. Please mark each statement in the left-hand margin according to your agreement or disagreement, as follows:

+ 1 slight support, agreement	- 1 slight opposition, disagreement
+ 2 moderate support, "	- 2 moderate opposition, "
+ 3 strong support, "	- 3 strong opposition, "

____1. The refreshing aspect of Negro music is its rhythm and spontaneity.

*____2. One good way for Negroes to overcome existing social barriers in America is to change the things about their behavior which other Americans find objectionable.

*____3. Because of their aggressiveness and enjoyment of physical contact, Negro youths run into more trouble with the law than White youths.

*____4. Negroes might be able to solve many of their social problems if they could overcome their own laziness and irresponsibility.

*____5. Cleanliness and courtesy are characteristics which are noticeably lacking in the behavior patterns of most Negroes.

____6. In every field where they have been given an opportunity to advance, Negroes have shown that they are good sports and gentlemen.

____7. Despite the oppressions which they have endured, Negroes tend to be more happy and carefree than other groups.

*____8. Superstition and ignorance are characteristics which alienate the Negroes from other groups.

*____ 9. Most Negroes let situations of complete equality go to their heads. They find it impossible to control their excessively strong sexual and aggressive desires.

*Indicates the 15 negative stereotype statements and the only ones used in the analysis.

*____10. Although education and training can do much to polish the rough edges off the Negro group, a certain amount of inherited primitiveness is bound to remain.

____11. Because of the many obstacles which they have had to overcome in achieving success, outstanding Negro artists and athletes are often more capable then their White colleagues.

*____12. The problem of racial prejudice in America has been greatly overplayed by a few Negro malcontents.

*____13. The aggressiveness of most Negroes has certainly not helped to better the position of their group in America.

*____14. Perhaps the position of Negroes in America would become more secure if they stopped striving to gain entry into circles where they are not really wanted.

*____15. Negroes would be better citizens if they displayed as much self control in the use of alcohol and narcotics as other Americans.

____16. In spite of severe environmental handicaps, Negroes have proven that they can do as well as any other group.

*____17. Limited native intelligence among Negroes still remains an important factor in preventing them from making noteworthy contributions to our cultural heritage.

*____18. Because of their careless and slovenly habits, Negroes invariably decrease property values in any neighborhood.

*____19. Negro politicians and labor leaders would be doing their race a great service if they developed a bit more humility and reticence.

*____20. Negroes often make excellent maids and cooks, but they tend to be too unreliable for positions of greater responsibility.

____21. When one considers its relatively small size, one is amazed by the proportion of outstanding musicians and athletes which has emerged from the Negro group.

APPENDIX C

SEGREGATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. The best answer is your own personal opinion. Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it on the following basis:

+ 1: I agree a little	- 1: I disagree a little
+ 2: I agree pretty much	- 2: I disagree pretty much
+ 3: I agree very much	- 3: I disagree very much

____1. Negroes should be given the same opportunities to become officers in the armed services as Whites.

____2. Private business concerns should be allowed to exclude all Negroes from employment in their concerns if they so desire.

____3. Negro nurses should be allowed to serve on the staff of White hospitals.

____4. Negroes should be given jobs as foremen in mixed White and Negro work sections, if they are qualified for the job.

____5. There should be separate companies for Whites and Negroes in the armed services.

____6. Churches should admit Negroes to membership and to the same services as Whites.

____7. Negro and White children should be encouraged to play together.

____8. White students and Negro students should go to separate schools.

____9. It is a good idea to have some restaurants and hotels from which Negroes are excluded.

___10. There should be separate sections in towns and cities for Negroes and Whites to live.

What do you feel is the opinion of this immediate group (those with whom you are filling out this questionnaire) on the matter of having some restaurants and hotels from which Negroes are excluded (question 9)? Please fill in the scale point (+3, +2, +1, -1, -2, or -3) which you feel most closely approximates the majority of this group's opinion _____.

What do you feel is the opinion of this immediate group (those with whom you are filling out this questionnaire) on the matter of there being separate sections in towns and cities for Negroes and Whites to live (question 10)? Please fill in the scale point (+3, +2, +1, -1, -2, or -3) which you feel most closely approximates the majority of this group's opinion. _____.

APPENDIX D

NATIONAL SECURITY STATEMENT

Please answer the following questions

Mark statements 1 and 2 in the left hand margin according to how much you agree or disagree with them on the following basis:

+ 1: I agree a little	- 1: I disagree a little
+ 2: I agree pretty much	- 2: I disagree pretty much
+ 3: I agree very much	- 3: I disagree very much

____1. Discriminatory practices arising out of prejudice against minority groups (Negroes, for example) constitute a threat to our national security.

*____2. The problem of prejudice or discrimination against minority groups in the United States is essentially a domestic (internal one and has little or no significance as far as our international relations are concerned.

3. To what extent do you think the members of this group agree among themselves (i.e., share the same opinion about statement #1 above?

   a. (check one) Little or no agreement among themselves____; some agreement but less than a majority____; a bare majority____; a large majority____; complete agreement among themselves____.

   b. If you think there is some degree of agreement among this group on statement #1, what scale point or position do you feel best represents the most common opinion of the group? (circle one)
   +3, +2, +1, -1, -2, -3

*4. To what extent do you think the members of this group agree among themselves (i.e., share the same opinion) about statement #2 above?

   a. (check one) Little or no agreement among themselves____; some agreement but less than a majority____; a bare majority____; a large majority____; complete agreement among themselves____.

   b. If you think there is some degree of agreement among this group on statement #2, what scale point or position do you feel best represents the most common opinion of the group? (circle one)
   +3, +2, +1, -3, -2, -1.

*Not used in the analysis.

APPENDIX E

F SCALE

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

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one. Write in +1, +2, or +3, or -1, -2, or -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

+ 1: I agree a little	- 1: I disagree a little
+ 2: I agree pretty much	- 2: I disagree pretty much
+ 3: I agree very much	- 3: I disagree very much

____1. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.

#*____2. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

____3. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.

____4. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.

____5. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decision he obeys without question.

____6. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.

#Six items from which is derived a measure of that dimension of the authoritarian syndrome termed "Submission to Authority" which on the basic personality level indicates failure to develop an inner authority, with a tendency to masochistic behavior.

*Three items from which is derived a measure of that dimension of the authoritarian syndrome termed "Conventionalism (conformity to an external agency)" and which relate to the basic personality mechanism of rigidity.

*____7. A person who has bad manners, habits and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.

____8. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.

____9. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.

___10. Nowadays, when so many different kinds of people move around and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself especially carefully against catching an infection or disease from them.

___11. An insult to our honor should always be punished.

___12. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.

___13. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.

___14. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.

___15. People can be divided into two distinct classes; the weak and the strong.

___16. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

___17. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.

___18. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.

___19. Wars and social troubles may someday be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.

___20. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked and feebleminded people.

___21. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.

*___22. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.

___23. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.

___24. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

___25. No sane, normal, decent person would ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.

___26. Familiarity breeds contempt.

___27. It is essential for learning or effective work that our teachers or bosses outline in detail what is to be done and exactly how to go about it.

___28. Some leisure is necessary but it is good hard work that makes life interesting and worthwhile.

___29. Books and movies ought not to deal so much with the unpleasant and seamy side of life; they ought to concentrate on themes that are entertaining or uplifting.

___30. When you come right down to it, it's human nature never to do anything without an eye to one's own profit.

APPENDIX F

MICHIGAN SENTENCE COMPLETION

Instructions for the Sentence Completion

This is a series of incompleted sentences. I would like you to complete each of them. If you get stuck on any question, skip it and go on, but try to complete it later. Please try to answer all of the items. Do not worry about spelling or grammar.

* 1. The rules of society

2. It is wrong to make people

3. My parents are

4. It makes me nervous to

5. The difference between Mom and Dad was

* 6. To get along well in a group you have to

7. Because of Mom, I

8. I am afraid

* 9. One must never

10. I feel that my father is

#11. I couldn't get along without

12. I hate

13. Because of Dad, I

14. I cannot understand what makes me

15. I feel that my mother is

16. My best trait

*Five items which were coded for "conformity"

#Three items which were coded for "Need for Authoritarian Support"

17. When people push me around

#18. As a youth my greatest unfilled emotional need was

19. I feel that I am

20. My greatest fault is

21. Most men are

22. Sexual desires

23. When I was struck in the face

*24. The worst thing that a person can do is

*25. Authority

26. I was really hurt when

#27. The most wonderful thing in the world is

28. To achieve success

29. My life at home

30. Most women are

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, Else, Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper and Bros., 1950.

2. Asch, S. E. Social psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952.

3. Bennett, Edith B. The relationship of group discussion, decision, commitment and consensus to individual action. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1952.

4. Bruner, J. S. Personality dynamics and the process of perceiving. In Blake, R. R., and Ramsey, G. V., Perception--an approach to personality. New York: Ronald Press, 1951 (pp. 121-147).

5. Carlson, E. R. Attitude change through modification of attitude structure. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1953.

6. French, Vera V. The structure of sentiments. I. A restatement of the theory of sentiments. J. Personality, 1947, 15, 247-282.

7. _____. The structure of sentiments. II. A preliminary study of sentiments. J. Personality, 1947, 16, 78-108.

8. _____. The structure of sentiments. III. A study of philosophicoreligious sentiments. J. Personality, 1947, 16, 206-244.

9. Helson, H. Adaptation-level as a basis for a quantitative theory of frame of reference. Psychol. Rev., 1948, 55, 297-313.

10. Krech, D., & Crutchfield, R. S. Theory and problems of social psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948.

11. Lewin, K. Group discussion and social change. In Newcomb, T.M., & Hartley, E. L., Readings in social psychology. New York: Henry Holt Co., 1947 (pp. 330-344).

12. Maier, N. R. F. Principles of human relations. New York: John Wiley and sons, 1952.

13. Marks, M. R. Two kinds of experiments, distinguished in terms of statistical operations. Psychol. Rev., 1951, 58, 179-184.

14. McClelland, D. C. Personality. New York: William Sloane Associates, 1951.

15. McDougall, W. An introduction to social psychology. Boston: John W. Luce, 1926.

16. Myrdal, G. An American dilemma. New York: Harper Bros., 1944.

17. Newcomb, T. M. Social psychology. New York: Dryden Press, 1950.

18. _____. Attitudes and perceptions of consensus of group members. Unpublished paper, 1952.

19. Riesman, D. The lonely crowd. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

20. Rose, A. M. Race prejudice and discrimination. New York: Knopf, 1951.

21. Rosenberg, M. J. The experimental investigation of a value theory of attitude structure. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1952.

22. Shand, A. F. The foundations of character. London: Macmillan, 1926.

23. Sherif, M. A study of some social factors in perception. Arch. Psychol., 1935, No. 187.

24. White, Martha S. Attitude change as related to perceived group consensus. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1953.