A STUDY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF POSITIVE ATTITUDES

TOWARD NATIVE SPEAKERS OF SPANISH

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

By

Madeline Anna Cooke, B.Sc., M.A.

* * * * * *

The Ohio State University
1969

Approved by

Edward D. Allen

Adviser
Department of Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

VITA

December 6, 1924	Born - Lorain, Ohio
1946	B.Sc. in Ed., The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
1946-1949.	Teacher of Spanish, Latin, and English, Bellevue, Ohio
1949-1951.	Graduate Assistant, Mexico City College, Mexico (now called University of the Americas)
1951	M.A. in Spanish, Mexico City College
1951-1952.	Teacher of Spanish, University High School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota
1952-1954.	Teacher of Spanish and Latin, Wayzata, Minnesota
1955-	Teacher of Spanish, Parma, Ohio
1959-1965.	System-wide Chairman of Foreign Language Department, Parma City Schools
1960	NDEA Summer Institute, Level I, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana
1964	NDEA Summer Institute, Level II, Quito, Ecuador, Organized by The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico
1965-1966.	Sabbatical leave. Doctoral studies at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Foreign Language Education

    Studies in Foreign Language Education. Professors
        Edward D. Allen and Paul Pimsleur

    Studies in Anthropology. Professors Erika E.
        Bourguignon and Robert K. Dentan

    Studies in Curriculum and Supervision. Professors
        Alexander Frazier, Jack Frymier, and Paul R. Klohr

    Studies in Linguistics. Professors Charles J. Fillmore,
        D. Terence Langendoen, and Catherine A. Callaghan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Review of the Literature of Foreign
   Language and Attitude
The Problem, the Hypothesis, and Objec-
   tives of the Study
Procedures
Summary

Definitions of Attitude
Origins of Attitudes
Attitude Change in Theory
Attitude Change in Practice
The Relationship of Attitude to Behavior
Problems of Attitude Measurement
Conclusion

Discussion of Similarities and
   Differences
The Family of Man
Values
Reading a Novel Set in Another Culture
Impressions of the United States
Visitors
Pen Pals
Reports on Countries and the Life of
   Their Teen-agers
Films
Molar Study of Puerto Rico
Summary and Conclusions

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The writer believes that it is unfortunate if
students finish a Spanish course thinking that people who
speak Spanish are inferior to Americans. In a rapidly-
shrinking world, men must learn not only to get along with
one another but also to respect one another as human beings.

Preliminary testing in the writer's school indi-
cated that people from Spanish-speaking countries were not
rated so high as people from some other countries. There-
fore she became intrigued with the idea of discovering tech-
niques which could be used in the high-school classroom to
develop more positive attitudes toward native speakers of
Spanish.

The writer believes that differences in value sys-
tems are the cause of most misunderstandings between people
of different cultures. When this study was begun, it was
hoped to ferret out differences between the value systems
of Spanish speakers and Americans and discover some mean-
ingful way of presenting them to high-school students. How-
ever, very little analysis of Spanish-speaking value systems
has been done. Furthermore, Spanish teachers have a problem
which French and German teachers do not; for Spanish is

1

spoken not only in Spain but also in twenty countries in the Western Hemisphere. To discover which values are common to all Spanish speakers and which are uniquely Costa Rican or Colombian, for example, would require a life-time of investigation. Therefore the writer set aside her focus on values and looked to other means of developing more positive attitudes toward native speakers of Spanish.

It was decided to make this study a research project. Research requires measurement. Six months of intermittent searching produced no instrument suitable for measuring attitudes toward Spanish speakers. The following two years were spent in developing such instruments. As a result, whereas the writer had set out intending to develop techniques for producing more positive attitudes toward native speakers of Spanish, she actually spent all of her time developing tests for measuring these attitudes.

It is regrettable that the number of techniques tried was so limited. However, several additional techniques are suggested in Chapter VI.

Perhaps the value of the project, if any, will lie in the instruments. They are offered to others in the hope that they can therefore devote all of their efforts to finding ways for building more positive attitudes toward Spanish speakers.

CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM

In the contemporary world, people are becoming
more keenly aware of the differing, even conflict-
ing, beliefs, values, and ways of life of various
human groupings of the same or different societies.
These differences are no longer an academic issue.
. ... For in a world shrunken by human achievements
in means of transportation and communication, human
groupings must inevitably have traffic with one
another, whether they like it or not.[1]

Ever since her participation in World War I caused

the United States to turn from her path of isolationism and

to assume leadership in world affairs, many Americans have

recognized the need for developing a spirit of international

understanding among her citizens. It was only natural that

the schools and colleges should be thought of as logical

places in which to nurture this concept. Social studies

courses usually include the development of international

understanding as one of their goals. Some educational

leaders have also looked to the foreign-language classroom

as another place where such an attitude might be fostered.

---

[1]Carolyn W. Sherif and Muzafer Sherif, Attitude and
Attitude Change: the Social-Judgement-Involvement Approach
(Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1965), p. 1.

Many language teachers would include the fostering of international understanding as one of their goals. The profession itself officially resolved in December, 1951, "that the members of the Modern Language Association pledge their support of every effort to deepen our understanding of the other peoples of the earth, to the end that we may play our proper role in a united world."[2]

Yet Stephen A. Freeman, looking back on the decade 1958-1968, feels that although foreign language teachers have made great strides in teaching language as a skill for practical use, they have tended to forget the cultural objective.[3]

Because language is culture, many language teachers feel that an understanding of the culture is an automatic by-product of language study. Others feel that one must teach for international understanding. Many articles have been written describing attempts at teaching for international understanding. However very few of these efforts have been designed as research projects.

The writer believes that holding favorable attitudes toward the people who live in another country is one aspect of international understanding. The following section is a review of the literature on foreign language and attitudes.

[2]Minutes of the Annual Meeting, December 27, 1951, published in PMLA, LXVII (February, 1952), p. 127.

[3]Stephen A. Freeman, "Let Us Build Bridges," Modern Language Journal, LII (May, 1968), p. 262.

A Review of the Literature of Foreign Language and Attitudes

The major studies in this area are those conducted by Riestra and Johnson, Sutherland, Young, and Nostrand.

In the spring of 1961 Riestra and Johnson carried out a study involving 126 fifth-grade pupils in ten class-rooms.[4] The five control classes were not studying a foreign language. The five experimental classes were in their second year of a FLES (Foreign Languages in the Elementary Schools) Spanish program. These classes all had the same Spanish teacher. She taught three of the classes "live" and the other two via TV and tape recordings. The control and experimental groups were matched for school experience, socio-economic status, sex, chronological age, and intelligence. All subjects were given an eight-page questionnaire, one page referring to each of these countries: Russia, Spain, Germany, Mexico, France, Argentina, and Bolivia--plus a final page in which the children were asked to choose which of the following children they thought they would like most and give a reason: a Russian-speaking child, a Spanish-speaking child, or a French-speaking child.

The pupils in the experimental group chose positive adjectives significantly more often than did those in the

---

[4]Miguel A. Riestra and Charles E. Johnson, "Changes in Attitudes of Elementary-School Pupils Toward Foreign-Speaking Peoples Resulting from the Study of a Foreign Language," The Journal of Experimental Education, XXX (Fall, 1964), pp. 65-72.

control group to describe people from Spanish-speaking
countries which they had studied. They also tended to
choose more positive adjectives to describe people from
Spanish-speaking countries which they had not studied, al-
though this only reached the .06 level of significance.
The third finding of this study was that the experimental
children selected significantly more often a Spanish-speak-
ing child as the one that they thought they would like most.

The results of this study show that these FLES
Spanish students did have more positive attitudes toward
Spanish speakers.

Back in 1946 Margaret B. Sutherland did an attitude
study for her B. A. thesis at the University of Glasgow.[5]
She administered the Bogardus social distance scale to 183
students who had studied French for two years and another
183 who had not studied French. The subjects were all
girls selected mostly from three schools, both Catholic and
Protestant high schools, although twenty-seven university
students were also tested. The scale was applied to sixteen
countries including France.

The summary of the thesis does not give the statis-
tical level of significance and suggests caution in inter-
preting the data due to the possible effect of I. Q., size

_____

[5]Margaret B. Sutherland, "A Study of the Effects of
Learning French on Attitudes Toward the French," British
Journal of Educational Psychology, XVI (February, 1946),
p. 44.

of the groups, and the difference in the school environment.
Two trends were noted in the results: (1) France was
ranked higher by students who had studied French than by
those who had not, and (2) the French pupils made more re-
sponses highly favorable to the French and fewer very un-
favorable responses.

Miss Sutherland concludes that "while a slight in-
crease in favor of the French seems to accompany learning
French, it is neither great nor so great as it could be."[6]

During the spring of 1961 Eleanor C. Young conducted
an experiment involving 78 third- and fourth-year French
students in Plainfield, Somerville, and Westfield, N. J.[7]
The purpose of the study was to determine if the intensive
reading of 250 pages of French literature during a three-
month period would effect a significant change in certain
attitudes related to prejudice and international understand-
ing. The classes were conducted entirely in French. The
selections read included as themes those values which were
tested before and after the reading period, values such as
national liberty, international friendship, and religion.
In addition to a discussion of the aesthetic aspects of the
works read, each teacher encouraged discussion of the values

---

[6]Loc. cit.

[7]Eleanor Culver Young, "An Experimental Study of In-
tensive Reading of Selected Materials in a Foreign Language
Upon Certain Attitudes" (unpublished Ed. D. dissertation,
Rutgers University, 1962).

presented in the lesson by asking such questions as, "How many items of Voltaire's prayer could be taken as urgent needs of today's society?" or "How do Vercor's proposals for peace compare with yours?"

Three instruments were used: Paul Dressel's Inventory of Beliefs, which identifies personality types, among them the ability to change; Allport-Vernon-Lindzey's Study of Values, which identifies six basic interests of personality; and a semantic differential whose origin she does not identify. One infers that she selected the twelve scales herself, four comprising the evaluative factor, another four the potency factor, and the same number for the activity factor.

> Differences were found at the .01 and .05 levels for all three tests. However, not all subjects yielded significant changes on all instruments or in all sections of one instrument. No more than 17% of the students showed a significant change.[8]

The author summarizes some of the results on the semantic differential. Only nine of the eighteen concepts showed a significant change, and some of these changes were not in the direction hoped for. For example, French Language was rated lower in two schools after three months of intensive reading, while English Language rated higher. Silence increased significantly in value on the potency and activity factors, and War increased significantly on all

[8]*Ibid*., p. 171.

three factors. The concepts of Foreigner, Home, and Religion decreased in value on all three factors at all three schools; and Pastor went down on the evaluative and potency factor. National Liberty went down significantly at Mrs. Young's own school. The other nine concepts were not affected significantly. They were The Arts, Catholic, Honesty, International Friendship, Personal Independence, Poetry, Respect for Military Law, Respect for Parents, and Love.

Mrs. Young concludes that "the cultural objective of foreign-language study (that is, lessening of prejudice and improving international understanding) was not realized by the intensive reading."[9]

This study indicates that even when the classroom teacher is consciously teaching for improved attitudes, the desired results may <u>not</u> be achieved.

Nostrand of the University of Washington is interested in determining what cultural content will best prepare students to adapt themselves understandingly to the cultural patterns they will find when living or traveling in the land whose language they are studying. He has prepared a lengthy questionnaire called "How the Americans See the French." One of the sections of this questionnaire consists of a semantic differential made up of twenty pairs of adjectives. The subject is first asked, "In general, how would you rate

---

[9]<u>Ibid.</u>, p. 217.

the French?" On the following page, he is asked to rate

the American people, using the same pairs of adjectives.

As part of the pre-test of this questionnaire,

these two tests were administered to 137 French students at

the University of Washington. The results showed that

these students perceived the French as being very much like

Americans.[10] The entire questionnaire, including these two

tests, was also pre-tested on seventy-eight Americans who

were living in France or who had recently returned from

residence abroad. In response to one of the questions, most

of these Americans said that their attitude toward the

French had changed after they lived there. On the semantic

differential tests this group rated the French very differ-

ently from the Americans. There was a tendency to see

Americans as having all the virtues and the French as having

poor or bad characteristics.[11] The findings of this ques-

tionnaire suggest that the positive image which some lan-

guage students do have is altered when the student finds

himself living abroad.

In addition to these studies, which were specifi-

cally planned to measure attitudes, several other studies

---

[10]Howard Lee Nostrand, Experiment in Determining Cultural Content: Pretesting the Questionnaire, "How Americans See the French" (Department of Romance Languages and Literature, University of Washington, July, 1964), p. 16. (Mimeographed.)

[11]Loc. cit.

were designed in such a way that the results yielded some information on student attitudes as a part of a broader experiment.

Scherer and Wertheimer conducted an experiment with German students at the University of Colorado in 1960.[12] Its primary purpose was to compare the proficiency of audio-lingually- vs. traditionally-taught college students in the four language skills of reading, writing, speaking, and understanding. They administered several attitude tests, two of which are relevant here.

> The first of these forms, consisting of 25 statements to which the student was requested to indicate his degree of agreement or disagreement on a 7-point scale, was a "Germanophilia" scale directly based upon Gardner's and Lambert's Francophilia" scale. It was composed of such assertions as, "Germans are a very dependable people," "The German way of life seems crude when compared with ours," and "Germans contribute to the richness of our society."[13]

The other was a semantic differential test consisting of twenty-three scales to be used for the concept "German people in Germany." After one year of college German the results of these two tests showed that the audio-lingual students had significantly more positive attitudes toward Germans.[14]

---

[12]George A. C. Scherer and Michael Wertheimer, A Psycho-linguistic Experiment in Foreign-Language Teaching (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1964).

[13]Ibid., p. 160.

[14]Ibid., p. 243.

The Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM), which is composed of ten small, liberal arts colleges, has conducted extensive research in foreign-language instruction. One of the experiments concerned the effects of language-laboratory type upon the cultural attitudes of the students.[15] The subjects were nearly 700 students of French, German, and Spanish from the ten member colleges. As a part of their regular class work, the students were randomly assigned to either a non-recording (audio-passive) or recording (audio-active) type of language laboratory. In May of 1963 the subjects were all tested with several of the attitude tests which had been used by Scherer and Wertheimer in the Colorado tests. Appropriate changes had been made for use with the French and Spanish students. On the phylophilia measure, students who had used a non-recording lab scored significantly higher than students who had used the recording-type laboratory. The non-recording-lab students also scored higher on the semantic differential scale for the concept Foreigners in their Country, but the difference was not significant. However, on the concept Foreigners in this Country, the non-recording-lab subjects once again showed significantly more positive attitudes. (Scherer and Wertheimer did not publish the results of their

[15]Klaus A. Mueller and William Wiersma, "The Effects of Language Laboratory Type Upon Cultured Orientation Scores of Foreign Language Students," _Modern Language Journal_, LI (May, 1967), pp. 258-263.

test of attitudes toward Germans in this country "since results with German-Americans closely resembled results with the measures of attitude toward Germans.")[16] Mueller and Wiersma point out that inter-college rather than laboratory differences may contribute to the results, for there were many significant differences on individual tests on a college-to-college basis.[17]

It has been found that the ratings which subjects give to groups of people may vary according to the series in which they are presented. Diab, working with Arab subjects, found that some groups, such as Negroes, changed from positive to negative ratings depending upon the series in which they were presented; while other groups changed in degree of favorableness or unfavorableness according to the context. For example, Americans were rated more favorably when Russians also appeared in the list; the French were rated less favorably when Algerians were on the list.[18] Keeping this in mind, one might question the favorable results of the attitude tests administered as part of the Colorado and ACM experiments. In each instance the student was asked to rate only one group. The results might have

---

[16]Op. cit., p. 227.

[17]Op. cit., p. 261.

[18]N. L. Diab, "National Stereotype and the 'reference group' concept," Journal of Social Psychology, LVII (1962), pp. 339-351 cited by Carolyn W. Sherif and Muzafer Sherif, op. cit., p. 145.

been different if that one group had been included as part
of a series.

As a pilot study for this experiment, a Bogardus
social distance scale for fifteen countries was administered
in the spring of 1967 to 240 Valley Forge high-school stu-
dents, 129 of whom were enrolled in Spanish II, 79 in World
History, and 32 in French II. All three groups ranked the
top six countries in this order: America, Great Britain,
Ireland, Germany, France, and Italy--all, that is, except
the French students, who transposed Germany and Ireland.
The middle group was made up of the same five countries,
though there was variation in the order among the three stu-
dent groups. They included these countries (in the order
listed by the Spanish students): Italy, Spain, Argentina,
Poland, and Mexico. The bottom four countries were ranked
in this order by all three groups: Puerto Rico, Nationalist
China, American Negro, and Red China (ranked lowest of all
fifteen countries). Actually the French II sample again
varied the order slightly, this time transposing Puerto Rico
and Nationalist China. The ranking of the four Spanish-
speaking countries included in the list was the same for all
three groups--Spain, Argentina, Mexico, and Puerto Rico.
The Spanish-speaking countries were all ranked in the mid-
dle-and lower-thirds.

In June of 1966 a Bogardus scale which included
eighty-seven categories of people was administered to 154

sophomores at the two high schools of the Parma City Schools. Half these students were considered to be terminal students, that is, students not planning to continue their formal education beyond high school; the others were non-terminal or college-bound. Data are available for the non-terminal students only. The groups which they ranked lowest are: 84th Dominicans; 85th Negro Rhodesians; 86th Congolese, Mainland Chinese and Cubans, all tied; and 87th Vietnamese.[19] It is interesting to note that the countries ranked in these four lowest positions include two Spanish-speaking countries.

The results of this Bogardus test and of the one which the writer administered in her pilot study indicate that some students at Valley Forge High School do not rate people from Spanish-speaking countries as high as they rate people from some other countries.

Because psychology tells us that attitudes are learned, it should be possible to develop techniques which will enable students to learn more positive attitudes toward native speakers of Spanish. The Riestra and Johnson study demonstrates that positive attitudes may be an automatic by-product of language study. The Sutherland study observes trends in a positive direction but finds nothing significant. The Nostrand study suggests that the kinds of positive

---

[19]Thomas W. Kelbley, Psychologist's Report for Arts and Humanities for Leisure Time, prepared for the Parma, Ohio, City Schools, August, 1966. (Dittoed.) (In the files of the Pupil Personnel Dept.)

attitudes which show up on paper-and-pencil tests adminis-
tered in this country may not survive the acid test of liv-
ing in the culture concerned. The Young study indicates
that especially selected readings will not necessarily pro-
duce favorable attitudes.

The Problem, the Hypothesis, and Objectives of the Study

The problem is to discover which techniques will
produce more positive attitudes toward native speakers of
Spanish. This study has been designed to test the follow-
ing hypothesis: that it is possible to develop more posi-
tive attitudes toward native speakers of Spanish. The
objectives of the study are two-fold: (1) to develop tech-
niques which will foster these more positive attitudes, and
(2) to develop techniques for measuring attitudes toward
native speakers of Spanish.

Procedures

Design

This study was a field experiment, also known as a-
experimental research, using the writer's four Spanish
classes at Valley Forge High School, one of two high
schools in the Parma City School District in suburban
Cleveland, Ohio. The school was built in 1961. It is lo-
cated in Parma Heights, an all-white suburb of a middle or

perhaps slightly higher socio-economic level.[20] There are
approximately 7,000 Puerto Ricans living in Cleveland; how-
ever none live in the Parma area. Our students have no
contact with them and are hardly aware of their presence
(in contrast to Anglo awareness of Mexicans in the South-
west).

The experiment took place during the school year
1967-1968. During that year there were 2,893 students en-
rolled. Valley Forge is a comprehensive high school with
substantial enrollments in vocational and commercial
courses as well as in academic subjects. Fifty-two percent
of the students at Valley Forge go on to college, with
another 15% continuing their education at vocational
schools or on a part-time basis. In the year of the study
1,059 students or 37% were enrolled in a foreign-language
class. Nine full-time teachers offer instruction in five
languages: French, German, Latin, Russian, and Spanish.
Five years of instruction are offered in French and Spanish;
four in the others.

The writer teaches audio-lingually and conducts her
classes mostly, though not entirely, in Spanish. Hablar y
Leer published by Holt is the text used in Spanish II.

---

[20]The average income in Parma Heights in 1967 was
$9,028. Records of the Finance Department, City of Parma
Heights, Ohio. The median income for 1967 of families in
the United States was $8,000. U. S., Census Bureau, Con-
sumer Income: Family Income Advances, Poverty Reduces in
1967 (P60 #55, August 5, 1968), p. 1.

Two classes were designated as control classes, and
in them the classroom instruction was limited to the lan-
guage skills. In the two experimental sections, a delib-
erate effort was made to supplement the language instruction
with activities designed to develop more positive attitudes
toward native speakers of Spanish. Attitude tests were
given at the beginning and end of the study, which lasted
five months.

Sampling

Cluster samples were used, that is, natural class
groups. During the school year 1967-1968 the writer had
four classes--three sections of second-year Spanish and an
advanced class containing both fourth- and fifth-year stu-
dents. The advanced class was selected as one of the ex-
perimental classes. Although it seems reasonable to suppose
that students who elected to study a fourth or fifth year
of Spanish already had fairly positive attitudes, the
writer had no way of knowing whether this was in fact true
and hoped to guard against the irony of having students com-
plete four or five years of Spanish and at the same time
hold patronizing attitudes toward Spanish speakers. This
class was conducted entirely in Spanish. More than half the
time it was taught as two separate classes, the teacher di-
viding her time between the fourth- and fifth-year groups.
This class met the first period in the morning.

The second-year classes were scheduled for second, fourth, and fifth periods. Fifth period was selected as the other experimental class. Second period was eliminated in order to preclude any morning vs. afternoon effects. Since the fifth period class met from 12:15 to 1:15 p. m., both a morning and an afternoon class were thereby represented in the experimental groups. The fourth-period class was eliminated because it had an unusually large number of good students in it. The fifth-period class was academically more balanced. Moreover, inasmuch as it was the writer's last class of the day, its members would not be forewarned of the additional activities which pertained to attitudes. Although work in the language skills was conducted almost entirely in Spanish, the attitude work was done in English at the second-year level.

The cluster samples were unbalanced in several ways, as shown in Table 1.

There were fewer students in the experimental than in the control classes. In the experimental group the girls outnumbered the boys by more than two-to-one, while there were more boys than girls in the control classes. More than half of the control classes were sophomores. There were more seniors than either sophomores or juniors in the experimental classes.

TABLE 1.--Distribution of experimental and control classes
according to sex and grade in school

Experimentals	Sex		Grade in School		
	Boys	Girls	10th	11th	12th
(Spanish IV)	(1)	(5)	(0)	(0)	(6)
(Spanish V)	(0)	(11)	(0)	(3)	(8)
Spanish IV-V 1°	1	16	0	3	14
Spanish II 5°	12	18	17	8	5
Total Experimentals N=47	13 (28%)	34 (72%)	17 (36%)	11 (24%)	19 (40%)
Controls					
Spanish II 2°	21	14	18	12	5
Spanish II 4°	12	12	13	7	4
Total Controls N=59	33 (56%)	26 (44%)	31 (53%)	19 (32%)	9 (15%)
Total, all four classes N=106	46 (43%)	60 (57%)	48 (45%)	30 (28%)	28 (27%)

No attempt was made to gather IQ data on these students. The mean IQ of the class of 1970, who were sophomores the year of this study, was 108.[21] Because there has

---

[21]Average of the mean IQ's calculated from the Otis-Lennon and California Test of Mental Maturity, which were administered to all sophomores during the 1967-68 school year. (In the files of the Pupil Personnel Dept., Parma City Schools.)

been no rapid population shift in the school district, the
writer assumes that this figure is probably fairly close to
the mean IQ of the juniors and seniors. Furthermore, the
most academically-talented students at Valley Forge usually
do not take Spanish; so the writer believes that this figure
is probably also fairly close to the mean IQ for the stu-
dents represented in the study.

Table 2 shows that Catholics outnumber Protestants.
The other religions represented were four Eastern Orthodox,
one Unitarian, one Jewish, and one agnostic. Only three
students failed to answer this question. It is rather in-
teresting to note the rather large percentage of students
who were not enough concerned about politics at this stage
of their lives to indicate a preference. Of those who did,
the Democrats outnumbered the Republicans. The percentages
under Nationality Background total more than 100% because
they were computed in the following manner. If a student
mentioned two nationalities, they were both noted. (If he
mentioned more than two, only the first two were counted.)
Thus, while 34% of the students indicated that they were of
German descent, some of these same students may have been
among the 13% who also claimed Hungarian ancestry. The
high percentage of Slavic extraction resulted from combin-
ing the following ethnic groups: Ukranian, Russian, Slovak,
Polish, Slavic, Croatian, Czech, Bohemian, Rumanian, and

Slovenian, most of which were represented individually only once or twice in any given class.

TABLE 2.--Some personal data on the experimental and control classes

	Religious Preference	Political Preference	Nationality Background
Experimentals N=47	Catholic 66% Protestant 30% Other 4% None 0%	Democratic 40% Republican 21% Independent 6% No preference 33%	German 34% Slavic 28% Italian 26% Irish 15% Hungarian 13% English 9%
Controls N=59	Catholic 57% Protestant 32% Other 6% None 5%	Democratic 46% Republican 31% Independent 5% No preference 18%	Slavic 49% German 27% Hungarian 19% English 12% Irish 10% Italian 10%

Instrumentation and Data Collection

Three pretests were administered and two posttests. The three pretests were the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, a modified Bogardus scale, and a semantic differential scale.[22] The Bogardus and semantic differential scales were given again at the end of the study.

The Rokeach Scale was given on November 28, 1967. Difficulties in printing the other two tests delayed their

----

[22]See Appendix.

administration until January 3, 1968, the first day after
the Christmas vacation. They were re-administered on May
23, 1968.

No attitude activities were initiated in the Span-
ish II experimental class until after January 3. In the
Spanish IV-V class, however, some activities were begun the
first week of school in September.

The Rokeach scale is a measure of open- and closed-
mindedness. The students are asked to indicate their degree
of agreement or disagreement with such statements as these:
"A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is be-
neath contempt." "It is better to be a dead hero than a
live coward." It was felt that it might be helpful to have
some measure of how open- or closed-minded the subjects
were to begin with, since attitude research indicates that
closed-minded people sometimes react to attempts to alter
their attitudes by clinging to them more firmly than ever.

A semantic differential test was given because it
measures the cognitive and affective aspects of an attitude.
In order to have some measure of the conative or behavioral
aspect, the Bogardus scale was used.

Every effort was made to disguise the fact that
there was any connection between these tests and the class-
room teacher. On the day that the Rokeach test was given
the students were merely told, "We have been asked to par-
ticipate in a series of tests, and today we are going to

take one of them." The title of the test as administered
is simply "Opinionnaire." When the other two tests were
administered in January, the students were told, "We have
been asked to participate in a series of tests. You took
one of them awhile ago. We are going to take two others
today." The title of both scales read "Scholastic Surveys:
Columbus, Ohio." The teacher distinguished between them by
referring to "the long one" (the semantic had fifteen pages
stapled together) and "the short one" (the Bogardus was a
single sheet). In May the students were told, "We have
been asked to participate in a series of tests. These look
similar to the tests you took in January. They know how
you felt about these things in January. I guess they want
to know how you feel about them now." There were a few
queries, to be sure, but the investigator prevaricated
freely.

In one of the little five-minute talks in Spanish
with which the writer customarily begins a class, she one
day discussed her academic background including the fact
that she was working toward a doctorate. The subject was
hardly ever mentioned again. Only two students ever asked
the topic of the dissertation and when told that it had to
do with the teaching of culture, they seemed satisfied.

Analysis

Correlations and an analysis of variance were run
on the data. If the Rokeach correlated highly with either

of the other measures, it might indeed predict which students would be most or least likely to change. If the Bogardus and semantic correlated highly with each other, then it might be more economical in both time and money to administer just the Bogardus in future studies. The analysis of variance revealed whether there was any statistically significant difference between the control and experimental classes on any of the measures.

Summary

Many language teachers accept international understanding as one of the goals of foreign-language study. The writer holds that having favorable attitudes toward people from other countries is one facet of international understanding. Research on the attitudes of foreign-language students shows inconsistent results, some studies indicating a more favorable attitude, others reporting less favorable attitudes.

This study will test the hypothesis that it is possible to develop more positive attitudes toward native speakers of Spanish. Its objectives are to develop two kinds of techniques: some for fostering more positive attitudes and others for measuring these attitudes.

Four classes were involved in the experiment. The two designated as control classes concentrated on the language skills. In the two experimental classes the language

study was supplemented by activities designed to improve attitudes toward native speakers of Spanish.

Three attitude measures were taken: the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, a semantic differential scale, and a modified Bogardus Social Distance scale. The results of these measures were submitted to statistical analysis in order to determine if more positive attitudes had been developed and to discover what relationships exist between the different attitude measures.

CHAPTER II

ATTITUDE AND ATTITUDE RESEARCH

Introduction

Social psychology is the discipline which has been most concerned with attitude and attitude research. For the language teacher whose background in the social sciences may be limited, we include this description of the field of social psychology:

> An extreme psychological view of the world sees a complexly structured organism (man) facing an empty or minimally structured environment (society), while a very extreme sociological view . . . sees an empty or minimally structured organism facing a complexly structured environment. The social psychologist sees both man and society as equally complex and recognizes additional complexities caused by the interaction between the two.[1]

Jahoda and Warren give this brief history of social psychology:

> Social psychology is younger than the century itself. . . . In the earlier decades of the century . . . research into attitudes was the mainstay of empirical social psychology, enabling it to establish itself . . . as an independent discipline. In the period . . . between the two world wars interest in attitudes manifested itself in two forms: first, in what we call research into content . . . and secondly, in the construction of

---

[1]Edward E. Sampson (ed.), <u>Approaches, Contexts, and Problems of Social Psychology: a Book of Readings</u> (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1965), p. 2.

scaling techniques for the quantification of atti-
tude assessment. In later years, after 1940, as
social psychology itself mellowed and established
itself in many other areas e.g., group structure
and process , the study of attitudes became more
ambitious and more systematic. . . . The study of
prejudice, so much a part of the problem-centered
approach of many American social psychologists, has
been in post-war years enriched by the study of the
more systematically elaborated syndrome of authori-
tarianism. But the most striking element of post-
war work on attitudes has been a vast expansion in
the study of attitude change. This . . . has . . .
given rise in recent years to various theoretical
models . . .[2]

These are some of the problems to which attitude

researchers have addressed themselves: the definition of

attitude, the origins of attitude, theories of attitude,

attitude change, the relationship of attitude to behavior,

and attitude measurement. In this chapter we shall take up

each of these topics in turn and attempt to set forth the

major findings in each area. Although a great deal more is

known about attitudes in 1968 than in 1948, nevertheless,

the language teacher is warned that this great body of

knowledge serves largely to highlight the problems involved

in attitude change rather than to indicate solutions.

Definitions of Attitude

Attitude is a layman's term which has been borrowed

by the social psychologists. It is readily understood by

teacher and student, parent and child. Social psychologists

---

[2]Marie Jahoda and Neil Warren (eds.), Attitudes:
Selected Readings (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, Inc.,
1966), pp. 10-11.

have defined _attitude_ in various ways, and we shall present some of the definitions most frequently encountered in the literature.

In order to facilitate an understanding of the different emphases represented in these definitions, we present first a background statement taken from Sampson:

> An early Platonic trichotomy describes all mental processes in terms of three major aspects: (1) _Cognitive_, involving knowing, thinking, perceiving; (2) _Affective_, involving feelings and emotions; and (3) _Conative_, involving acting, doing, striving.[3]

Davis prefaces his definition of attitude by pointing out that all definitions seem to have two factors in common:

> 1. Attitude is an _inferred_ entity, something which is not measured directly but rather is deduced from other observable data.
>
> 2. Attitudes imply some sort of _tendency to act_ toward the object toward which they are held.[4]

He then proceeds to suggest the following working definition of an attitude:

> An attitude is an inferred factor within the individual which involves a tendency to perceive and react in a particular manner toward some aspect of his environment.[5]

A person may hold an attitude toward any object, be it animal, vegetable, or mineral, abstract or concrete.

---

[3]_Op. cit._, p. 7.

[4]E. E. Davis, _Attitude Change: a Review and Bibliography of Selected Research_ (Paris: UNESCO, No. 19, 1964), p. 8.

[5]_Ibid._, p. 9.

Concerning social attitudes, i.e., attitudes toward in-

dividuals or social groups, Davis has this to say:

> In analyzing the psychological processes which
> are involved in attitudes, a distinction is usually
> made in terms of their cognitive, affective, and
> conative components.

> A. The cognitive component includes the per-
> ceptions, beliefs, and expectations that the in-
> dividual holds with respect to members of various
> social groups.

> It includes his stereotypes, those attributes
> usually used to describe an individual which are
> instead applied to a whole group. These stereo-
> types are usually characterized by (a) over-gener-
> alization (the traits are attributed to all or
> nearly all members of a race, nation, etc.);
> (b) over-simplification (one, or at most a few,
> characteristics are used to encompass the complex-
> ity of a whole race, nation, etc.); and (c) rigid-
> ity. (Due to selective perception and interpreta-
> tion, contrary evidence is often either ignored or
> is seen as confirming the preconceived notion.)

> B. The affective component refers to the fact
> that in addition to beliefs about particular groups,
> such attitudes usually entail feelings toward these
> groups as well.

> C. The conative component refers . . . to the
> fact that, in addition to thinking and feeling a
> certain way about a social group, there is usually
> a policy orientation, i.e., a tendency to react in
> a particular way toward members of this group.[6]

Newcomb believes that probably the two definitions

of attitude which have been the most influential are those

of Gordon W. Allport and of D. Krech and R. S. Crutchfield.

Allport's definition, first postulated in 1935, is this:

> An attitude is a mental and neural state of
> readiness, organized through experience, exerting
> a directive or dynamic influence upon the individ-
> ual's response to all objects and situations with

---

[6]Loc. cit.

which it is related.[7]

Krech and Crutchfield define attitude in this way:

An attitude can be defined as an enduring or-
ganization of motivational, emotional, perceptual,
and cognitive processes with respect to some as-
pect of the individual's world.[8]

Newcomb emphasizes that attitudes must of necessity

be inferred from observed behavior. He makes this clear

both in his own definition of attitude and in the statement

following it.

An attitude is the individual's organization of
psychological processes, as inferred from his be-
havior . . .[9]

Attitudes have occasionally been defined, both
by sociologists and psychologists, simply in terms
of the probability of the occurrence of a specified
behavior in a specified situation. Such defin-
itions, while relatively devoid of conceptual con-
tent, serve to remind us that the ultimate referent
of attitudes is behavior.[10]

As we shall see in one of the later sections of

this chapter, the relationship between attitudes and be-

havior is not so obvious as the layman might suppose. The

four definitions just given all include this conative or

behavioral aspect of attitude. However, Sampson, writing

---

[7] Theodore M. Newcomb, "On the Definition of Atti-
tude," Attitudes, eds. Marie Jahoda and Neil Warren (Bal-
timore, Md.: Penguin Books, Inc., 1966), p. 23.

[8] Loc. cit.

[9] Ibid., p. 22.

[10] Ibid., p. 23.

in 1965, suggests that current thinking questions whether the conative aspect must necessarily be included.

> . . . the concept of attitude slowly shifted its meaning until presently there is general agreement that attitude is a concept having at least cognitive and affective (evaluative) components. . . Whether the concept of attitude so defined additionally has the motivational or dispositional properties it had historically, leading its holder to act in a particular manner, is still open to some dispute.[11]

Insko, writing in 1967, observes that most recent definitions of attitude "focus on the evaluative dimension of attitude, discarding the notion that any overt behavior is implied."[12] He gives as an example the 1959 definition of Katz and Stotland: "An attitude is a tendency or disposition to evaluate an object or the symbol of that object in a certain way."[13]

Asch suggests the notion of hierarchy in regard to the cognitive aspect of attitudes.

> An attitude is an organization of experiences and data with reference to an object. It is a structure of a hierarchical order, the parts of which function in accordance with their position on the whole.

> At the same time a given attitude is a quasi-open structure functioning as part of a wider context.[14]

---

[11]Sampson, op. cit., p. 236.

[12]Chester A. Insko, Theories of Attitude Change (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967), p. 2.

[13]Loc. cit.

[14]Solomon E. Asch, "Attitudes as Cognitive Structures," Attitudes: Selected Readings, eds. Marie Jahoda and Neil Warren (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, Inc., 1966), p. 32.

Belief and opinion are two related terms frequently encountered in the literature. Both of them are associated with the cognitive component of an attitude. "Operationally, one has an attitude toward and a belief in or about a stimulus object."[15] An opinion is more tentative than a belief. These distinctions are not always made, however; and opinion and belief are sometimes used as synonyms of attitude. In fact, a researcher usually defines his terms according to his own preference. The following quotation from Allport will illustrate:

> A prejudice is a feeling, favorable or unfavorable, toward a person or thing, prior to, or not based on, actual experience. . . .[16]
>
> We have said that an adequate definition of prejudice contains two essential ingredients. There must be an attitude of favor or disfavor; and it must be related to an overgeneralized (and therefore erroneous) belief. Prejudiced statements sometimes express the attitudinal factor, sometimes the belief factor. In the following series the first item expresses attitude, the second, belief:
>
> I can't abide Negroes.
> Negroes are smelly. . . .
>
> . . . certain programs designed to reduce prejudice succeed in altering beliefs but not in changing attitudes.[17]

---

[15]D. Krech and R. S. Crutchfield, Theory and Problems of Social Psychology (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948) quoted in Joseph B. Cooper and James L. McGaugh, "Attitude and Related Concepts," Attitudes: Selected Readings, eds. Marie Jahoda and Neil Warren (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, Inc., 1966), p. 26.

[16]Gordon W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice (Boston: Beacon Press, 1954), p. 6.

[17]Ibid., p. 13.

Jahoda and Warren attempt to distinguish <u>attitude</u> from two other related concepts, those of <u>personality</u> and <u>culture</u>.

> "Personality" refers to the total organization of internal psychological functioning. . . . Many investigators have examined the idea that the nature and content of a specific attitude is related to an individual's personality and have found much confirmatory evidence. . . . This area of work has become known as the functional approach to the study of attitudes because the basic question it asks is: what is the function of a given attitude for maintaining the personality characteristics of an individual?
>
> On the sociological side, "culture" is a very general notion referring to the system of values and orientations common to a social or national group. Thus "culture" refers to attitudes and beliefs which exist irrespective of individual differences; whereas for the social psychologist attitudes are located in the individual, and people may differ in their attitudes towards a whole range of social objects and practices. . . . The task of the social psychologist is ultimately that of setting personality, attitudes, and culture in a system of interdependent relationships.[18]

The definition of attitude which the writer adopts is that of Krech and Crutchfield cited on page 31.

> An attitude can be defined as an enduring organization of motivational, emotional, perceptual, and cognitive processes with respect to some aspect of the individual.

She believes that, although the affective component may be the largest, the beliefs and perceptions associated with the cognitive aspect are also important. And finally, although other things besides attitude determine behavior,

---

[18]<u>Op. cit.</u>, pp. 9, 10.

attitude _is_ one of the determinants. The writer is interested in attitudes toward native speakers of Spanish only because she is ultimately interested in more positive behaviors toward this group.

Origins of Attitude

No child is born with attitudes. These are learned, first at home, later in peer groups, and finally in society at large. The child as he develops usually adopts his parents' attitudes. Later he may adapt these to conform to those of his peers, or he may discard them entirely and adopt new attitudes from his peers. This process of adaptation and/or adoption continues as he moves out into society, whose norms will also affect his attitudes.

We shall present two theories on the origin of attitudes, group-norm theory, and psychoanalytic theory. In so doing we do not intend to deny the importance of society, which after all determines to which groups the individual will belong and which techniques of child training are favored.

Group-Norm Theory

The group-norm theory has been advanced by Mustafa and Carolyn Sherif among others. According to this theory,

> .... the psychological basis of established
> social norms such as stereotypes, fashion conventions, customs, and values is the formation of
> common reference points or anchorages as a product
> of interaction among individuals. Once such

anchorages are established and internalized by the individual they become important factors in determining or modifying his reactions to the situation which he will face later alone.[19]

Asch did an experiment, reported in 1951, which illustrates the potency of group pressure on one's beliefs. The members of a group were asked to match the length of lines. All except one were confederates of the experimenter and gave wrong answers. A large percentage of individuals yielded to the pressure of the unanimous majority, even though this majority was very clearly in error. As Davis observes in describing this experiment:

> If the pressure of strangers in an experimental situation is so great, how much greater must be the pressure of groups which have very definite emotional and practical significance for him![20]

Psychoanalytic Theory

Allport, however, while not denying the importance of group membership in attitude formation, disagrees with the group-norm theory as the final word. He feels that "prejudice is ultimately a problem of personality formation and development."[21] Allport leans on Freud and psychoanalytic theory for his theory of personality structure. So also did Sanford, Adorno, and colleagues in their analysis of the research which led to the postulation of the authoritarian personality.

---

[19]Davis, op. cit., p. 22.

[20]Davis, op. cit., p. 23.

[21]Op. cit., p. 40.

Because prejudice, ethnocentrism, and stereotyping are components of the syndrome of the authoritarian personality, we shall present some aspects of the psychoanalytic theory of personality development. First, however, let us set forth the characteristics of the prejudiced or authoritarian personality as summarized by Adorno.

1. Adherence to conventional values is a characteristic of the prejudiced personality.

2. Authoritarianism is another--a general disposition to glorify the ingroup and to take an attitude of punishing outgroup figures in the name of some moral authority.

3. Anti-intraception or opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tender-minded.

4. Superstition and stereotypy, that is the belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate and the disposition to think in rigid categories.

5. Power and "toughness." There is a preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension; identification with power figures; overemphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego; exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness.

6. Destructiveness and cynicism. There is generalized hostility and vilification of the human.

7. Projectivity. This is the disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outwards of unconscious emotional impulses.

8. Sex-exaggerated concern with sexual "goings-on."[22]

_____

[22]T. W. Adorno et al., The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper and Bros., 1950), pp. 227-229.

Let us hasten to repeat Adorno's reminder that the distribution of these characteristics follows the normal curve, that very few people will score high on every one of these characteristics. In fact, in their sample subjects who scored high on the Fascist Scale more commonly were rated high on the conventional and authoritarian components of the syndrome than on the others.

How does an authoritarian personality develop? According to psychoanalytic theory, it all begins at home on mother's knee.

> There is a type of child training that . . . creates an atmosphere in which he develops (sic) prejudices as his style of life. . . . What is crucial is that the parents' mode of handling the child (disciplining, loving, threatening) is such that the child cannot help acquire suspicions, fears, and hatreds that sooner or later may fix on minority groups.[23]

> Children who are too harshly treated, severely punished, or continually criticized are more likely to develop personalities wherein group prejudice plays a prominent part. Conversely, children from more relaxed and secure homes, treated permissively and with affection, are more likely to develop tolerance.[24]

Sanford explains it in this way:

> . . . parents and their discipline are very probably the major sources of the most essential features of the authoritarian personality syndrome, the superego's[25] failure to become integrated with the ego. Discipline that is strict and rigid and, from the child's point of view,

---

[23]Allport, op. cit., p. 297.

[24]Ibid., p. 300.

[25]The "superego" is the unconscious "conscience"; the "ego" is rational self-control.

unjust or unreasonable, may be submitted to, but it will not be genuinely accepted, in the sense that the child will eventually apply it to himself in the absence of external figures of authority. There is also good reason to believe that authoritarian discipline . . . acts directly to prevent the best ego development. Where the child is not allowed to question anything, to participate in decisions affecting him, nor to feel that his own will counts for something, the stunting of the ego is a pretty direct consequence. It is for this reason that, when it comes to talking with parents about the prevention of authoritarianism and ethnocentrism in children, the recommendation is: 'Treat the child with respect--especially after he is about two years old and begins to show signs of having a will of his own.' This has nothing to do with permissiveness, nor does it work against the maintenance of high standards. Naturally the parent has to put certain things across; but, if he is to get acceptance and not mere submission, he must at least recognize that he is dealing with another human being.[26]

According to Sampson, lately there is a changing conception in both human and animal motivation, turning more toward the cognitive function of perceiving, learning, and knowing;[27] and Allport observes that the cognitive processes of prejudiced people are in general different from those of tolerant people.

1. The prejudiced person is given to two-valued judgments in general (sic), e.g., good-bad, black-white.

2. The prejudiced person prefers monopolistic (everybody in this group is alike) to differentiated categories.

3. He has a marked need for definiteness; he cannot tolerate ambiguities.[28]

----

[26]R. N. Sanford, "The Genesis of Authoritarianism," Attitudes: Selected Readings, eds. Marie Jahoda and Neil Warren (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books Inc., 1966), p. 111.

[27]Op. cit., p. 119.

[28]Allport, op. cit., p. 175.

The prejudiced person may therefore form different attitudes from the tolerant person toward the same set of stimuli because he perceives them differently.

The larger social milieu in which the person finds himself can also shape his attitudes. Freedman administered the F-Scale, E-Scale, and a Political Conservatism Scale to 528 women who had graduated from Vassar College during the six decades from 1904 to 1956. The mean scores for some classes differed significantly from those of others. Freedman believes that the experiences of the college years are a major source of these variations in attitudes and that the graduates reflect the mood of American society which was dominant during their years at Vassar. He suggests that "changes in American society and culture seem to be accompanied by changes in individual personality structure as well as by changes of opinion and attitude."[29]

Allport lists a whole series of causes for prejudice which are related to society. There are those who say that all prejudice has historical roots. Others argue that class differences (that is, the exploiter-exploited relationship) are the foundation of all prejudice. There are some who point to urbanization as a cause, explaining that "the standards forced upon us by advertisers call for contempt of people who are poor, who do not reach the level of

---

[29]M. B. Freedman, "Changes in Attitudes and Values Over Six Decades," Attitudes: Selected Readings, eds. Marie Jahoda and Neil Warren (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, Inc., 1966), p. 135.

material existence that is prescribed."[30]   Others place a

situational emphasis on prejudice, explaining that a per-

son's prejudice is a mirror of what he sees around him.

Allport concludes that "multiple causation is at work."[31]

The home in which the individual is raised, the

groups to which he belongs, the society in which he lives

all seem to play a part in determining which attitudes he

will develop. Just how much weight should be given to per-

sonality needs, group pressures, and societal norms is a

question still to be resolved.

Attitude Change in Theory

Insko in his book _Theories of Attitude Change_ has

brought together a score of theories. These theories fall

under one of two rubrics, consistency or psychoanalytic

theory. We shall review three which are related to the

notion of balance or consistency and three which are assoc-

iated with psychoanalytic theory.

Balance Theories

The balance or consistency theories all share the

notion that people like to feel that their attitudes, feel-

ings, and behavior are consistent and that if they are not,

the resulting "inconsistency is a painful or at least

---

[30]Allport, _op. cit._, p. 212.

[31]_Ibid._, p. 218.

uncomfortable state . . . which sets up pressures to elim-
inate it or reduce it."[32]

Heider's Balance Theory

The first of these which we shall discuss is Heider's
theory of balance. Heider was interested in the relations
between two people and an object in their environment. His
theory may be diagrammed as a very platonic triangle with P
standing for the Person at the apex, O standing for the
Other person at the left end of the base line, and X stand-
ing for the stimulus object at the right end of the base
line. According to Heider's theory, a state of balance
exists if the relationships among the three are all positive
or if two are negative and one positive. "The fundamental
assumption of balance theory is that an unbalanced state
produces tension and generates forces to restore balance."[33]
Insko feels that balance theory has wide applicability and
is therefore "potentially a major theoretical orientation
in social psychology, although it is not generally recognized
as such."[34] Zajonc, however, says

> . . . that there really has not been a serious ex-
> perimental attempt to disprove the theory. It is

---

[32]Robert B. Zajonc, "Balance, Congruity, and Dis-
sonance," Attitudes: Selected Readings, eds. Marie Jahoda
and Neil Warren (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, Inc., 1966),
p. 261.

[33]Ibid., p. 263.

[34]Op. cit., p. 166.

conceivable that some situations defined by the
theory as unbalanced may in fact remain stable and
produce no significant pressures toward balance.[35]

Osgood and Tannenbaum's Congruity Theory

In balance theory there is no way to indicate the
degree of the positive or negative relationship nor are
predictions made concerning which relationships will change
in order to restore balance. In congruity theory, however,
advanced by Osgood and Tannenbaum in 1955, it is possible
to measure the degree of liking or disliking and also to
predict which relationships will change in order to restore
balance or congruity. According to congruity theory, people
or sources we like should always support ideas which we like
and vice versa. When they do not, there is a state of in-
congruity which is resolved by our changing our attitude
toward either the source or the thing advocated or both.
The theory also allows for the case where incredulity toward
the source dampens attitude change. By means of a semantic
differential test, Osgood and Tannenbaum are able to measure
the subject's initial attitude toward both the source and
the object of communication on a scale which runs from +3
to -3. By means of mathematical formulae which they have
worked out, they can then predict how much change will occur
when a positively valued source advocates a negatively val-
ued concept or vice versa.

---

[35]Op. cit., p. 266.

In general, when the original attitudes toward
the source and the concept were both positive and
the assertion . . . was also positive, no signifi-
cant attitude changes were observed in the results.
When the original attitudes toward the source and
the concept were negative and the assertion was
positive, again no changes were obtained. As pre-
dicted, however, when a positively valued source
was seen as making a positive assertion about a
negatively valued concept, the attitude toward the
source became less favorable, and toward the con-
cept more favorable. Conversely, when a negatively
valued source was seen as making a positive asser-
tion about a positively valued concept, attitudes
toward the source became more favorable and toward
the concept less favorable.[36]

Osgood and Tannenbaum have made no attempt to integrate

their congruity model with more general psychological theory.

Festinger's Cognitive Dissonance Theory

Perhaps the most popular of the balance theories is

that of cognitive dissonance advanced by Leon Festinger in

1957. In everyday life there are hundreds of "If A, then B"

situations, such as "If I go out in the rain, I shall get

wet." If I do not get wet, then a state of dissonance is

created. ("Cognitive" means that the theory refers to

items of information.) As in the other balance theories,

dissonance is assumed to be an uncomfortable state which

the person will attempt to reduce or eliminate. Festinger

summarizes experiments in which the subjects reduced dis-

sonance in three different situations by means of changing

their attitude toward a cognition related to that dissonance.

The first of these concerns decision-making and dissonance.

---

[36]Ibid., p. 268.

In everyday life, decision-making frequently leads to dissonance because "the road not taken" has certain attractive features and that chosen may, in fact, have some disadvantages. According to the theory, "The process of dissonance reduction should lead, after the decision, to an increase in the desirability of the chosen alternative and a decrease in the desirability of the rejected alternative."[37] Festinger performed an experiment in which high-school girls were asked to rate twelve popular records. Later they were told that they could select one of the records which they had rated as fifth and sixth. Because these records were so closely evaluated, it was assumed that a certain amount of dissonance would be created regardless of which record the girl chose. It was further assumed that she could reduce this dissonance by giving a higher rating to the record chosen and a lower rating to the one not selected. This, in fact, is what did occur when the girls were asked to rate again all twelve records.

Another experiment concerns lying and dissonance reduction. After participating in an hour-long experiment on motor skills which was tedious and boring, each subject was asked to tell the next subject that the experiment had been fun and interesting. Some were paid $1 to tell the

---

[37]Leon Fastinger, "Cognitive Dissonance," Approaches, Contexts, and Problems of Social Psychology, ed. Edward E. Sampson (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1965), p. 11.

lie; others were paid $20. It was assumed that those subjects paid $20 would be able to rationalize their dishonesty and would therefore feel little dissonance, while those paid only $1 would feel some dissonance which could be reduced internally by deciding that maybe the session had not been so dull after all. Both groups of subjects were later retested, and it was found that those paid the lesser amount had changed their attitude more.

A third experiment was designed to test temptation and dissonance. An experimenter brought in five toys for a nursery school youngster to play with. After a time the child was asked to rate the toys. Later the experimenter left the room and used one of three procedures to prevent the child from playing with the toy which he had rated as his second-favorite. For some youngsters the experimenter took the toy out of the room with her; for others she threatened the child with mild punishment if he played with the toy, which was left on the table; and for others she threatened the child with severe punishment. It was hypothesized that the most dissonance toward the toy would be set up under the condition of mild punishment and that the child could reduce the dissonance by deciding that that toy was less attractive. Later the child was asked to rerate all five toys. In the treatments where the toy was prohibited (removed) or there was severe threat, the toy

increased in attractiveness, whereas after mild threat the toy was rated as less attractive.[39]

Unlike the balance and incongruity theories

> . . . this one contains no assignment of positive, negative, or neutral signs to cognitive elements in and of themselves. Rather, it stresses the notion of psychological implication and assumes that dissonance results from the fact that one element follows from the obverse of the other. It is also unique in that it has something special to say about individual behavior. . . . Thus while the balance and incongruity models are mainly concerned with inconsistent cognitions related to objects or events in the environment, the dissonance model focuses on the individual's own behavior as that behavior serves to create dissonance between groups of his cognitions.[40]

Insko states that "dissonance theory seems to be the single most popular theory,"[41] and in his evaluation of the theory he stresses its application to conflict situations:

> Dissonance theories nonobvious predictions arise from the treatment of choices or decisions in various conflict situations. Since congruity and balance theory do not deal with decisions in conflict situations, they do not make analogous predictions.[42]

Psychoanalytic Theory

The "functional" point of view of modern psychoanalytic thought emphasizes the role of attitudes in reducing tensions and resolving conflicts among motives.

---

[39]Adapted from Festinger, op. cit., pp. 11-15.

[40]Arthur R. Cohen, Attitude Change and Social Influence (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964), p. 79.

[41]Op. cit., p. 281.

[42]Loc. cit.

Sarnoff suggests the following definition:

> An "attitude" is a disposition to react favorably or unfavorably to a class of objects.[43]

> A "motive" is an internally operative, tension-producing stimulus which provokes the individual to act in such a way as to reduce the tension generated by it and which is capable of being consciously experienced. . . . Whenever two or more motives are activated at the same time, their coalescence produces a state of conflict.[44]

When two motives are simultaneously aroused, the person will move to reduce the tension of the stronger motive. How the person responds when two simultaneously-aroused motives are of equal intensity depends upon whether the motives are consciously acceptable or consciously unacceptable. If the motives are consciously acceptable, he will satisfy one and postpone the tension-reduction of the other by either suppressing or inhibiting it; that is, he "may suppress his perception of one of the motives or simply inhibit one of the motives while remaining conscious of its presence."[45] Sarnoff points out that

> . . . attitudes may be formed in the process of facilitating the effect of these postponing responses as well as in the eventual process of reducing the tensions of the consciously acceptable motives per se.[46]

---

[43]Irving Sarnoff, "Social Attitudes and the Resolution of Motivational Conflict," Attitudes: Selected Readings, eds. Marie Jahoda and Neil Warren (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, Inc., 1966), p. 279.

[44]Insko, op. cit., p. 285.

[45]Loc. cit.

[46]Sarnoff, op. cit., p. 281.

If one of the motives is consciously unacceptable, it may be deferred by an ego-defense mechanism. These may take the form of repression, projection, denial, or iden-tification with an aggressor. In repressing the motive

> . . . the individual makes himself oblivious of the motive and of anything that might bring the motive into conscious awareness. Other defense mechanisms admit the motive into consciousness, but in a distorted form. For example, the person may make himself believe that it is not he who has this motive but someone else (projection), or he may deflect the motive from its primary target (dis-placement).[47]

"Prejudice may involve projection--ascribing to the out-group characteristics which one refuses to recognize in oneself."[48]

> Bettleheim and Janowitz suggest that prejudice reflects our dissatisfaction with the evil in our own nature. The Negro personifies our sins of the flesh (our own "id" impulses); the Jew personifies our sins of pride, deceit, unsocialized egotism, and grasping ambition (our own violations of our "superego" or conscience).[49]

In denial the person declares that he has no such motive. "Methinks he doth protest too much."

> By identifying with or adopting the attitudes of an aggressor, the individual becomes less cap-able of perceiving the aggressor as separate from or different from himself.[50]

> Although the ego defenses may be effective in eliminating the perception of unacceptable motives,

---

[47]Cohen, op. cit., p. 56.

[48]Ibid., p. 57.

[49]Allport, op. cit., p. 199.

[50]Insko, op. cit., p. 287.

this does not guarantee that the tension produced
by these motives will be reduced. In order for
tension reduction of unacceptable motives to occur,
the individual must make some overt response.
These overt responses are called symptoms.[51]

"Attitudes may also develop as a function of con-
sciously unacceptable motives."[52]

Insko makes some comparisons between psychoanalytic
theory and dissonance theory:

> According to dissonance theory, dissonance re-
> sults when the individual decides to do something
> with unpleasant consequences. According to psycho-
> analytic theory, homeostatic imbalance is produced
> by competing motives. Dissonance theory maintains
> that the individual may react to the inner tensions
> with one or more modes of dissonance reduction, and
> psychoanalytic theory maintains that the individual
> may react with one or more defensive reactions.[53]

> Sarnoff himself considers psychoanalytic theory
> inadequate insofar as it focuses totally on uncon-
> scious impulses to the complete exclusion of con-
> scious volitional choices . . . It puts relatively
> more emphasis upon values and relatively less em-
> phasis upon cognitions or beliefs.[54]

Sherif's Assimilation-Contrast Theory

The two theories which we shall now present are de-
rived from psychoanalytic theory: Sherif's assimilation-
contrast theory and Kelman's theory of social influence.

The writer is attracted to Sherif's theory because
she is interested in changing attitudes which may be highly

---

[51]Ibid., p. 286.

[52]Ibid., p. 287.

[53]Ibid., p. 288.

[54]Ibid., p. 295.

ego-involved for many students, and Sherif has designed many of his experiments around topics on which people have strong feelings.

The assimilation-contrast theory uses such concepts as the formation of reference scales, anchors, contrast, assimilation, and latitude of acceptance and rejection.

Sherif, following Harvey Cantril, believes that ego development consists of the person's forming stable ties and anchorages with his physical and social environment. If these ties and anchorages are disrupted, the result is painful and discomfiting. Rather than considering an attitude as a point on a continuum, Sherif feels that an attitude is more adequately represented as a range or latitude of acceptance. The aforementioned anchorages, which are intrinsic to the formation of the person's self-identity, also serve as the boundaries to the attitudes which determine what is acceptable to him as a person, what is objectionable to him by virtue of being that person, and what as that person he is noncommital about.[55]

Insko summarizes assimilation-contrast theory below:

> When repeatedly presented with a number of stimuli, individuals tend to form reference scales for the relative placement of these stimuli along one or more dimensions. . . . Stimuli which exert

---

[55]Carolyn W. Sherif and Muzafer Sherif, Attitude and Attitude Change: The Social Judgment-Involvement Approach (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1965), pp. xii-xiii.

a relatively large influence upon the determination
of judgment, such as end points in a series of
stimuli or standard stimuli, are called anchors. .
. . An attitude or opinion is regarded as an inter-
nal anchor, and a persuasive communication as an
external anchor. Thus the influence situation,
from the standpoint of assimilation-contrast the-
ory, involves a confrontation of the discrepancies
between the two anchors. . . . According to Sherif
and Hovland the important discrepancy is . . . the
discrepancy . . . between the communication and the
latitude of acceptance.

The range of acceptance is defined as . . . the
range of . . . statements which are considered ac-
ceptable (including the one most acceptable). The
latitude of rejection consists of all those points
of view that the individual finds unacceptable or
objectionable (including the most objectionable).
Between the latitudes of acceptance and rejection
is the latitude of neutrality. The latitudes of
acceptance and rejection theoretically vary in
width according to the individual's degree of ego-
involvement or personal concern with the object of
the attitude. With high ego-involvement, the lati-
tude of acceptance will be narrow and the latitude
of rejection wide, and with low ego-involvement,
the opposite. . . .[56]

A person receiving a communication dealing with a

topic of low ego-involvement, will judge the discrepancy

between his acceptable positions and that of the communica-

tion to be smaller than it is. He can therefore change his

stated position on the topic with little discomfiture. On

the other hand, when faced with a communication related to

a topic of high ego-involvement, he will perceive the dis-

crepancy between the communication and his own range of ac-

ceptable positions as greater than it is, and the likelihood

of his changing his position toward that advocated in the

---

[56]Insko, op. cit., pp. 64-68.

communication is reduced. If the topic is one which is constituent to his ego constellation, far from changing his own stand in the direction advocated, he is more likely to retrench his position and may, when possible, shift his stand even farther away from that of the message.[57]

Insko feels that dissonance theory can account for more behavior than can assimilation-contrast theory. He feels that the latter is not a serious contender in the field of attitude change.

> The theory is weak because there is no exact specification of the causal relationships between perceived communication location, communication evaluation, and attitude change. . . .

> This does not mean that judgment principles have no relevance to attitude change; it just means that such relevance has not been adequately demonstrated.[58]

Kelman's Social Influence Theory

Kelman has proposed a different theory of attitude change.[59] He believes that there are three different reasons why people adopt attitudes and that there are three different reasons why they change them, one corresponding to each of the reasons for which the attitude was adopted initially. Kelman believes that people adopt attitudes for reasons of compliance, identification, and internalization.

---

[57] Sherif, op. cit., p. xiii.

[58] Insko, op. cit., pp. 90-91.

[59] Herbert C. Kelman, "Process of Opinion Change," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXV (1961), pp. 57-78.

In _compliance_ a person adopts an attitude because he hopes to receive some favor or approval from another individual whom he believes has authority or control over him. When that authority figure is not actually present, the person will not manifest the attitude; and if the authority figure ceases to have power over the person, the attitude will disappear.

In _identification_ a person adopts an attitude because he feels it "belongs" to some individual with whom he wants to identify or because he believes it is appropriate for some role relationship in which he wants to participate. Kelman became interested in attitude research because he was intrigued by the process of brainwashing. He believes that brainwashed prisoners adopt their guards' attitudes because they actually want to identify with them. Some kinds of role relationship are reciprocal, such as doctor-patient, teacher-student, or friend-friend, in which the relationship functions smoothly because each of the participants expresses the attitudes which the other expects of him in fulfillment of his role. Another type of role relationship is that of member of a group. The member willingly adopts the attitudes approved by the group to which he belongs. An attitude adopted under identification will manifest itself only when the particular role is activated. It does not become integrated into the person's value system. When the role no longer is appropriate, the attitude will be forgotten or discarded.

In _internalization_, the person adopts an attitude because he perceives it as fitting into his value system. Such an attitude is always operative and will change only when the individual changes his perception of the conditions necessary for maximizing his values system.

These three reasons for adopting an attitude frequently overlap in real-life situations.

The perfect theory of attitude change has yet to be proposed. Although the balance theories take care of much of the data, there are exceptions. Zajonc points out a few.

> Some people who spend a good portion of their earnings on insurance also gamble. . . . Almost everybody enjoys a magician. And the magician only creates dissonance. . . . And it is also true that human nature does not abhor dissonance absolutely, as nature abhors a vacuum. Human nature merely avoids dissonance. . . .
>
> Only a theory which accounts for all of the data that the consistency principles now account for, for all the exceptions to these principles, and for all the phenomena which these principles should now but do not consider, is capable of replacing them. It is only a matter of time until such a development takes place.[60]

Insko recognizes that each theory of attitude change has contributed to the basic ground work out of which will evolve better theories. "These theories are the primitive beginnings which will make greater sophistication possible."[61]

---

[60]Zajonc, _op. cit._, p. 276.

[61]Insko, _op. cit._, p. 348.

Attitude Change in Practice

When a researcher sets out to test an hypothesis about attitude change, a frequent technique is to expose the subject to a communication. Role-playing is another method used. Some researchers do all of their work within their experimental laboratory; others move out into the world and conduct surveys. In this section we shall present some of the ways in which the subject, the communicator, the communication, role-playing, experiments, and surveys relate to attitude change.

The Subject

There is some evidence which indicates that some subjects are more easily influenced than others. Hovland and Janis have edited a book called Personality and Persuasibility, which supports the idea that there is a general trait of persuasibility. What are its components? The following personality factors have all been found to correlate positively with persuasibility, though the list should not be taken as definitive, and the correlations are not too high:

1. Perceptual dependence - some subjects' perceptions of physical stimuli are affected by the surrounding environmental field while other subjects rely on their own bodily experiences as cues for perception.

2. Authoritarianism - some subjects look to those who have authority over them or to prestige figures for direction in their thinking.

3. Other-directedness - the value system of some subjects stresses group adaptation and conformity.

4. Social isolation - the attitude of a subject isolated from his peers is more easily changed.

5. Richness of fantasy - some subjects are better able to anticipate which rewards or punishments might follow an attitude change.

6. Sex differences - men are less susceptible to persuasion than are women.[62]

Cohen also outlines some differences in cognitive style and cognitive needs. Some people are "sharpeners," that is, their cognitive style is to give great attention to details. Others are "levelers," those who see the forest rather than the trees. As for cognitive needs, some people are content to remain ignorant, others are eager to know and learn. There are also differences in the need for cognitive clarity. Some subjects need to impose meaning, organization, integration, and reasonableness on their experiential world.[63]

> 'Sharpeners' change their attitudes more than 'levelers' where the need for cognitive clarity is strong, but . . . where the need is weak, the effect is reversed, so that levelers show more change than sharpeners; this effect of different needs and styles is greater where the communication is more ambiguous.[64]

Katz, Sarnoff, and McClintock suggest these three principal reasons why a subject may change his attitude:

---

[62]Adapted from Cohen, op. cit., pp. 46-47.

[63]Ibid., pp. 48-49.

[64]Ibid., p. 54.

1. If he feels the need to acquire consistent knowledge about the external world. Katz *et al.* call this reason "reality-testing and the search for meaning," and it fits Cohen's "need for cognitive clarity" mentioned above.

2. If he feels the need to gain social acceptance and to avoid social disapproval. Such a subject wants to think like the group. Katz designates this reason as "reward and punishment."

3. If he feels the need to defend himself against inner conflict. Katz refers to this as "ego defense."[65] For example, "a race prejudice may serve the . . . ego defense function by projecting onto an outgroup some of one's own unacceptable characteristics and impulses."[66]

Allport has listed some of the "earmarks" of a subject in whom prejudice is functionally important:

Ambivalence toward parents
Moralism
Dichotomization (e.g., right-wrong, good-bad)
A need for definiteness
Externalization of conflict
Institutionalism (e.g., membership in a lodge,
    fraternity, club, or church)
Authoritarianism[67]

An attitude in which reality testing . . .
predominates is most likely to change in response
to new information or rational arguments. An

---

[65]Adapted from Daniel Katz, Irving Sarnoff, and Charles McClintock, "Ego Defense and Attitude Change," *Approaches, Problems, and Contexts of Social Psychology*, ed. Edward E. Sampson (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1965), p. 277.

[66]Insko, *op. cit.*, p. 332.

[67]Allport, *op. cit.*, p. 397.

attitude in which reward and punishment . . . pre-
dominates is most likely to change in response to
prestige suggestion, group pressure, testimonials,
or information discrediting the social support for
opposing views. . . . An attitude in which the ego
defense . . . function predominates is most likely
to change in response to 'reassurance and permis-
siveness,' presumably like that obtained in psycho-
analysis.[68]

Giving reassurance and being permissive is rather
vague, but Katz, Sarnoff, and McClintock decided that they
would try to change attitudes related to the ego defense
function by exposing the subjects to materials designed to
"give insight into the mechanisms and motivations of an ego-
defensive nature that could be the basis of prejudice."[69]
They designed their experiment so that they could compare
this method to that of changing attitudes by means of pro-
viding accurate information about the object toward whom
the attitude was held, in this case Negroes. Their sub-
jects were 243 female students at Michigan State Normal Col-
lege. After administering the F-Scale and a 20-item check
list relating to the subject's emotional functioning, they
divided the subjects into high, medium, and low ego defen-
siveness. Significantly more people changed favorably
toward Negroes utilizing interpretative materials than using
informational materials.

Curiously, there was no significant difference
between the two approaches when tested immediately
after the presentation. But six weeks later there

---

[68]Loc. cit.

[69]Katz, Sarnoff, and McClintock, op. cit., p. 277.

was "more continuous gain and less backsliding
among the people subjected to the interpretative
approach.

The superior power of the interpretative
approach lies in its ability to effect more cog-
nitive reorganization over time.

The experiment confirmed the theory that
affect-laden attitudes are more effectively in-
fluenced through attempting to give insight into
the self than thru giving insight into the objec-
tive nature of the problem.

People highest in ego-defensiveness are the
most difficult to change through the self-insight
procedure. . . . The prediction that the lowest
ego-defensive subjects would respond most to in-
formation was not confirmed.[70]

Perhaps misinformation about Negroes is not the

principal cause of prejudice against them and that is why

the informational approach seemed to have so little effect

in this experiment. If there are attitudes which result

from misinformation or lack of information, it seems only

logical to suppose that furnishing the subject with accurate

information might change that attitude. Allport has this

to say about the informational approach:

Perhaps the value of factual information may
be long delayed and may consist in driving wedges
of doubt and discomfort into the stereotypes of the
prejudiced. It seems likely, too, that the greater
gains ascribed to other educational methods, re-
quire sound factual instruction as underpinning.[71]

Sherif believes that "individuals who hold extreme

stands are least likely to change that stand in response to

---

[70]Ibid., p. 283.

[71]Allport, op. cit., p. 486.

communication."[72] He also feels that "a person who is initially unfamiliar with, or just disinterested in, an issue . . . is more prone to change his judgment or opinion on it.[73]

The Communicator

Besides the subject, another important variable in attitude research is the communicator. According to Davis, the effect of the communicator was neglected in earlier research.[74] The results of later research are inconclusive. In general, people are more likely to change their attitudes if they believe the communicator has high credibility than if they feel he is untrustworthy or has vested interests. There are two exceptions to this. One is if the communicator is an important reference person for the subject.[75] In this circumstance it is more important for the subject to think like the communicator than it is to question the communicator's credibility. The other exception came to light when experiments were conducted over a period of time. High credibility sources have a greater _immediate_ effect on the subject's opinions. However, after three weeks the advantage of high vs. low credibility tend to disappear. Cohen explains the sleeper effect in this way:

[72]_Op. cit._, p. 176.

[73]_Ibid._, p. 181.

[74]_Op. cit._, p. 28.

[75]Davis, _loc. cit._

> If the recollection of the source tends to dis-
> appear while much of the information is retained,
> the subject later reacts to the information with
> this normal (uninfluenced) critical assessment of
> the information.[76]

Nevertheless, even three weeks later, if the subject is re-

minded of the source at the time of the retesting, a high-

credibility communicator will continue to exert more

influence.

> But normally there seems to be a tendency to
> dissociate the content from the source and conse-
> quently the positive (or negative) influence of
> the source declines with time.[77]

Most theories of attitude change say that the great-

er the dislike for the communicator, the less the change of

attitude; however, dissonance theory says just the opposite.

Insko cites research in which there was greater attitude

change with a disliked communicator and with a low-credi-

bility communicator.[78] Apparently one way of reducing the

dissonance caused by dislike for the communicator or skep-

ticism of the truthfulness of his message is to accept his

message.

The Communication

Perhaps more research has been done on the nature

of the communication itself than on the other two members

---

[76]Cohen, op. cit., p. 32.

[77]C. I. Hovland, I. L. Janis, and H. H. Kelley, "A
Summary of Experimental Studies of Opinion Change," Atti-
tudes: Selected Readings, eds. Marie Jahoda and Neil
Warren (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books Inc., 1966), p. 149.

[78]Op. cit., p. 276.

of the triad--the subject and the communicator. One of the

problems which have interested researchers is to determine

whether it is more effective to state the conclusion to be

drawn from an argument or whether to let the subject draw

his own. Cohen says:

> With a less intelligent audience and when dis-
> cussing relatively unfamiliar topics, it is more
> effective to state the conclusions rather than to
> let the audience draw their own.[79]

Hovland says that with a complicated issue it is

also better to state the conclusion.[80] This also seems

true if the topic is of little concern to the listener. On

the other hand, if the communication concerns a topic in

which the subject is highly ego-involved, more attitude

change occurs when he is permitted to draw his own conclu-

sions.[81]

Another problem is whether it is better to present

one or both sides of a controversial issue. Abelson sum-

marizes:

> When the audience is generally friendly, or
> when your position is the only one which will be
> presented, or when you want immediate, though tem-
> porary, opinion change, present one side of the
> argument. When the audience starts out disagreeing
> with you, or when it is probable that the audience
> will hear the other side from someone else, present
> both sides of the argument.[82]

---

[79]Cohen, op. cit., p. 7.

[80]Hovland, Janis, and Kelley, op. cit., p. 142.

[81]Loc. cit.

[82]H. I. Abelson, Persuasion: How Opinions and Atti-
tudes are Changed (New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1959),
p. 2, quoted in Davis, op. cit., p. 32.

Cohen's conclusions refer to the educational level of the audience.

> A one-sided argument is best with less-educated men who already favor the position advocated. A two-sided argument is more effective with better-educated men, regardless of their initial position.[83]

Whenever two arguments are used, there may be effects of ordering. The question is one of primacy vs. recency--that is, which argument produces the most attitude change, the one heard first or last (most recently)? Cohen and Insko, after summarizing the considerable research, come to a similar conclusion: there is no universal law of primacy or recency.[84] Insko says that there are three theories which relate to order effects: set theory, linear operator theory, and forgetting theory.

> Asch is considered one of the originators of set Einstellung interpretation. He found that . . . 'if subjects are asked to form an impression of a stimulus person described by a series of adjectives, the first adjectives in the list have a more marked effect than the later adjectives.'[85]

This "set" created by the first impression is what has led many people to suppose that primacy has more effect than recency. Linear operator theory "assumes that the amount of change is an increasing function of the amount of change advocated."[86] The forgetting theory assumes that the

---

[83]Cohen, op. cit., p. 4.

[84]Ibid., p. 7; Insko, op. cit., p. 60.

[85]Insko, ibid., p. 61.

[86]Ibid., p. 60.

listener may forget the earlier arguments and will therefore be most affected by those he hears last. Hovland cites one experiment which indicated that when the same communication presented contradictory material, the argument presented first had the most effect on attitude change. Then he cites an experiment of his own in which two different communicators presented contradictory viewpoints successively, and there was little primacy effect.[87]

Concerning the ordering of arguments within a one-sided communication, Cohen has this to say:

> The research is not too conclusive, but it seems better to start first with arguments which satisfy the subject's needs. It also seems best to put the strongest arguments first.[88]

All of the communications we have been discussing have attempted to change the subject's attitude. McGuire has experimented with communication designed to prevent attitude change. His inoculation theory says that it is possible to design communications which will so strengthen a subject's attitude that he will successfully resist later communications which urge him to change. McGuire used health truisms to test hypotheses derived from his theory. He discovered that with no kind of "inoculation," college students were quite vulnerable to communications which challenged the truisms which they had taken for granted all

---

[87]Hovland, op. cit., p. 296.

[88]Cohen, op. cit., p. 7.

their lives. They had no practice in defending them; more-
over they were not sufficiently motivated to gain that
practice. In order to motivate them, the most effective
technique seemed to be to expose the subjects to some argu-
ments attacking the belief. These attacks were mildly
threatening, and served to arouse the subject's interest in
defending the truisms. The communications, however, also
contained refutations of these attacks. The combination of
attacks plus their refutation was effective in inoculating
the subject against subsequent attacks. It seemed to make
little difference whether the "inoculating" attacks were
the same as those heard later or whether they were differ-
ent. Attempts to inoculate the subjects by giving them
communications containing only ideas in support of the tru-
isms, did make the subjects firmer in their beliefs, but
did not inoculate them against later communications attack-
ing the beliefs. However, McGuire's experiments indicated
that the most effective inoculation consists of a combina-
tion of supportive and refutational communications. In
addition "forewarning of the impending attack prior to the
defenses, enhances their immunizing effectiveness."[89]

McGuire chose to do his research with health tru-
isms because he found them to be one topic on which all of

---

[89]William J. McGuire, "Inducing Resistance to Per-
suasion," Attitudes: Selected Reading, eds. Marie Jahoda
and Neil Warren (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, Inc.,
1966), p. 168.

his college-student subjects held a similar positive attitude. As Cohen observes, "on controversial issues, the results might differ."[90]

Some research has been done concerning the medium of communication. Davis reports that oral presentation is more effective than written presentation.[91] He also cites a study done by Hoban and Ormer in 1951 which concludes that in education, a film is approximately equal to an instructor in communicating the desired material.[92] Hovland, however, found

> . . . that the magnitude of effects was directly related to the type of attitude involved: film communications had a significant effect on opinions related to straightforward interpretations of policies and events, but had little or no effect on more deeply entrenched attitudes and motivations.[93]

Mitnick found that the influence of a film on ethnocentric attitudes was considerably greater when the content of the film was later discussed in a group situation.[94]

Four hundred students in two Maryland high schools were given a slightly modified version of the California E

---

[90]_Op. cit._, p. 127.

[91]_Op. cit._, p. 32.

[92]_Loc. cit_

[93]_Hovland_, op. cit., p. 302.

[94]Leonard L. Mitnick and Elliott McGinnies, "Influencing Ethnocentrism in Small Discussion Groups Through a Film Communication," _Journal of Abnormal Psychology_, LVIII (1958), 82-90.

Scale. Twenty-seven students from each school were finally
selected for the experiment. These 27 were divided into
three groups. One group was made up of nine high-ethno-
centrics, another group consisted of nine students in the
middle range, while the third group was composed entirely
of low ethnocentrics. There were three treatments: film
only, film-discussion, and controls (no treatment). The
film was "The High Wall," which treats prejudice as a com-
municable disease and traces its origins in the family and
in the community. The subjects were retested following the
treatment. The scores of both experimental groups showed
improvement, but there was no significant difference at
that time between those who had seen the film and those who
had both seen and discussed it. When retested one month
later, however,

> . . . the retention of attitude change for the dis-
> cussion groups was significantly greater than for
> the film-alone groups (and of course for the con-
> trol groups). In fact the film-alone groups moved
> significantly from their posttreatment score posi-
> tion in the direction of their pre-experimental
> position.[95]

And finally there is the salience of group norms as
it affects a communication.

> Communications which call attention to group
> membership may prompt the individual to take ac-
> count of group norms in forming his opinion on a
> given issue. This effect has been described as the
> salience of the group.[96]

---

[95]_Ibid._, p. 86.

[96]Hovland, _op. cit._, p. 141.

This recalls Kelman's <u>identification</u> reason for adopting an attitude. If the communication reminds the subject of his identity as a member of a certain group, he will more likely shift his attitude if he believes that the other members of the group would accept the position advocated. Conversely, if he feels that the group would disapprove, he will tend to resist the communication.

Role Playing

The role-playing technique is a different approach to inducing attitude change. Some subjects, after being required to "play a role," i.e., support a position, which they normally reject, change their attitude to agree with the viewpoint advocated in that role. Janis and King designed two of the best-known studies on role-playing. In one of these

> . . . groups of three male college students were asked to deliver an oral talk on an assigned topic about which they had expressed an opinion on a questionnaire four weeks earlier. . . . The questions were: 'How many movie houses will still be in business in three years?' 'What will be the total supply of meat available for civilian use in the year X?' 'How many years before the discovery of a cold cure?'

> . . . Each student was given an outline of the main arguments, in every case supporting a figure lower than that predicted by anyone. His two group-mates read the same outline while he was preparing his talk. Each subject was an active participant for one topic and a passive participant for the other two.[97]

---

[97]I. L. Janis and B. T. King, "The Influence of Role Playing in Opinion Change," <u>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</u>, XLIX (1954), 211-18.

The results showed that the active participants changed more than the passive participants. This outcome is not surprising, for not only are these topics impersonal but the information asked for is the kind that many subjects could only give a wild guess on. One would expect the participants to accept the "true" figures given them in the role-playing situation. The researchers themselves recognize this weakness:

> It remains problematical, however, whether active participation also influences the acceptance of opinions and attitudes that are more directly tied up with daily-life activities, interpersonal relationships, and emotionally-charged dilemmas.[98]

Two years later the authors designed another study on a more significant topic in order to determine whether it was the improvisation which the subjects were called upon to do in the role playing or the satisfaction which they felt after playing the role well which caused them to modify their attitudes.

> Several months after expressing their opinions on the draft, students of draft age were asked to give talks supporting the drafting of 90% of all college-age students one year after graduation, to serve for three years instead of two.

> All subjects participated actively. In the improvisation mode, they read the talk once, then had to present it without the script.

> In the satisfaction mode, the subjects were able to read the talk aloud from the script. This group were more satisfied with their performance.

---

[98]Ibid., p. 217.

Group A improvisation showed more change than Group B satisfaction at the .01 level. Group B, in fact, did not change significantly from a control group which just passively read the text.[99]

Sherif examines role playing in relation to ego-involvement and latitudes of acceptance. He cites a study by Elbing which did specify the extremeness of his subjects' stands. This study was so designed that some subjects played roles compatible with their own views on the right-to-work issue while others played roles opposite to their own.

> . . . the great majority who played a compatible role did not change at all or became more extreme in the same direction. Moderates somewhat frequently shifted toward a less extreme position.

> The results suggest a trend toward more frequent shift when subjects played roles opposite to their own. It is equally apparent, however, that the largest proportion of those who did change toward the opposite role they played . . . were moderates.[100]

> . . . Almost 75% of those with moderate positions changed after the role-playing and 25% did not change. Of those with initially extreme stands, 46% did not change.[101]

-----

[99]B. T. King and I. L. Janis, "Comparison of the Effectiveness of Improvised vs. non-Improvised Role Playing in Producing Opinion Change," Human Relations, IX (1956), 178-80.

[100]Alvar O. Elbing, "An Experimental Investigation of the Influence of Reference Group Identification on Role Playing as Applied to Business (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1962), quoted in Sherif, op. cit, pp. 198-199.

[101]Ibid., p. 177.

Insko considers role playing to be an exceedingly powerful attitude-change technique.[102]

Experiments vs. Surveys

Hovland has attempted to explain why experiments generally show more attitude change than do surveys.

In the laboratory situation, usually only one communication is involved, whereas in real life people are constantly exposed to many communications in addition to the one designed to change their attitude.

Further, in the experimental situation, you have a captive audience, and everyone must listen to the communication. In real life, people just don't watch programs or read articles exposing them to a viewpoint different from their own.[103]

The experiment and the survey use a different unit of communication. The experiment usually employs a single communication, while the survey takes into account all the TV viewing, all the newspaper and magazine reading, etc. of the subject. The time interval also differs. In the experiment, the subject is usually tested immediately after exposure to the communication; in the survey, much later. The types of populations also differ: there is a preponderance of high-school and college students in the experiment, whereas the survey attempts a random sampling of the entire population. Even the type of issue varies.

---

[102]Insko, op. cit., p. 222.

[103]Carl I. Hovland, "Reconciling Conflicting Results Derived from Experimental and Survey Studies of Attitude Change," Approaches, Problems, and Contexts of Social Psychology, ed. Edward E. Sampson (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1965), p. 294.

In the typical experiment . . . we usually deliber-
ately try to find types of issues involving atti-
tudes which are susceptible to modification through
communication. . . . In the survey . . . socially
significant attitudes which are deeply rooted in
prior experience and involve much personal commit-
ment are typically involved.[104]

The Relationship of Attitude to Behavior

Back in the 1930's an American LaPiere and a Chi-

nese couple toured the United States and were refused ser-

vice in only one out of 250 hotels and restaurants. Yet

when LaPiere sent questionnaires to the managers of these

same places, over 90% responded that their established

policy was to refuse service to Chinese clients.[105] This

study has become the classic illustration of one of the

most disconcerting problems in attitude research, namely

the fact that attitudes are not always in accordance with

behavior.

Most theories of attitude have addressed themselves

to the problem of attitude change. Says Insko:

. . . the most glaring weakness of contemporary
theorizing is the lack of emphasis upon the rela-
tion between attitudes and behavior. . . . Common
sense seems to suggest that there is some relation
between attitudes and behavior, but social psychol-
ogy has been slow to explore the matter.[106]

---

[104]Hovland, "Reconciling Conflicting Results,"
p. 291.

[105]Richard T. LaPiere, "Attitudes vs. Actions,"
Social Forces, XIII (December, 1932), pp. 230-237, quoted
in Melvin L. DeFleur and Frank R. Westie, "Verbal Attitudes
and Overt Acts," Attitudes: Selected Readings, eds. Marie
Jahoda and Neil Warren (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books,
Inc., 1966), p. 214.

[106]Insko, op. cit., p. 348.

Jahoda expresses a

. . . need for theoretical models which do justice
to the complexities of the relationships between
attitudes and behavior, and for theory-guided in-
vestigations of these relationships.[107]

Davis explains that one of the fundamental ques-

tions in the social sciences about which there is much dif-

ference of opinion is the following:

. . . To what extent is behavior determined by
variables within the person, of which attitudes are
one example, and to what extent is it determined by
the external factors in the individual's social and
physical environment? Lewin's (1935) classical
formula B=f (P, E), to the effect that Behavior is
a function of the Person and the Environment, has
long become a truism in the behavioral sciences.
It is merely a matter of the relative emphasis
placed upon the two factors . . . Psycho-analysts,
clinical psychologists, and personality theorists
emphasize the importance of factors within the in-
dividual; social psychologists seek to bridge the
gap; and sociologists, cultural anthropologists,
and economists emphasize the importance of external
factors.[108]

DeFleur and Westie call attention to the distinction

between

. . . a verbal attitude universe, from which atti-
tude scale items are drawn, and an action attitude
universe, consisting of a variety of overt behavior
forms regarding the attitude object.[109]

They indicate that we should not expect attitudes in one

universe to predict behavior in the other.

---

[107]Jahoda, op. cit., p. 211.

[108]Davis, op. cit., pp. 9-10.

[109]DeFleur and Westie, op. cit., p. 213.

DeFleur and Westie propose the development of standardized <u>overt action opportunities</u> on which a person can be classified on a positive-negative continuum. As a first attempt at doing this, they have developed a photograph authorization form to be used in conjunction with a series of verbal attitude tests. After taking an hour of verbal tests designed to elicit the subject's attitude toward Negroes, the subject was asked if he would be willing to have his picture taken with a Negro of the opposite sex. Those who consented were then presented with what they were told was a standard photograph release and were asked to sign for each use of the picture to which they agreed. These uses--there were seven in all--ranged from experimental use in the sociological laboratory only, all the way to nation-wide release as part of a campaign advocating integration.

> . . . there was clearly a greater tendency (p .01) for the prejudiced persons than the unprejudiced to avoid being photographed with a Negro. . . .

> In spite of the statistical significance, however, there were some prejudiced persons who signed the agreement without hesitation at the highest level, as well as some unprejudiced persons who were not willing to sign at any level.

> Immediately after signing (or not) the release, the subjects were asked, 'Are there people who you felt would approve or disapprove?' Nearly three-fourths invoked some type of reference group when faced with this problem, while the remaining fourth apparently made an inner-directed decision. . . . <u>All</u> of those who did cite a reference group mentioned some type of peer group, while only a third

referred in addition to the family.[110]

Cook and Selltiz prefer to think of attitude

> . . . as an underlying disposition which enters
> . . . into the determination of a variety of be-
> haviors toward an object . . . including statements
> of beliefs and feelings about the object and ap-
> proach-avoidance with respect to it.
>
> . . . We believe that apparent inconsistencies in
> social behavior may often best be understood in
> terms of the operation of such stable underlying
> dispositions in shifting relation to other influ-
> ences on behavior. . . .
>
> . . . a dispositional concept has . . . a wider
> range of situational relevance--including projec-
> tability into relatively novel situations--than a
> simple descriptive concept equating attitude with
> behavior in specified situations.
>
> We assume that two classes of variables, in
> addition to an individual's attitudinal disposi-
> tion . . . influence his behavior . . . : (a) oth-
> er characteristics of the individual . . . ;
> (b) other characteristics of the situation.[111]

Sherif gives an example which shows the importance of refer-

ence groups and how an underlying disposition toward be-

havior can shift in relation to other influences.

> During Little Rock desegregation, a number of
> ministers expressed stands favoring peaceful deseg-
> regation. But when they had to decide whether to
> take that stand before their own congregations,
> which opposed desegregation on the whole, all but a
> few ministers kept quiet. Their identity as a pas-
> tor of a congregation, with the duty to remain in
> touch with it, was more potent than the stand on

---

[110]Ibid., pp. 216-220.

[111]Stuart W. Cook and Claire Selltiz, "A Multiple
Indicator Approach to Attitude Measurement," Attitudes:
Selected Readings, eds. Marie Jahoda and Neil Warren (Bal-
timore, Md.: Penguin Books, Inc., 1966), pp. 325-326.

desegregation they took as a minister of the gospel. Personal identity as a minister of brotherly love was overshadowed by identity with a church congregation where one actually moves and works.[112]

Adorno observes that "overt action, like verbal expression, depends very largely upon the situation of the moment."[113]

Both Jahoda and Insko suggest that perhaps instead of trying to predict behavior from attitudes it might be more fruitful to do more research on the attitude change which follows behavior change. This, in effect, is what occurs in role playing. After a person behaves in a certain way, his attitude may change. In other words, "Saying is believing."[114] Insko sees dissonance theory as also lending itself to behavior-then-attitude research.

It may indeed turn out that most of the consistency between attitudes and behavior is due not to the effect of attitudes upon behavior but of behavior upon attitudes.[115]

Concerning the specific attitude of prejudice, Tumin feels that we should concentrate on the behavior and forget about the prejudice.

If we are as successful in the area of blocking the impulse to discriminate as we have been in blocking the impulse to cheat and steal, we shall probably have done a great deal. It would be

---

[112]Sherif, op. cit., p. 67.

[113]Adorno, op. cit., p. 4.

[114]Jahoda, op. cit., p. 211.

[115]Insko, loc. cit.

utopian to expect more--at least in the near future.[116]

Perhaps the most discouraging observation on the relationship between attitudes and behavior comes from Cohen:

> Until experimental research demonstrates that attitude change has consequences for subsequent behavior, we cannot be certain that our procedures for inducing change do anything more than cause cognitive realignments; perhaps we cannot even be certain that the concept of attitude has critical significance for psychology.[117]

Problems of Attitude Measurement

In the preceding section on attitudes vs. behavior, the distinction was made between the universe of verbal attitudes and the universe of overt action and it was pointed out that knowledge of a subject's placement in one universe should not necessarily predict his placement in the other. Even within the universe of verbal attitude, however, there are a number of factors which weaken the validity of measurement devices. Most devices are of the self-report type in which the individual rates himself. In a self-report measure, the purpose of the instrument is obvious to the respondent; the implications of his answers are apparent to him; and he can consciously control his answers.

---

[116]M. Tumin, "Some Problems for Sociological Research in Desegregation," The Role of the Social Sciences in Desegregation: a Symposium (New York: Anti-Defamation League, 1958), pp. 33-40, quoted in Davis, op. cit., p. 35.

[117]Cohen, op. cit., p. 138.

The academic setting in which most tests are administered encourages respondents to assume that the responses which will place them in the most favorable light are those which represent them as well-adjusted, unprejudiced, rational, open-minded, and democratic. Moreover, since these are ideal norms, at least in the American middle class, the pressures specific to the test situations are likely to coincide with inner pressures toward maintaining an image acceptable to the self as well as to others.[118]

Ideally there should be more measures in which inferences on attitude are drawn from overt behavior.

However situations capable of eliciting behavior toward an attitudinal object are more difficult to devise and to standardize, and more time-consuming and costly to administer than self-report measures.[119]

There are various types of projective tests in which inferences are drawn from the individual's reaction to or interpretation of partially structured stimuli. However, one can never be sure whether the subject is giving his own reaction or whether he is responding the way he thinks most people would respond. Some researchers have attempted to infer attitudes from a measure of physiological response to the attitude object, e.g., galvanic skin response or vascular constriction. Such techniques can measure only the intensity but not the direction of the response; they cannot measure whether the response is pleasurable or not.[120]

Self-report tests of verbal attitudes are commonly

---

[118]Cook and Selltiz, op. cit., p. 329.

[119]Ibid., p. 335.

[120]Ibid., pp. 340-348.

of three types: differential scales, summated scales, and
cumulative scales.

L. L. Thurstone was one of the first to develop a
differentiated attitude scale. A sample is given:

Scale Values		Form A
10.9	1	Show a high rate of efficiency in any- thing they attempt
10.2	2	Can, be depended upon as being honest.
10.0	3	Are mentally strong.
. . .	. . .	
6.8	20	Have an air of dignity about them.
. . .	. . .	
2.4	32	Tend to lower the standards of living of their neighbors.
. . .	. . .	
0.4	46	Are inferior in every way to the rest of the world.[121]

The subject is instructed to put a plus sign before every
statement with which he agrees for whatever reference group
his attitudes are being measured. "The mean (or median) of
the scale values of the items the individual checks is in-
terpreted as indicating his position on a scale of favor-
able-unfavorable attitude toward the object."[122] The scale
value to the left of each statement (which does not appear
on the subject's test form) has been determined by a rating
operation performed by judges. To secure equal-appearing
intervals is a time-consuming procedure. Briefly, from

---

[121]Taken from Marvin E. Shaw (ed.), Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 411.

[122]Claire Selltiz, Marie Jahoda, M. Deutsch, and Stuart W. Cook, "Attitude Scaling," Attitudes, eds. Marie Jahoda and Neil Warren (Baltimore: Penguin Books Inc., 1966), p. 308.

50-300 judges are asked to classify hundreds of items into eleven groups. One of the serious objections raised to the Thurstone type scale is that the scale values assigned to the different items are influenced by the attitudes of the judges themselves. Nevertheless, even on scales in which there is a marked difference in the scale values assigned by the judges, there is marked uniformity in the rank ordering of the items.

> . . . although the assumption that Thurstone-type scales are true interval scales seems dubious, it is still possible for them to constitute reasonably satisfactory ordinal scales; that is, they provide a basis for saying that one individual is more favorable or less favorable than another.[123]

Likert in 1932 developed the pattern which is followed in most summated-type tests. Only items which are very favorable or very unfavorable are used, never neutral items. The subject is asked to respond to every item according to the following pattern: (1) strongly approve, (2) approve, (3) undecided, (4) disapprove, (5) strongly disapprove. The range of responses supposedly gives more precise information than the Thurstone-type scale about the subject's attitude. However, "it does not provide a basis for saying how much (sic) more favorable one person's attitude is than another's, nor for measuring the amount of change after some experience."[124]

---

[123]Ibid., p. 308.

[124]Ibid., p. 315.

In a cumulative scale, the items are so arranged
that a person who responds favorably to item 3 has also
replied favorably to items 1 and 2, etc. The Bogardus
Social Distance Scale, which the writer uses in her experi-
ment, is a cumulative scale.

> A number of investigators had pointed out that
> the Thurstone and Likert scales, although osten-
> sibly measuring 'an attitude,' contained statements
> about various aspects of the object under considera-
> tion, rather than about a single aspect only . . .

> One of the approaches to this problem was the
> technique developed by Guttman, commonly called
> scale analysis or the scalogram method. One of the
> main purposes of this technique is to ascertain
> whether the attitude or characteristic being
> studied (technically termed the 'universe of con-
> tent' or the 'universe of attributes') actually in-
> volves only a single dimension. . . .

> In the Guttman procedure, a 'universe of con-
> tent' is considered to be unidimensional only if it
> yields a perfect or nearly perfect cumulative
> scale. . . . In practice, perfect cumulative, or
> unidimensional, scales are rarely or never found
> in social research, but approximations to them can
> often be developed.[125]

Here is an example of a unidimensional scale. The
subjects are asked to indicate each statement with which
they agree.

1. A young child is likely to face serious emotional
   problems if his parents get divorced.

2. Even if a husband or wife or both are unhappy in
   their marriage, they should remain together as
   long as they have any young children.

3. Divorce laws in this state should be changed to
   make it more difficult to get a divorce.

---

[125]Ibid., pp. 319-320.

If these items were found to form a perfect
cumulative scale, we would know, for example, that
all individuals with a score of 2 on the scale be-
lieve that divorce of the parents presents serious
emotional problems for a young child and that a
couple with young children should remain together
even if they are unhappy, but do not believe that
the divorce laws should be made more stringent.[126]

Two qualifications related to the use of uni-
dimensional scales should be kept in mind: (1) such
a scale may not be the most effective basis either
for measuring attitudes toward complex objects or
for making predictions about behavior in relation
to such objects; (2) a given scale may be uni-
dimensional for one group and not for another.[127]

Conclusion

After reviewing the literature on attitude, one

concludes that social psychology can presently offer only

guide-lines to attitude change, not a proven method. Be-

cause the research indicates that attitudes have different

origins and serve different functions for different people,

perhaps there never will be one method which will work for

everybody.

The literature discourages the foreign language

teacher from expecting to accomplish too much. It suggests,

for example, that attitude change is the result of so many

variables that the occasional efforts of a classroom teacher

are unlikely to effect a significant change. Research re-

quires some kind of attitude measurement. Yet the litera-

ture points out that subjects can surmise the purpose of

---

[126]Ibid., p. 320.

[127]Ibid., p. 322.

most attitude tests and will control their responses in order to create the most favorable self-image or to conform to what they think the investigator expects. A study of the relationship between attitude and behavior reveals the most discouraging fact of all: attitude does not necessarily predict behavior. Therefore even if one is sure that a positive shift in attitude has occurred, he cannot be certain that correspondingly positive actions will follow.

Among the techniques mentioned in the literature which can be adapted to classroom use are the following: role playing, film presentation, discussion, personal contact, and the presentation of oral and written communication.

In summary, a review of the literature on attitude does not reveal any consistent pattern of attitude change. Underlying all the studies, however, is this positive finding, namely, that attitudes can and do change.

CHAPTER III

TECHNIQUES USED TO DEVELOP MORE POSITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARD NATIVE SPEAKERS OF SPANISH

In this chapter we shall describe the techniques which were used in an effort to develop more positive attitudes toward native speakers of Spanish. All of the procedures used at the second-year level were done in English; those employed in the fourth-fifth-year class were carried out in Spanish. No attempt was made to alter attitudes in the Spanish II class until the second semester. This was after the Bogardus and semantic differential attitudes tests were administered for the first time to all classes on January 3, 1968.

In the advanced class techniques designed to improve attitudes were introduced as early as September. Part of the time the fourth- and fifth-year classes worked together; more often they had separate activities. So it was with the attitude materials. Sometimes they were introduced to the combined class, at other times to one level but not to the other.

To many language teachers the teaching of culture means teaching the great works of literature, the

masterpieces of art, or the great moments of history. To others it has been a study of the mountains and rivers, of famous landmarks, or of quaint customs. We have avoided these methods in favor of a more anthropological approach.

Not all anthropologists agree on a definition of culture. Ours is a rather simple one: culture is everything which is learned. Therefore we try to discover what the Spanish speaker has learned. For example, whom has he learned to consider his family, whom has he learned to respect, when has he learned to eat his meals, how has he learned to organize his society, what has he learned to consider aesthetically pleasing, what has he learned to consider humorous, what has he learned to value?

Although our research is designed to measure the students' attitude on paper-and-pencil tests only, our desire is to build the kind of positive attitudes which will stand up under the reality of living or working with Spanish-speaking people. As The Family of Man pictures illustrate, we have a great deal in common with Spanish speakers as fellow human beings. Nevertheless we want to make our students aware of the fact that Latin Americans will frequently think and act differently from us simply because they were reared in Latin America and not in the United States.

In teaching the language skills, we have learned that the similarities between two languages are easily

learned; but the differences or points of contrast are more difficult to master, and we must therefore spend more time on them. So, too, we believe, in the teaching of culture. Customs, social organizations, and values which are similar to ours are easily accepted by our students; we must spend more time on those which are different, for they are the ones which may cause our students to react negatively to Spanish speakers.

Discussion of Similarities and Differences

It is for this reason that we have included a discussion of similarities and differences. We want to make students aware that the concept of differences exists not only among other cultures but even within our own school and families. We also want to convey the idea that "difference" is a neutral concept, not one of "good vs. bad" or "superior vs. inferior." We hope to teach that the willingness to accept differences is necessary, not only for international understanding but also for our own society.

The question of accepting differences was approached in the following way in the Spanish IV-V class. On the third day of school we spent a few minutes talking about the ways in which Valley Forge was similar to other high schools and how our class was similar to other classes at Valley Forge. On succeeding days we considered these questions: How is Valley Forge different from other high schools? How is our class different from other classes?

How is your family like other families? How is your family
unique? (This latter is a question that Margaret Mead has
used in beginning anthropology classes.)[1] What differences
might we be unwilling to accept in our class? They men-
tioned Negro students. The writer suggested that since
cleanliness was a middle-class value, we might not accept a
student who was dirty and smelly. Why wouldn't we accept
these differences? Regarding Negro students, several sug-
gested that, although they personally would have no objec-
tion, they thought that other members of the student body
would object and that many parents would.

The Family of Man

The collection of photographs entitled The Family
of Man[2] can be used to relate similarities and differences
in a new way. The pictures were used in a similar fashion
in both experimental classes. Approximately fifteen min-
utes of time on two successive days were spent in looking
at the photographs. Because there were not enough copies
of the book to go around, the students sat in groups of
three and four. On the first day they were to think about

---

[1]Margaret Mead, "Culture in Foreign Language Teach-
ing: the Anthropologist's Point of View," Report on a Con-
ference on the Meaning and Role of Culture in Foreign
Language Teaching, Institute of Language and Linguistics,
Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown Uni-
versity (Georgetown: March 10 and 11, 1961), p. 9.

[2]Edward Steichen (ed.), The Family of Man (New
York: Museum of Modern Art, 1955).

the following two questions: What was the editor's purpose in assembling this collection of pictures, and how were the pictures organized? On the following day the students looked at the pictures again for a few minutes and then attempted to answer the two questions. Some groups felt that the editor wanted to show how similar mankind was all over the world, while others decided that he wanted to show how different man was.

With some guidance from the teacher, they were able to reconcile their conflicting viewpoints in the following way: all men share certain universals such as family life, work, emotions, etc., but how they express these differs from one culture to another.

The concept that the universals are expressed differently in different cultures is one which we believe may help build more positive attitudes toward people who appear different from us. For years well-meaning teachers have taught that people are alike all over the world and imply that there is therefore no reason why we cannot all get along with one another. Yet people who must live or work with those from another culture sometimes become so acutely aware of differences[3] that they doubt whether mankind can

---

[3]Howard Lee Nostrand, Experiment in Determining Cultural Content: Pretesting the Questionnaire "How the Americans See the French" (Department of Romance Languages and Literature, University of Washington, July, 1964), pp. 6-15. (Mimeographed.)

ever work together. We believe that the concept exemplified in The Family of Man is a valid reconciliation of these two conflicting viewpoints and that it can serve as a springboard from which to investigate some of the different ways in which the universals are expressed.

Values

It is the writer's personal belief that much of the conflict which arises when people from different cultures try to work together results from a difference in values; therefore we have tried to make our students aware of the concept of values and of the role which values can play in determining behavior.

In order to make the members of the advanced class aware of values, we spent a period discussing them. We suggested that everyone has certain things or ideals which he values and that these values are arranged in a hierarchical order. We also commented that one's behavior is frequently influenced by what he values. As examples of a value we pointed out that some students in our high school valued clothes, some valued money, others valued friends. We asked them to suggest things which they thought were valued by students at Valley Forge. Then we asked them to name values which they believed were held by their parents or other adults. Over fifty moral and material values were mentioned. Then we asked each student to write down a list

of his own top ten values in order of their importance to him. The most obvious finding was that each person's hierarchy of values was unique. The fifteen students present mentioned ten different values in first place. Six of them mentioned love, two mentioned religion, one mentioned morals, and one mentioned respect.

Reading a Novel Set in Another Culture

An activity suitable for beginning a study of cultural differences is the reading of a novel set in another culture. In these books the hero or heroine is a teen-ager with whom American students can identify, someone whom they can accept as a fellow human being who is drawing on the same arsenal of human resources as they to face the world, even though his specific problems may reflect cultural differences.

There were five girls and one boy in the fifth-year class. The first week of school they were assigned to read in English a book whose setting was in another culture. With the help of the school librarian, we selected a dozen suitable books, brought them to class, gave them a brief description of each one, and let them make their own selection. The boy chose a book whose hero was a Negro teen-ager in a small town in the Deep South. The girls all selected books set in other countries. China, Japan, and Greece were among the countries represented. The students

presented their reports in Spanish to the combined class.
In addition to summarizing the plot, they mentioned cus-
toms or attitudes which were different from ours.

Impressions of the United States

Impressions of the United States[4] is a collection
of letters based on observations written by foreign students
dents studying at American universities. They permit us to
see ourselves as others see us. In December we read two of
them aloud to the advanced class.

"Jose Invites a Girl on a Date" is amusing and on a
theme which is of perennial interest to teen-agers. We
suggested that Latin American dating customs might be
better understood if we used the term "courtship" rather
than "dating." The following were among the questions
asked: What differences in behavior does Jose notice be-
tween the American girl and the Venezuelan? What differ-
ences in behavior does Jose notice between the American
parent and the Venezuelan? Is Elvira's father strict be-
cause he does not want his daughter to marry? In what way
might differences in dating customs be related to the dif-
ference in divorce rates between Latin America and the
United States?

---

[4]Sophie Smith Hollander (ed.), Impressions of the
United States (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.,
1964).

The second letter read was "Eusabio Observes the Dog's Life in America," in which a Chilean notes the lavish attention we foster on our pets. We noticed that the principal reason why a Latin American would keep a dog is as a watchdog, and asked these questions: Did any of you mention a dog or cat as a member of your family in your letter to your pen pal? How do you think he reacted to this? The writer pointed out the differences in the treatment of dogs in homes where she has lived in Mexico and Ecuador. We noted that the lack of emotional involvement with animals is also manifest in the bullfight. Whereas many Americans are sickened by the suffering of the bull, the Spaniard thinks only of the man.

Visitors

In order for our students to have personal contact with native speakers, we invited as many of them as possible to visit the class. We also invited some Americans who had visited a Latin American country, hoping their enthusiasm would have a positive effect. Some of these people also visited the advanced class.

The following is a list of the visitors:

December 13 - Miss Aguayo, our student teacher, talked on the customs of the Puerto
Span. II   Rican community in Lorain, Ohio,
Span. IV-V   where she was raised. (This was a formal, prepared talk, in addition to the many opportunities for incidental comment which occurred during her student teaching.)

January 18 — Sara Jugo, our American Field Service
(AFS) exchange student, talked about
Span. IV-V schooling in Peru. We were able to
note the similarities and the differ-
ences between the Peruvian and the
Spanish systems, for we had just read
about the latter in our civilization
book.

January 30 — Martin Cornejo, one of a group of
students from Argentina who were
Span. IV-V spending three weeks at near-by
Baldwin-Wallace College, visited this
class. In order to orient him toward
some of the topics in which the stu-
dents were interested, we showed him
before class the list of questions
which the fourth-year students had
recently prepared as a guide for in-
terviewing Latin American students.

February 23 — Annette Black, a student in another
second-year class, showed slides of
Span. II her trip with the Camp Fire Girls to
Puerto Rico, Colombia, and Jamaica.
During her week in Puerto Rico, she
lived with a Puerto Rican family.
(Annette was permitted to show her
slides in her own class, even though
it was a control class.)

March 15 — Janet Darchuk, a 1967 graduate of
our sister high school, showed
Span. II slides of Ecuador and talked about
her summer there, where she was the
guest of the AFS exchange student
who had spent 1966-1967 in Jan's
home.

March 27 — Carlos Diaz Reyes from Colombia was
an AFS exchange student at a neigh-
Span. II boring suburb. He talked and showed a
Span. IV-V few slides.

May 29 — Annette Black, a senior at Valley
Forge and a Spanish II student,
Span. IV-V talked to the advanced class about
her trip with the Camp Fire Girls to
Puerto Rico, Colombia, and Jamaica.
(This was after the attitude tests
had been given for the second time
on May 23.)

May 31   - Sara Jugo talked about Peru and
                     showed a few slides. (This date,
Span. II   too, was after the attitude tests had
Span. IV-V   been administered for the second time.)

The students prepared for the Latin American visitors by making out a list of questions which they would like to ask. At the second-year level, these were submitted several days in advance so that the Spanish could be corrected. The students were told of an American visitor one day in advance and asked to think of questions on the country about which he would talk.

Whenever the visitor's schedule permitted, arrangements were made for students to take him to lunch and/or give him a tour of the building.

We believe that meeting one Latin American may do more good than reading twenty letters or books, especially if that Latin American is an attractive teen-ager to whom the students can relate positively. Although we know that it is unfair to judge a whole group by one member, nevertheless, for our purpose, we hope that the positive impression made by one visitor <u>will</u> produce a favorable image of the group which he represents.

On the other hand, bringing visitors into the classroom has some potential and inherent weaknesses, which we would like to comment on briefly. A potential weakness is that the visitor may not create a positive impression. This problem can be avoided if visitors are screened before an invitation is issued. Another potential danger is that

even enthusiastic American visitors to Latin America can make a patronizing or unfavorable remark which reinforces the very ethnocentrism which we are trying to reduce.

An inherent weakness of bringing visitors into the classroom is that the contact is on a group-to-one basis rather than on a one-to-one basis; and the communication is usually unidirectional, that is, the visitor usually does most of the talking. These weaknesses can be overcome for the one or two students who serve as the visitor's hosts for lunch or guides on a tour of the building, for they are able to relate to him on a one-to-one basis, and the communication can flow freely in both directions.

Pen Pals

On September 26 we suggested that each of the eleven girls in the fourth-year class choose a different Spanish-speaking country and try to find out what it would be like to be a teen-ager living in that country. The people of each Latin American country believe that they are different from--and superior to--their neighbors. They themselves seldom use the term "Latin American" and dislike the fact that we do. By choosing different countries, we hoped that the students would become aware of the fact that while young people in the Southern Hemisphere share many things in common, nevertheless there are some differences determined by the country in which they live. The students

themselves suggested writing to pen pals as a way of find-
ing out about teen-age life. The fifth-year students all
wrote to young people in Puerto Rico (their study of Puerto
Rico will be described later in this chapter), while each
fourth-year girl wrote to someone in the country of her
choice.

The correspondence was to be carried out in the
following way. In addition to whatever personal informa-
tion he cared to include, everyone in the class would ask
his pen pal to comment on one special topic in each letter.
For example, in class we might discuss the concept of the
family: whom does it include, in what areas are we con-
trolled by our family, in what areas are we free to make
our own decisions? Then each student would ask his pen pal
to react to these same questions. When the replies came
back, we would discuss them in class, observing not only
the areas of similarity which appeared but also the differ-
ences. We would ponder the degree to which geography, age,
sex, and social class might have contributed to these dif-
ferences. We would discuss the concept of reference people
and reference groups; and after determining who some of
ours were, would ask our pen pals to consider the same ques-
tion. We would discuss such social institutions as the
school, government, and the church and present one of these
in each letter, inviting our pen pals' comments. Directing
the same culture-oriented question to each of our

correspondents would offer the possibility of discovering a range of differences.

Unfortunately the pen-pal project was not carried out as planned because only five members of the class received a reply.

<div align="center">

Reports on Countries and the Life
of Their Teen-agers

</div>

On January 25 we proposed to the second-year class that they learn as much as they could about a Latin-American country of their own choosing. It was further suggested that they also try to find out what it would be like to be a teen-ager living in that country. Recalling the Lewin study which indicated that more attitude change occurs in small groups than individually,[5] we had them work in their conversational groups. (Each day one of these friendship groups of four or five students conversed with the teacher in Spanish during the last fifteen minutes of the class.)

On the first day each group selected a country, made out a list of the things they would like to know about it, and suggested sources for obtaining the information. On March 28 the first group report was given on Venezuela. Each member reported on one of the following topics: geography, history, economy, government, and

[5]Kurt Lewin, "Group Decision and Social Change," Readings in Social Psychology, ed. Guy E. Swanson, Theodore M. Newcomb, and Eugene L. Hartley (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1952), pp. 459-473.

customs. The other members of the class took notes, and each panel member submitted a question on each of the three most important facts or ideas presented in his report. These questions were incorporated into a test which was later administered to the whole class. The other countries reported on were El Salvador, Peru, Mexico, and Chile. The presentation of each group was similar to that described for Venezuela, except that a representative from the El Salvador and Mexican groups was able to talk with someone from each of those countries about teen-age life. A test based on the panel members' questions was given for each country.

Because of the poor response from pen pals in the advanced class, letter-writing was not attempted at the second-year level.

Films

The committees on Venezuela and Peru borrowed films on those countries from the public library.

On Friday, May 24, the day after the attitude tests were given for the second time, and on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of the following week, Channel 25, Cleveland's educational TV station, broadcast a special series on the Negro problem, called "One Nation Indivisible." This series was planned for classroom use and had been preceded the week before by two "training films" for teachers. We

were interested to see if the use of these films would result in any improvement in attitudes toward Negroes. With the class's approval, we abandoned Spanish for four days and watched and discussed the films. Our class schedule was such that we saw the last twenty minutes of a half-hour film presentation and then had thirty-five minutes for discussion. On Wednesday, June 6, one week after the final program, the Bogardus social distance scale was given again to determine if there had been any change in their attitudes toward the American Negro.

Molar Study of Puerto Rico

In Democracy and Excellence in American Secondary Education, Broudy, Smith and Burnett suggest that the curriculum should include some experience at the eleventh- and twelfth-grade levels in solving problems of "massive complexity and multilateral dimensions."[6] They suggest spending considerable time discussing such complex social problems as juvenile delinquency or disarmament and refer to such a task as "molar" problem-solving.[7]

This idea prompted us to suggest to the fifth-year group on September 26 that they choose a Spanish-speaking country and make it the focal point of a year-long study.

---

[6]Harry S. Broudy, B. Othanel Smith, and Joe R. Burnett, Democracy in American Secondary Education (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964), p. 232.

[7]Ibid., p. 236.

They selected Puerto Rico. Undoubtedly their choice was influenced by the arrival that very week of a student teacher, a petite, pretty, gentle native speaker who was born in Puerto Rico and who had been reared in the Puerto Rican colony of Lorain, Ohio. Miss A. was with us until Christmas. Because she was in the classroom every day, she was able to share much information about customs and daily life. However, since it was the fourth-year class (along with the second-year classes) for which she eventually assumed full teaching responsibility, she was unable to work closely with the fifth-year students in their study of Puerto Rico.

In October they gave reports to the combined class on the following aspects of Puerto Rico: art and music, daily life, history, and agriculture. Early in November they focused on Operation Bootstrap. The last part of the month they read a little booklet in Spanish which described life in Puerto Rico during the nineteenth century.[8] In December they had a Puerto Rican dinner at the writer's apartment. Miss A. planned the menu and brought some of the condiments from home. The girls all came early and helped to prepare the meal. Sara Jugo, our AFS student from Peru, was invited. The students discovered that each country has its own foods, for the meal was as novel to

---

[8]Rafael W. Ramírez, _Como vivían nuestros abuelos_ (San Juan, Puerto Rico: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña, 1957).

Sara as it was to the rest of us. In January they read the chapter on the Puerto Rican family which appears in an eighth-grade textbook used in the public schools of the island.[9] In addition to describing the family, the chapter includes sections on social problems which affect the family, such as housing, juvenile delinquency, recreational facilities, and health. In February they read about Puerto Rican subcultures as presented in Julian Steward's résumé of his anthropological study of the island.[10] They became aware of the concept of subculture and of the fact that there are subcultures in the United States as well as in Puerto Rico. The last week in May they read in English and discussed in Spanish Two Blocks Apart,[11] which shows the life of Juan Gonzales, a Puerto Rican boy who emigrated to New York City, and contrasts it with that of Peter Quinn, an American teen-ager who lives just two blocks away. The fact that our students reacted negatively to the American boy may indicate that they had begun to acquire a new perspective on American culture.

---

[9]Lecturas sobre Puerto Rico, Vol. I: Aspecto social: Lecturas para estudiantes de octavo grado (San Juan, Puerto Rico: Departamento de Instrucción Pública, 1960).

[10]Julian H. Steward, "Culture Patterns of Puerto Rico," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 285 (January, 1953), pp. 95-103.

[11]Charlotte L. Mayerson, Two Blocks Apart: Juan Gonzales and Peter Quinn (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965).

Summary and Conclusions

The following techniques were used in an attempt to develop more positive attitudes toward native speakers of Spanish: discussing similarities and differences; interpreting the purpose of The Family of Man pictures; introducing the concept of values; inviting visitors to the classroom; corresponding with pen pals; giving reports on countries; and viewing films.

Actually this list represents only a small part of the number of techniques possible. In Chapter Six additional activities are suggested.

It will be noted that the techniques which we did use are quite varied. We are constantly amazed at how differently students react to classroom activities. At the end of the year when we ask for an evaluation of the course, an activity which has been the favorite for half the class will invariably be mentioned by someone else as the thing he disliked the most. We assume, therefore, that techniques for improving attitudes will not be equally effective with all students and for this reason recommend a variety of approaches.

We are in favor of the student's learning as much information as possible about the countries where Spanish is spoken. The reports on countries and the films which we showed contribute to the student's fund of knowledge about Spanish-speaking countries. Several findings in our review

of attitude literature, however, compel us to urge caution in estimating the effectiveness of information in producing attitude change.

Allport points out that prejudice has an attitude factor and also a belief factor and comments that some programs succeed in altering beliefs but not in changing attitudes.[12] A study concerning change in attitudes towards Negroes showed that presenting information produced less change than when the subjects were given insights into a personality factor which could be the basis of prejudice.[13] Allport believes that information plays the following role in attitude change:

> Perhaps the value of factual information may be long delayed and may consist in driving wedges of doubt and discomfort into the stereotypes of the prejudiced. It seems likely, too, that the greater gains ascribed to other educational methods, require sound factual instruction as underpinning.[14]

Another possible factor affecting attitude change in the classroom is the manner in which the teacher relates to the students. If a teacher does not show respect for his own students as individuals, he can hardly expect them

---

[12]Gordon W. Allport, The Roots of Prejudice (Boston: Beacon Press, 1954), p. 13.

[13]Daniel Katz, Irving Sarnoff, and Charles McClintock, "Ego Defense and Attitude Change," Approaches, Problems, and Contexts of Social Psychology, ed. Edward E. Sampson (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1965), p. 282.

[14]Allport, op. cit., p. 486.

to learn to respect Spanish speakers as individuals. If
there is to be attitude change in a group situation, a per-
missive atmosphere must be established in which people feel
safe to say what they really feel without fear of ridicule
or punishment.[15] The teacher cannot be authoritarian
during language-learning activities and expect to establish
a relaxed atmosphere during those moments when there are
attitude-related activities; this permissive atmosphere
must be consistent. The questions discussed the first week
with the advanced class, e.g., in what way is our high
school like every other high school, were "safe," neutral
topics which a new teacher could use with new students to
help establish a permissive discussion atmosphere early in
the year.

We suggest that the discussion should be fairly
non-directive with as many of the ideas as possible coming
from the students themselves. The easiest thing in the
world is to "tell" the students how they should think or
act. Teachers and preachers have been deluding themselves
for years that this is the way to make people better.
High-school students already know what they are supposed to
feel and say, as witness Allport's description of the type
of changes which may take place between the ages of eight.

[15]C. Gratton Kemp, "Improvement of Critical Think-
ing in Relation to Open-Closed Belief Systems," Journal of
Experimental Education, XXXI, No. 3 (1963), p. 323.

and fifteen in regard to a child's attitudes toward other

ethnic groups:

> Around the age of eight, children often talk
> (sic) in a highly prejudicial manner. But the re-
> jection is chiefly verbal. . . . They may still be-
> have in a relatively democratic manner. They may ·
> play with Jews, Catholics, etc., even while they
> talk against them.
> Now when the teaching of the school takes ef-
> fect, the child learns a new verbal norm: he must
> talk democratically. . . . Hence by the age of
> twelve, we may find verbal acceptance but behavi-
> oral rejection. By this age the prejudices have
> finally affected conduct. . . .
> The paradox, then, is that younger children
> may talk undemocratically but behave democratic-
> ally, whereas children in puberty may talk (at
> least in school) democratically but behave with
> true prejudice. By the age of fifteen consider-
> able skill is shown in imitating the adult pat-
> tern. Prejudiced talk and democratic talk are
> reserved for appropriate occasions, and rational-
> izations are ready for whatever occasions require
> them. . . . It takes the entire period of childhood
> and much of adolescence to master the art of eth-
> nocentrism.[16]

Our students already know that they are supposed to think

positively toward native speakers of Spanish. The trick is

to find techniques for internalizing these positive atti-

tudes.

We believe that including attitude activities at

least once a week will be more effective than doing an

occasional big unit. The techniques outlined in this chap-

ter will probably be more effective if the students can

discover many of the insights for themselves in a permis-

sive classroom atmosphere.

---

[16]Allport, op. cit., p. 301.

CHAPTER IV

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ATTITUDE TESTS

The Bogardus Social Distance Scale was modified
and a semantic differential test was developed in order
to measure student attitudes before and after treatment.
The Bogardus scale is a measure of the conative aspect of
attitude, while the semantic differential measures the
cognitive and affective components.

Bogardus Social Distance Scale

The Bogardus Social Distance Scale, named after the
sociologist who developed it, is a device to measure a sub-
ject's attitude toward specified groups of people by re-
quiring him to indicate how he would behave toward these
groups as he relates to them in different ways, e.g., as
neighbor or friend. These relationships are arranged on the
test in order of social distance. For example, the social
distance between the subject and a visitor to his country
would be greater than that between the subject and a close,
personal friend.

The two basic questions, therefore, which had to be
answered were which ethnic groups to use and which social

distances. In addition to determining which social dis-
tances to use, it was also necessary to decide how to word
the description of each social distance and how to order
them.

Selection of the Ethnic Groups

A study by Diab showed that the trait ratings of a
number of groups vary depending on the series in which they
are presented.[1] Therefore, although this research con-
cerned Spanish-speaking countries, it was decided that the
results would be more meaningful if other countries were
also included.

Bogardus originally used forty ethnic groups,
thirty occupational groups, and thirty religious groups.[2]
Fifteen countries were selected for the social distance
scale used in this study. The four Spanish-speaking coun-
tries included were Spain, Mexico, Puerto Rico and Argen-
tina. Spain was used because it is the Mother Country and
because it is in Europe. The other three countries are all
in Latin America. Mexico was selected because of its geog-
raphical proximity and because it represents a country
which has a large Indian population. Puerto Rico was chosen
because it is a Caribbean country and because it frequently

---

[1]N. L. Diab, "Factors Affecting Studies of National
Stereotypes," Journal of Social Psychology, LIX (1963),
pp. 29-40.

[2]Emory S. Bogardus, "A Social Distance Scale,"
Sociology and Social Research, XVII (January, 1933), p. 267.

has a negative image in the United States. Argentina was added to the list because it is a Latin American country of white, European background and in order to see what student attitudes are like for a Spanish-speaking country about which they know very little. In a first attempt at selecting meaningful scales for the semantic differential, students in two World History classes were asked to write down the first three words which came to their minds for each of eighteen countries. A great many students left Peru and Argentina blank because they did not know enough about these countries. Peru was not selected because the list already contained a country with a large Indian population. France, Germany and Russia were included because these are the countries where the other languages offered in our school are spoken, and the test could thus be used for students of other languages. America was picked partly for comparison with other ethnic groups and partly for comparison with American Negro, which was added to satisfy the writer's curiosity. Great Britain was selected in order to get a comparison with another English-speaking group. Poland, Italy and Ireland were used because these ethnic groups are represented in the school district. At the request of a colleague in the history department, Nationalist China (Formosa) and Red China were also included.

The fifteen countries were randomized with the following restrictions: (1) two Spanish-speaking countries

could not be next to each other, and (2) America must precede American Negro. This was the order used for the Bogardus pretest[3] administered in late May, 1967: Russia, Ireland, France, America, Italy, Mexico, American Negro, Germany, Spain, Great Britain, Nationalist China (Formosa), Argentina, Poland, Puerto Rico, Red China.

Selection of Social Distances

The original form of the Bogardus scale used the following scales:[4]

I would willingly admit members of _____ group to

close kinship by marriage
my club as personal chums
my street as neighbors
employment in my occupation in my country
citizenship in my country
as visitors only to my country
would exclude from my country

The "occupation" category did not seem especially relevant for high-school students, and the "exclusion" category was adjudged too extreme for the 1960's. (The scale was first given in 1926.)[5] Two other social distances were

---

[3]The term _pretest_ as used in this chapter does not refer to a test given before treatment. Instead it refers to the first form of either the Bogardus or semantic differential tests which the writer developed and tested in her classes during the winter-spring of 1967.

[4]Emory S. Bogardus, "Measuring Social Distances," _Journal of Applied Sociology_, IX (March-April, 1925), p. 301.

[5]Emory S. Bogardus, "Racial Distance Changes in the United States During the Past Thirty Years," _Sociology and Social Research_, XLIII (1958), p. 127.

therefore substituted for these. Although high-school students are not yet established in occupations, many of them do hold part-time jobs. Therefore "co-worker on a job" was included. In order to make the scale as pertinent as possible, a new social distance was created: "as a classmate in my school." It was placed in the scale after the "job" category and immediately preceding "citizenship."

It was thought that the introductory phrase "I would admit a member of _____ group" implied more control over these social distances than teen-agers had. Sutherland's 1946 Bogardus scale used a variety of beginnings.[6]

> I would be pleased to see a person from _____ visiting my country.
> I would allow a person from _____ to become a citizen of my country.
> I would allow a person from _____ to enter my profession.
> I would encourage a person from _____ to settle in my town.
> I would like to have a person from _____ as my next-door neighbor.
> I would like to have a person from _____ as my friend.
> I would be glad to have a person from _____ marry into my family.
> I would like to marry a person from _____.

These phrases show varying degrees of positive feeling. In order to have an introductory phrase which was consistent and which represented a response which was open to teen-agers, the phrase "I would be willing to accept a person from _____" was chosen.

---

[6]Margaret B. Sutherland, "A Study of the Effects of Learning French on Attitudes Toward the French," British Journal of Educational Psychology, XVI (February, 1946), p. 44.

Bogardus arranged the scale beginning with "close kinship by marriage" and ending with "would exclude from my country"; that is, he began with the closest social distance and ended with the most remote. Sutherland, on the other hand, reversed the procedure, beginning with the farthest social distance and ending with the closest. It was decided to follow Sutherland's ordering, beginning with the most distant category. Most middle-class Americans like to think of themselves as unprejudiced. By beginning with the most remote social distance, it was reasoned that the student would be able to accept a person from the majority of the countries in one if not several categories and thereby flatter his self-image; whereas if he was confronted first with the closest social distance, he might be reluctant to portray himself at the outset as prejudiced.

The social-distance descriptions were also slightly reworded, and the scale was pretested in the form shown below.

I would be willing to accept a person from the country listed to the right . . .

1. as a visitor to my country
2. as a citizen of my country
3. as a co-worker on a job
4. as a classmate in my school
5. as a neighbor on my street
6. as a friend
7. into kinship by marriage

This form of the Bogardus can be found in Appendix A.

Scoring the Bogardus

The students were instructed to put an $\underline{X}$ in the block after each statement with which they agreed. In order to score the test, a value was assigned to each social distance, and these were summed. The value assigned was the same as the rank order of the social distance as shown in the preceding paragraph. For example, "visitor" counted 1; "neighbor" counted 5; and "kinship" was assigned a value of 7. If a student put an $\underline{X}$ in all seven categories, his total score for that country was 28. If a student put an $\underline{X}$ for the first four categories only, his score for that country was 10 $(1 + 2 + 3 + 4)$. The total scores for each of the fifteen countries were summed to determine the total score for each student. The highest possible score was 420. A high score indicated greater acceptance; a low score, less acceptance.

Each student's score for a given country was also totaled, producing a total score for each of the fifteen countries.

Revising the Bogardus Social Distance Scale

Reordering the fifteen countries

The total scores for each country are listed in rank order for each of the pretest groups in Table 3. The rank ordering of the countries was similar for all three test groups. The same countries appear among the top six

TABLE 3.--Total scores for each country on the Bogardus pretest

	Spanish II N=129			World History N=79			French II N=32	
Group[a]	Country	Total Score	Group	Country	Total Score	Group	Country	Total Score
I	America	3491	I	America	2145	I	America	850
	Great Britain	3413		Great Britain	2119		Great Britain	827
	Ireland	3274		Ireland	1983		Germany	813
	Germany	3248		Germany	1886		Ireland	808
	France	3243		France	1844		France	805
II	Italy	3205	II	Italy	1803	II	Italy	718
	Spain	2893		Spain	1620		Russia	665
	Argentina	2777		Poland	1570		Poland	645
	Poland	2729		Argentina	1513		Spain	638
	Mexico	2558		Mexico	1480		Argentina	568
III	Russia	2251	III	Russia	1339	III	Mexico	564
	Puerto Rico	2192		Puerto Rico	1260		Nationalist China	524
	Nationalist China	2068		Nationalist China	1173		Puerto Rico	445
	American Negro	1746		American Negro	986		American Negro	431
	Red China	1112		Red China	724		Red China	397

[a]The countries which fell into the top third are designated as Group I, those in the middle third as Group II, and those in the bottom third as Group III.

114

for all groups, though the French order varies slightly.
If the number of French subjects had been greater, perhaps
the results would have been more consistent with those of
the other two groups. The bottom four countries are the
same for each group, although again the French order varies.
Group II consists of the same five countries, although
there is some variation in the order among all three test
groups.

(Some language teachers have supposed that students
will be more favorably inclined toward speakers of the lan-
guage they are studying than toward speakers of other lan-
guages. The results of this test for this population do
not support that hypothesis.)

An examination of Table 4 reveals that three of the
countries which appeared in the top third on the test form
also appeared in the top third after the test had been
scored. None of the countries which scored in the top third
appeared in the bottom third on the test form. Although
the very first country listed on the test, Russia, scored
in the bottom third, three of the countries which fell in
the bottom third on the test form also ranked in the lower
third when the tests were scored.

In order to correct the tendency of the student
scores to correspond roughly to their position on the test
form, the ordering of the countries was revised. This time
the countries were randomized with the following

restrictions: (1) No more than two members of the same group, i.e., I, II, or III, could fall within the same third on the test form; (2) two members of the same group could not be adjacent to one another; and (3) two Spanish-speaking countries could not be adjacent to one another.

TABLE 4.—Comparison of the original ordering of countries on the Bogardus pretest with their group location after scoring

Group	Country
III[a]	Russia
I	Ireland
I	France
I	America
II	Italy
II	Mexico
III	American Negro
I	Germany
II	Spain
I	Great Britain
III	Nationalist China
II	Argentina
II	Poland
III	Puerto Rico
III	Red China

[a]Roman numerals indicate the "third" in which the country was located after scoring.

The revised test was administered twice, in January and May of 1968. As a further precaution against the effects of ordering, two versions of the revised test were prepared. In the second version the countries were listed in reverse order. In January, one version was administered to one control and one experimental class, while the second

version was given to the other control and experimental

classes. In May each class took the version which it had

not taken earlier.

Table 5 shows the two versions of the ordering used

in the revised Bogardus administered in 1968.

TABLE 5.--Comparison of the new ordering of countries on
the Bogardus revised test with their group location on the
scored pretest

Group	Country	Group	Country
I[a]	Ireland	I	Great Britain
II	Poland	III	Nationalist China
I	America	II	Mexico
III	Puerto Rico	III	Russia
II	Italy	I	France
III	Red China	III	American Negro
II	Spain	II	Argentina
I	Germany	I	Germany
II	Argentina	II	Spain
III	American Negro	III	Red China
I	France	II	Italy
III	Russia	III	Puerto Rico
II	Mexico	I	America
III	Nationalist China	II	Poland
I	Great Britain	I	Ireland

[a]Roman numerals indicate the "third" in which the
country was located after scoring the pretest.

Rewording and reordering the social-distance categories

A social distance scale is supposedly so arranged
that a person who puts an X for category five, for example,
will also have put X's in all of the preceding categories,
which are presumably more remote. In scoring the Bogardus

pretest it was observed that a number of students had not
marked all of the intermediate categories. Several, for
instance, indicated that they would be willing to accept
someone as a friend but would not accept him as a classmate
in school or even as a co-worker on a job. When questioned
about this at a later date, they offered such explanations
as these: "You might have them as a pen pal, but you don't
know if you would want them to go to your school." "You
wouldn't want your friend to work with you because you
might both fool around and get fired." They also defined
the word _friend_ in various ways. Some felt that a friend
was "like an acquaintance." In a school of 2,800 students
it is not possible for the students to know everyone, and
others said a friend was anyone whose name they knew.

Another explanation for skipping intermediate cate-
gories is that the subjects may not have perceived the
social distances in the same order as the writer. In order
to investigate this, the items were randomized and submitted
to two World History classes with these instructions:

> Please indicate by using the numbers 1, 2, 3, etc.
> how you would rank the following statements in order
> of social distance.

> Put the number 1 before the statement you feel
> is the closest relationship, number 2 before the next
> closest relationship, etc. until you have ranked all
> the statements.

Although there was some obvious clustering, each
category was marked at least once in nearly every position,
indicating that perception of social distance varied widely.

In order to get a numerical measure of the distance between categories, the following procedure was used.

A chart was prepared, the first two categories of which are reproduced in Table 6. A numerical value was assigned to each rank. The total number of responses for each rank was entered in the proper space. For instance, if _visitor_ was marked in the first rank twenty-eight times, it appears on the chart as "28x." The number of responses for each rank was then multiplied by the numerical value of that rank, shown on the table as "item." Each of these products was then added together, giving a total numerical value for the whole category. For example, in the first column, twenty-eight was multiplied by 6, giving a result of 168. To this were added the products for the other ranks, making a total numerical value of 175 for the category of _visitor_.

TABLE 6.--Chart for measuring the social distance between categories

	Rank							Total
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	
Value	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Visitor	28x	0x	1x	0x	0x	3x	0x	
Item	168	0	4	0	0	3	0	175
Citizen	1x	22x	2x	1x	2x	1x	0x	
Item	6	110	8	3	2	1	0	130

The numerical totals for all seven social distances are given in Table 7. It will be seen that for these subjects, co-worker, classmate, and neighbor occupy almost the same social distance.

TABLE 7.—Distance between categories on the Bogardus pretest

Category	Total Numerical Value	Numerical Distance Between Categories
As a visitor to my country	175	
		45
As a citizen of my country	130	
		41
As a co-worker on a job	89	
		-2
As a classmate in my school	91	
		10
As a neighbor on my street	81	
		27
As a friend	54	
		44
Into kinship by marriage	10	

In order to find categories which would produce discrete social distances, three new categories were created, and the friend category was reworded. This list of ten categories was randomized and submitted to sixty-two World History students. They were instructed to rank them using the numbers 1-10.

The responses were plotted on a chart similar to the one described in Table 6, expanded, of course, to include ten categories. The results are shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8.—Distances between categories on a tentative list
of ten categories

Category	Totals	Numerical Distance Between Categories
As a visitor to my country	480	
		42
As a citizen of my country	438	
		104
As a co-worker on a job	334	
		15
As a member of my church	319	
		40
As a neighbor on my street	279	
		18
As a classmate in my school	261	
		13
As a visitor in my home	248	
		38
As a member of my "crowd"	210	
		118
Into kinship by marriage	102	
		32
As a close, personal friend	70	

The next step was to decide which seven of these ten
social distances should be used.   Three lists were drawn up.

A	B	C
Visitor	Visitor	Citizen
Citizen	Citizen	Coworker
Church	Coworker	Church
Neighbor	Church	Neighbor
Classmate	Neighbor	Classmate
Crowd	Crowd	Crowd
Kindship	Kinship	Kinship

In order to be sure that the social distances would not
overlap when the list was reduced to seven, each list was
randomized and submitted to two other World History classes.

The results are shown in Table 9.

TABLE 9.—Numerical values for categories on three tentative lists

A	Total	B	Total	C	Total
Visitor	322	Visitor	270	Citizen	253
Citizen	248	Citizen	202	Church	189
Church	222	Church	179	Coworker	184
Classmate	195	Coworker	152	Classmate	161
Neighbor	177	Neighbor	136	Neighbor	137
Crowd	101	Crowd	102	Crowd	107
Kinship	68	Kinship	26	Kinship	56

Comparison with the original list shows that there were some shifts in rank order when the list was reduced to seven. It was decided to use List A in the revised Bogardus test. The distances between ranks in List B were just as satisfactory, but List A was preferred because all of the subjects had classmates whereas not all of them had coworkers. List C was rejected because church and coworker occupied practically the same social distance in the grouping.

The revision of the Bogardus social distance scale was now completed. Both versions of the revised Bogardus can be seen in Appendix A.

Semantic Differential Test

A semantic differential test is the name given to a type of test rather than to a specific test itself. It was

developed by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum and described in their book The Measurement of Meaning.[7]

The Bogardus Social Distance Scale refers to the entire test, but the term scale as used for this type of test refers to a pair of adjectives and the space between them, as below.

good ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ bad

The subject might be asked to use this scale to rate the concept baseball. He would do this by placing an X in the space on the scale which most accurately indicated his attitude toward baseball. Most semantic differential tests consist of a series of scales, usually ten or more, and a series of concepts. The same group of scales is used throughout a given test. The concepts are frequently related but may be as disparate as baseball, love, and Hitler.

The Pretest

In order to develop a test of this type for measuring the attitudes of high-school students toward native speakers of Spanish, a choice of concepts and of scales had to be made. It was decided to use as concepts the same ethnic groups which had been selected for the Bogardus

---

[7]Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957).

scale and to present them in the same order.[8] The test was
arranged so that each concept was on a separate page. At
the top of the page appeared the following question:

How would you describe the Russians? (Irish,
French, etc.)

Selection of the scales for the pretest

In order to insure that the scales would be within
the vocabulary range of the subjects and would be words
which they associated with ethnic groups, the students in
two World History classes were asked to write down the
first three words which came into their heads for each of
eighteen ethnic groups. The groups were listed in this
order:

Germans	Puerto Ricans
Mexicans	Russians
British	American Negroes
Spaniards	French
Polish	Cubans
Argentinians	Indians (from India)
Americans	Peruvians
Brazilians	Italians
Irish	Japanese

It will be noted that all of the ethnic groups which ap-
peared on the Bogardus pretest appear here except National-
ist China and Red China. Many nouns were mentioned; but
the majority of the words were adjectives--more than fifty
for each country--though many were synonyms, such as cour-
teous and polite for the Japanese. The following résumé was

---

[8]Russia, Ireland, France, America, Italy, Mexico,
American Negro, Germany, Spain, Great Britain, Nationalist
China (Formosa), Argentina, Poland, Puerto Rico, Red China.

made of the words which were used three or more times
(either member of the pair or both) for at least one coun-
try:

proud-humble 5 countries	big-small 7 countries
rich-poor 9	fat-thin 3
clean-dirty 6	
happy-sad 5	industrious-lazy 4
intelligent-unintelligent 11	calm-excitable 5
educated-uneducated 3	
good-looking-ugly 3	fair-complexioned-
progressive-backward 3	dark complexioned 12

It will be observed that the above words have been
grouped. In analyzing the results of semantic differential
tests, Osgood and his associates noted that certain scales
fell into groups. Osgood concluded that each of these
groups represented a different aspect of the subject's
response to the concept and set about identifying these
aspects. In much of his research, an analysis of the data
fell into three groups which he called "factors" and which
he identified as evaluative, potency, and activity factors.
The evaluative factor is made up of words which are affect-
laden and which show how the subject feels about the concept.
Not all of the scales on a given test fall into neat little
clusters, but Osgood and his associates found that one-half
to three-quarters of those which do, group themselves into
the evaluative category. They include such scales as good-
bad, clean-dirty, and kind-cruel. A second cluster, named
the potency factor, includes words concerned with power and
the things associated with it, such as size, weight, and
toughness. Scales characteristic of this factor are

strong-weak, heavy-light, and powerful-powerless. This cluster is usually about half as large as the evaluative factor. The third grouping usually contains fewer scales than the potency factor. It is called the activity factor; for it contains words associated with quickness, excitement, warmth, agitation, etc. Typical scales for this factor are active-passive, fast-slow, calm-agitated.

As the semantic differential technique was applied to new concepts, the responses did not always fall into categories which were evaluative, potency, or activity factors. In applying a semantic differential test to the concept foreigner, for example, Osgood found four factors.[9] The first two he identified as evaluative and potency and the other two, as stability and receptivity factors. Each researcher must name or define the factors which appear in the analysis of his own data.

These clusters or factors are not apparent upon a visual inspection of the data. It is necessary to submit them to mathematical analysis designed especially to reveal if clustering has occurred. This procedure is called "factor analysis." In the days before computers the factor analysis of one concept might take months. A computer reduces the process to less than a minute.

The most frequently-mentioned scales from the student eighteen-country survey will now be repeated, this

---

[9]Osgood, op. cit., p. 181.

time indicating the factor into which the writer placed

them after reading The Measurement of Meaning.

Evaluative	Potency
proud-humble	big-small
rich-poor	fat-thin
clean-dirty	
happy-sad	Activity
intelligent-unintelligent	industrious-lazy
educated-uneducated	calm-excitable
good-looking-ugly	Unidentified
progressive-backward	dark-complexioned-fair complexioned

It was decided to use twenty scales on the pretest,

and the search began for additional scales to supplement

the thirteen in the above list.

Osgood's scales for the concept foreigner which re-

sulted from his Thesaurus study[10] supplemented by several

adjectives from the student survey were submitted to a group

of English teachers at Valley Forge High School with the

request that they suggest opposites. (Unfortunately for the

novice, most descriptions of semantic differential tests

give only one member of the pair.) While the English

teachers were supplying opposites to Osgood's list, the

writer was checking the same words in a dictionary of

synonyms and antonyms.[11] The best opposites from the dic-

tionary and from the teachers' lists were selected and the

---

[10]Loc. cit.

[11]James C. Fernald, Funk and Wagnall's Standard
Handbook of Synonyms, Antonyms, and Prepositions (New York:
Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1947).

list narrowed down to the twenty scales which seemed most pertinent. They are listed below by factors.

<u>Evaluative</u>

good-bad
happy-sad
intelligent-stupid
proud-humble
kind-cruel
friendly-unfriendly
progressive-backward

<u>Potency</u>

big-small
healthy-sickly
aggressive-submissive

<u>Activity</u>

lazy-hard-working

<u>Stability</u>

stubborn-cooperative
excitable-calm

<u>Receptivity</u>

clean-dirty
rich-poor
fair-complexioned-
  dark complexioned
interesting-uninteresting
colorful-drab
handsome-homely
polite-rude

It will be noted that some scales are here assigned to factors different from where they had first been placed. This is not critical. What does matter will be the factors into which the scales group themselves after the test data have been submitted to factor analysis. These clusters or factors are frequently different from those which the researcher had assumed at the outset.

One member of the scale is usually more positive in meaning than its pair. In order to avoid the establishment of a "set," half the scales are randomly reversed. The writer was still working alone at this point and was unaware of this procedure. Nostrand reversed seven scales on

his semantic differential test;[12] so the writer reversed seven on hers. It was evident that the scales on the Nostrand and Lambert tests[13] were not grouped by factors; so the writer first scrambled the order of the scales. Later these were randomized on the advice of the school psychologist, who had developed a semantic differential test.

The final ordering of the scales is listed below, and a sample page of the semantic differential pretest can be seen in Appendix A.

dark-complexioned	fair-complexioned
big	small
sad	happy
friendly	unfriendly
clean	dirty
proud	humble
uninteresting	interesting
good	bad
stubborn	cooperative
progressive	backward
healthy	sickly
aggressive	submissive
polite	rude
rich	poor
intelligent	stupid
lazy	hard-working
cruel	kind
colorful	drab
handsome	homely
excitable	calm

---

[12]Howard Lee Nostrand, Experiment in Determining Cultural Content: Pretesting the Questionnaire, "How Americans See the French" (Department of Romance Languages and Literature, University of Washington, July, 1964), Appendix D, pp. 8-9. (Mimeographed.)

[13]Wallace E. Lambert et al., A Study of the Roles of Attitude and Motivation in Second-Language Learning, Final Report (Montreal: McGill University, November 25, 1961). (Mimeographed.)

The semantic differential pretest was administered along with the Bogardus in late May. It was given to the writer's five Spanish II classes and to nine other Spanish classes taught by two other teachers. Four of these were first-year, two others were second-year, two were third-year, and one was a combined fourth-fifth-year class. It was also given in one second-year French class and in three World History classes taught by two different teachers. Approximately 475 students were tested. The same Bogardus and semantic pretests were readministered a second time two weeks later in early June to the writer's five classes.

Initial scoring of the semantic differential pretest

In order to score a semantic differential test, a numerical value from 1-7 is assigned to each space on the scale. The total score for each subject's test for each factor is then summed. Before the tests can be scored, therefore, it is necessary to submit the score for each scale for all subjects to factor analysis in order to identify the factors.

The writer had worked alone until late June of 1967, when arrangements were made with her to work with Dr. William L. Libby, Jr. of the Department of Psychology.

Prior to this, in mid-June, some of the tests had been scored by summing the scores for all twenty scales.

This procedure was incorrect, as the scores should be summed for each factor separately.

The hours spent on this incorrect first scoring taught the writer several things which will be commented on at this time. In the first place, the scoring is very time-consuming. Whereas the Bogardus could be scored in two minutes or less, it took ten minutes to score twenty scales for fifteen concepts (countries). One thing which slowed down the scoring was the fact that the seven scales which had been reversed had to be put back in regular order again so that the correct numerical value would be assigned. On scoring the 1967 pretest, a tagboard template was used to indicate which scales were to be reversed. A template would have been too awkward to use on the fifty-scale test which was given in January and May of 1968. Therefore, scores for this test were key-punched as they appeared on the test. These cards were then run through a program which had been especially written to right the reversed scales. This program produced new cards which were then submitted to factor analysis. It now appears that this "reversal" program was probably not necessary. Consultants at the computer center indicate that it is a fairly simple matter to read into the program directions for reversing the scales, so that this is accomplished simultaneously along with the factor analysis. Future researchers are advised to seek the services of the computer consultants

before key punching any of the data.

So time-consuming was the scoring that within a matter of hours, the decision was made to score the semantic differential test for the writer's five Spanish classes only. (The tests had been given to 475 students.)

Factor analysis of the pretest

Another result of the tedious scoring process was the decision to run the factor analysis from the data on three countries only rather than on all fifteen. The countries which ranked high, mid-, and low on the Bogardus were submitted to factor analysis. These countries were America, Spain, and Red China, respectively.

The program used for the factor analysis rotated Eigenvalues of 1.00 or greater. The first run gave three factors for America but only two for Spain and Red China. Therefore the Eigenvalue minimum was lowered to .95 and the data for Spain and Red China resubmitted. This time three factors emerged.

The factor loadings are given in Table 10.

It frequently happens that a factor for one concept will correspond rather closely with some other factor for another concept. On the pretest, Factor I had similar loadings for all three countries. Factor II for America and Spain, on the other hand, seemed more like Factor III for Red China; while Factor II for Red China had loadings

TABLE 10.--Rotated factors of the pretest

Scale	America N=113[a] Factor			Spain N=113 Factor			Red China N=113 Factor		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1. fair-complex.-dark complex.	13[b]	07	05	07	13	31	11	04	19
2. big-small	40	14	36	10	15	49	39	12	01
3. happy-sad	71	15	11	43	05	08	59	01	08
4. friendly-unfriendly	80	19	01	70	12	07	67	12	20
5. clean-dirty	62	20	23	54	20	51	76	13	17
6. proud-humble	51	09	27	62	20	28	08	52	13
7. interesting-uninteresting	57	26	23	76	01	21	15	26	57
8. good-bad	50	29	29	77	30	23	74	13	42
9. cooperative-stubborn	08	48	03	01	57	02	63	32	38
10. progressive-backward	32	13	61	48	19	53	52	51	05
11. healthy-sickly	23	06	75	52	19	53	73	32	06
12. aggressive-submissive	08	29	44	54	32	35	00	60	01
13. polite-rude	51	38	28	70	42	11	75	12	43
14. rich-poor	07	22	36	23	10	61	75	13	04
15. intelligent-stupid	20	37	68	52	15	54	58	47	22
16. hard-working-lazy	10	65	16	26	49	20	15	19	54
17. kind-cruel	39	60	17	59	59	04	61	22	48
18. colorful-drab	39	47	28	59	07	14	36	20	43
19. handsome-homely	38	35	45	58	04	42	53	27	21
20. calm-excitable	39	24	16	37	42	08	38	42	06

[a]Correlation coefficients of .25 or larger are significant at the .01 level.

[b]The decimal has been omitted. Read as .13, .40, etc.

similar to those for Factor III for America and Spain. The
major scales defining the three factors are shown in Table
11.

TABLE 11.--Major scales defining the three factors of the
pretest

Scale	America	Spain	Red China
	Factor I		
friendly	80	70	67
good	50	77	74
polite	51	70	75
clean	62	54	76
happy	71	43	59
	Factor II		
progressive	61	53	51
intelligent	68	54	47
healthy	75	53	32
	Factor III		
hard-working	65	49	54
kind	60	59	48

The scales in Factor I seem to focus on the indi-
vidual while those in the second factor could be components
of group achievement. The first factor was identified as
"individual sociability," for these are all qualities which
relate to the individual's social interaction. The word
clean in this factor was apparently interpreted by the sub-
jects in the sense of "clean cut" rather than in the hygien-
ic sense.

Factor II was called "group achievement." The three qualities in this factor are all necessary for achievement. Although individuals, of course, can manifest these traits, they do not seem so personal as the qualities in Factor I. Furthermore the concept was presented in group form: How would you describe the Spanish?, etc.

Hard-working and kind, the two scales which had high loadings in Factor III, seem unrelated. If Factor II is related to achievement, it is strange that hard-working did not load high on that factor. If one thinks of kind as a consistent quality in contrast to a trait which is only manifest on occasion, then kind and hard-working may be called a "consistency or constancy" factor.

In order to verify the identification of these factors, more scales were added to each one and a revised semantic differential test was administered to new subjects in 1968. The revised test will be discussed in more detail in a later section.

Reliability of the pretest

The test-retest method was used to determine the reliability of the semantic differential pretest. The test was given a second time in the writer's five Spanish II classes in June, two weeks after it was first administered. There was no treatment between tests. After the factor analysis had identified the factors, the tests were

rescored,[14] this time summing the scales for each factor separately for each student. The total score for each factor for all subjects in May was compared with the total score for each factor for all subjects in June, using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The formula used was

$$r = \frac{N\Sigma XY - \Sigma X\Sigma Y}{\sqrt{[N\Sigma X^2 - (\Sigma X)^2][N\Sigma Y^2 - (\Sigma Y)^2]}}$$

The results are shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12.--Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients for test-retest of semantic differential pretest (May-June, 1967)

Country N=82	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III
America	.792	.589	.680
Spain	.683	.627	. .
Red China	.826	.525	. .

Factor III was scored for America only. For 80 degrees of freedom, .283 is significant at the .01 level. All of these correlation coefficients are much higher; so the semantic differential pretest appears to have been reliable.

---

[14]It will be recalled that the tests had first been scored prior to the factor analysis by summing all twenty scales.

The Revised Test

Augmenting the scales

The number of scales composing the factors of the pretest was so limited that one could not be sure that they had been correctly named. The next step was to find additional scales to go with each factor to help define it better. The augmented test would be given to new subjects, and the results submitted to factor analysis. If the original factors plus the new words which had been added factored out together as a group, the factor had been correctly defined. If the same groups did not factor out, then the new groups would have to be defined. The revised test was augmented to fifty scales, selected as follows:

Factor I
Individual Sociability

friendly-unfriendly
good-bad
polite-rude
clean-dirty
happy-sad

---

refined-crude
sociable-unsociable
outgoing-withdrawn
nice-nasty
meek-violent
sympathetic-inconsiderate

Factor III
Consistency, Constancy

hard-working-lazy
kind-cruel·

---

considerate-thoughtless
obliging-unaccommodating
thorough-slipshod

Factor II
Group Achievement

progressive-backward
intelligent-stupid
healthy-sickly

---

confident-chicken-hearted
effective-ineffective
enterprising-cautious
creative-uninventive
productive-unproductive
successful-failing
ambitious-unaspiring

(Factor III, Continued)
dependable-undependable
orderly-disorderly
consistent-inconsistent
rebellious-conservative
patient-impulsive
generous-stingy
religious-non-believing
righteous-erring
virtuous-corrupt

Six New Scales	Ten Scales from Pretest
active-passive	big-small
strong-weak	proud-humble
warm-cold	interesting-uninteresting
quick-slow	cooperative-uncooperative
mature-childish	aggressive-submissive
right-wrong	rich-poor
	handsome-homely
	calm-excitable
	light-dark

Scales below the line are the new scales added to help define the factor. The last scale, light-dark is a revision of the original scale fair-complexioned-dark-complexioned. Factor III was so enigmatic that several scales with a religious connotation were added to see if the factor had a religious or moral orientation. Several of the six new scales are from Osgood's activity and potency factors. All of them are frequently used in semantic differential tests, although they had not been used on the pretest.

Half of the scales were randomly reversed; then all of the scales were randomized. One of the scales, consistent-inconsistent was inadvertently omitted. Sympathetic-inconsiderate was unintentionally used twice, the second time in reverse order. These errors were not observed until after the tests had been given.

Reducing the concepts

When the number of scales was increased to fifty, it was decided to reduce the number of concepts. The test

would have been fatiguing to take and probably could not have been administered in one class period.

The first plan was to use the four Spanish-speaking countries plus two countries which had rated higher on the Bogardus pretest and two which had rated lower. Later this was changed to the four Spanish-speaking countries and three others, as follows:

America
Germany

Spain
Argentina
Mexico

Puerto Rico
Red China

The seven countries are here grouped into the thirds into which they fell when arranged in rank order on the basis of the Bogardus pretest. America and Red China were included because they ranked at the top and bottom of the list of fifteen countries. Puerto Rico was in the lower third. By adding Germany, there were then two countries in the upper third to balance the two in the lower.

The countries were randomized with the restriction that two Spanish-speaking countries could not be next to one another. In an effort to counteract the effects of ordering, half of the revised semantic differential tests were collated in reverse order. In January, one control and one experimental class took the test in one order; the other two classes, in the other. In May each class was

given the test in the order which it had not taken previously. The countries were arranged as follows:

Mexico	Spain
Red China	America
Argentina	Puerto Rico
Germany	Germany
Puerto Rico	Argentina
America	Red China
Spain	Mexico

Miscellaneous revisions

Several changes of other kinds were incorporated into the revised test. The pretest arranged the scales thus:

good   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   bad

The subject was directed to circle the number which best represented his opinion. It was decided that the use of numbers did not especially facilitate the scoring and that it was better to disguise the method of scoring. Therefore the Osgood style of scale was used in the revised test.

big   __ : __ : __ : __ : __ : __ : __ __   small

The instructions were to put an X in the space along the line which best represented their opinion.

The concepts on the pretest were presented using a question of the following type: "How would you describe the Mexicans?" Several subjects asked whether this meant the Mexicans in Mexico or Mexican immigrants and their descendents who were living in the United States. On the revised test, therefore, the question was reworded to read,

"How would you describe the Mexican people in Mexico?" etc.
For Americans the question was worded in this way: "How
would you rate the American people in the United States?"

The pretest had space at the bottom of each page
where the subjects were invited to write down other adjec-
tives describing these people. Most students left this
space blank. In no instance was an adjective mentioned
which was incorporated into the revised test. This section
was therefore omitted from the revised test. Furthermore,
there would have been no room for it, as the fifty scales
completely filled two pages (twenty-five on each page).
The question"How would you describe the _____ in _____?"
was repeated at the top of the second page.

The final form of the fifty-scale revised test can
be seen in Appendix A. It was given to the control and ex-
perimental classes in January and May, 1968.

Factor analysis of the revised test

A factor analysis was made of the January, 1968,
data; and three factors common to all concepts were worked
out. A factor analysis was also made of the May, 1968,
data; and again three common factors were worked out. The
scales common to Factor I in both January and May were then
used to formulate what will here be called the final Fac-
tor I or Factor I of the final test. (The semantic dif-
ferential test went through three stages--a pretest, a
revised test, and a final test.) In similar fashion, the

scales common to the second and third factors in January
and May became Factors II and III of the final test.

In order to use the same scales in scoring both the
January and May revised tests, neither test was scored until
after the final factors had been worked out. Both tests
were then scored by summing each student's score for final
Factor I, for final Factor II, and for final Factor III. In
this way the comparison of the before- and after-treatment
scores is based on the students' reaction to the same scales.

Table 13 shows the first factor which emerged from
the separate factor analyses of the January and May data.
Each factor analysis produced from ten to fifteen rotated
factors for each country. The Roman numeral which appears
under the abbreviation for the country in the table shows
in which factor the loadings appeared for that country.
The first factor presented no problems, for there were
similar loadings on the first factor for all countries.
There were 101 subjects who took the January test; 87 who
took the test in May. (There was an Arts Seminar field
trip that day.) The criterion for including a scale in a
factor was that it have significant loadings at the .01
level for four out of the seven countries. In the first
factor most scales had significant loadings on all seven
countries. America and Spain did not have quite so many
loadings on this factor as did the others. America, in
fact, did not load heavily on the second and third factors

TABLE 13.—Factor I from the revised test data

Scale	M I	RC I	Arg I	G I	PR I	Amer I	S I	Scale	M I	RC I	Arg I	G I	PR I	Amer I	S I
	January, 1968 N=101[a]								May, 1968 N=87[b]						
polite	63	73	62	63	-86	38	29	kind	87	81	69	59	-78	39	74
nice	65	78	71	80	-83	..	52	nice	47	86	34	76	-68	33	77
friendly	75	73	58	83	-78	27	61	sympathetic (#44)	84	85	79	77	-79	81	60
considerate	72	80	71	82	-79	..	27	sympathetic (#9)	71	64	68	78	-68	69	36
sympathetic (#9)	68	69	39	75	-81	82	48	friendly	80	84	62	72	-70	63	62
sympathetic (#44)	68	76	78	80	-70	51	31	considerate	82	83	80	74	-78	54	78
kind	71	76	64	76	-79	27	43	polite	62	82	66	79	-68	30	61
cooperative	37	50	51	66	-77	79	..	warm	77	76	39	80	-66	75	71
warm	62	69	29	79	-72	..	79	generous	72	75	80	79	-33	32	72
good	52	77	54	53	-71	..	..	obliging	76	68	79	76	-62	54	71
generous	70	75	30	66	-74	..	..	good	65	70	46	78	-62	24	30
sociable	65	74	42	63	-72	27	44	sociable	70	73	53	74	-56	51	70
happy	30	43	27	40	-59	..	74	right	36	53	38	71	-45	..	..
obliging	69	61	60	55	-73	..	33	virtuous	36	47	51	67	-49	43	25
dependable	49	61	44	49	-64	26	31	dependable	..	60	28	55	-61	..	38
hardworking	26	35	35	29	-64	..	..	righteous	40	61	43	56	..	24	..
religious	32	61	..	47	-44	..	..	interesting	29	40	45	56	-36	27	..
virtuous	36	61	27	35	-59	..	..	cooperative	42	51	43	55	-45	29	49
right	..	60	54	60	-59	34	40	handsome	26	30	45	54	-34	..	32
mature	..	60	51	40	-49	35	51	religious	38	51	50	32	-26	..	26
handsome	31	57	..	41	-42	..	..	happy	58	37	..	42	-39	..	46
righteous	35	28	..	39	-36	..	..	orderly	..	36	..	31	-45	..	37
healthy	25	33	30	..	..	..	28								

[a]Correlation coefficients of .25 or larger are significant at the .01 level.

[b]Correlation coefficients of .28 or larger are significant at the .01 level.

either. Sympathetic is listed twice because it inadver-
tently was used twice. Scale number 9 on the revised test
was inconsiderate-sympathetic; scale number 44 was sympa-
thetic-inconsiderate. The loadings for these two scales
are more similar in May than in January.

Table 14 shows the scales which appeared in final
Factor I. Like all the final factors, it is composed of
those scales which appeared in four or more countries in
both January and May. They are arranged in the table in
rank order determined by summing the highest loading for
each scale from the January and May data.

TABLE 14.--Final Factor I as determined by totaling the
highest loadings from the test data from January and May,
1968

Scale	January	May	Total
nice	83	86	169
polite	86	82	168
friendly	83	84	167
kind	79	87	166
considerate	82	83	165
sympathetic	80	80	160
warm	79	80	159
generous	75	80	155
good	77	78	155
obliging	73	79	152
sociable	74	74	148
cooperative	79	55	134
right	60	71	131
virtuous	61	67	128
dependable	64	60	124
happy	74	46	120
religious	61	51	112
handsome	57	54	111
righteous	39	56	95

The final first factor is clearly an evaluative factor. Like Factor I of the pretest the scales are qualities which relate to social interaction. They apply equally well to either people or groups. Therefore, rather than distinguishing between the first factor as focusing on the individual and the second as focusing on the group, as was done in defining the pretest factors, the final first factor has been defined simply as a sociability factor.

It is interesting to note that kind and hardworking, the two scales which formed the third factor on the pretest, both loaded on the first factor in the revised test. In fact, kind, with a loading of .87 for Mexico in January, had the highest loading of any scale in the first factor. Kind loaded for at least four countries in both January and May, and so forms part of final Factor I. Hardworking does not, as it loaded significantly for only two countries in May. Altogether three scales were dropped from the January data--hardworking, mature, and healthy--, and two were dropped from the May data--orderly and interesting.

Table 15 shows Factor II for January and May. Nineteen scales loaded significantly on the second factor in January for four or more countries while only ten scales composed the factor in May. Argentina and America are represented by fewer scales in January. In May Germany joins with America in having fewer significant loadings for the second factor.

TABLE 15.--Factor II from the revised test data

| | January, 1968 N=101[a] | | | | | | | | May, 1968 N=87[b] | | | | | | |
Scale	M II	RC II	Arg IV	G II	PR III	Amer III	S VI	Scale	M II	RC II	Arg II	G IV	PR XI	Amer XII	S II
creative	..	-35	79	50	37	50	-28	refined	81	-61	70	41	..	..	80
quick	25	..	59	40	24	78	..	creative	..	-29	35	79	44	..	..
successful	25	-56	67	61	44	77	..	productive	32	-37	34	..	61	78	..
progressive	47	-74	..	73	64	..	-62	rich	75	-24	70	..	60	..	55
rich	29	-46	..	52	73	..	-39	intelligent	71	-73	74	34	32	26	24
refined	35	-73	..	52	66	..	-40	progressive	72	-64	63	..	34	61	54
ambitious	40	-35	62	59	26	71	-29	clean	52	-67	53	..	33	..	..
intelligent	67	-61	..	61	58	37	-70	healthy	..	-55	32	..	32	..	40
clean	44	-67	..	..	67	26	-58	successful	36	-25	..	31	48	47	38
productive	59	-50	34	63	41	24	..	orderly	34	-38	32	..	34	47	..
dependable	43	-28	..	..	59	..	-55								
polite	..	-29	30	36	24	..	-58								
effective	34	..	53	27	40	..	..								
healthy	..	-26	..	..	52	25	-43								
strong	39	-45	..	51	38	..	-31								
thorough	40	-51	..	32	69	..	-34								
sociable	25	..	47	..	34	..	-43								
mature	25	-40	..	..	45	..	-39								
good	41	..	..	31	41	..	-30								

[a]Correlation coefficients of .25 or larger are significant at the .01 level.

[b]Correlation coefficients of .28 or larger are significant at the .01 level.

Table 16 shows final Factor II, defined as an achievement factor. The scales are almost evenly divided between those qualities which help one achieve and those which result from achievement. The person who is creative, progressive, intelligent, productive and healthy is more likely to achieve than one who lacks these qualities. The achiever will certainly be adjudged successful, and these subjects assume that he will also be rich, refined, and clean.

TABLE 16.--Final Factor II as determined by totaling the highest loadings from the test data from January and May, 1968

Scale	January	May	Total
creative	79	79	158
refined	-73	81	154
rich	73	75	148
progressive	-74	72	146
intelligent	-70	74	144
productive	63	78	141
clean	67	-67	134
successful	77	48	125
healthy	52	-55	107

The only scale dropped from the January factor was orderly. It is disconcerting to the novice to discover that scales can load significantly on several factors.[15] Dependable, polite, sociable, and good appeared in Factor II for

[15]See Osgood, op. cit., pp. 186, 187.

January as well as in Factor I for both January and May.
Because they did not appear in Factor II for May and be-
cause their loadings were higher on Factor I, they were
included in the final first factor. Although ambitious
loaded on all seven countries in January, it did not load
significantly on any in May. Effective, strong, thorough,
and mature were also dropped because they loaded signifi-
cantly on only two or three countries in May.

Table 17 shows the third factor for the January and
May data of the revised test. Mexico, Germany, and America
had fewer high loadings on the January factor, while Amer-
ica and Argentina had fewer scales with high loadings on
the May data. Twice as many scales appear in these factors
as in the final factor.

The final third factor is shown in Table 18. This
factor was more difficult to define than the others because
these scales also represent qualities which could contribute
to achievement. The difficulty was compounded by the fact
that successful, productive, and progressive loaded signifi-
cantly on four or more countries in both January and May.
By summing all correlations for these scales in each Fac-
tor II and comparing this total with the sum for all cor-
rections in each Factor III, it was discovered that all
three of these scales had higher loadings in Factor II; so
they were placed in the final second factor.

TABLE 17.--Factor III from the revised test data

| | January, 1968 N=101[a] | | | | | | | | May, 1968 N=87[b] | | | | | | |
Scale	M IV	RC III	Arg II	G IV	PR IV	Amer X	S III	Scale	M IV	RC XII	Arg XIV	G II	PR II	Amer IV	S X
effective	-26	81	45	..	45	..	-64	ambitious	-72	81	..	53	48	..	-84
successful	..	46	31	28	48	..	-79	active	-34	48	..	79	31	-60	-44
progressive	-28	27	77	..	..	..	-33	successful	-41	76	-25	38	28	..	-73
productive	..	45	50	24	28	..	-72	productive	-75	42	-26	32	..	..	..
aggressive	..	71	66	38	36	..	-46	quick	-41	..	-47	27	73	-40	-28
active	..	71	32	..	62	28	-24	confident	-28	..	..	63	45	-28	-30
ambitious	..	68	..	..	50	26	-66	effective	-62	58	-25	35	39	..	-40
confident	-47	49	39	28	..	53	..	progressive	-36	39	..	43	34	..	..
patient	-51	..	-27	..	-33	31	..	interesting	-41	42	-39	29	28	-33	..
righteous	-50	..	40	24	50	..	..								

[a]Correlation coefficients of .25 or larger are significant at the .01 level.

[b]Correlation coefficients of .28 or larger are significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 18.--Final Factor III as determined by totaling the
highest loadings from the test data from January and May,
1968

Scale	January	May	Total
ambitious	68	-84	152
active	71	79	150
efficient	81	-62	143
confident	53	63	116

Active, effective, and confident, on the other hand,
had never loaded significantly on the second factor, al-
though these qualities seem logically to be associated with
achievement. Since they had factored out separately, this
indicated that they formed another aspect of the way in
which the subjects responded to the different ethnic groups.
Ambitious, it will be recalled, had loaded high on the
second factor for January but did not qualify for the final
version of that factor because it did not load on Factor II
at all in May. It did qualify for final Factor III and, in
fact, had the highest loadings for the factor.

What did ambitious, active, effective, and con-
fident have in common which was different from achievement?
It was decided that the common element was ebullience or
enthusiasm. Final Factor III was therefore defined as an
enthusiasm factor. Effective in this factor was apparently
interpreted by the subjects in the sense of striking or im-
pressive rather than in the sense of "producing an effect

or result." Because the scale <u>active</u> appeared in this factor, it was tempting to define it as the activity factor which so frequently appeared as the third factor in Osgood's research.[16] However, the other scales in the factor are related less to physical activity than they are to a state of mind.

Had <u>quick</u> appeared in the January third factor, the possibility of this being an activity factor would have been even greater. However, neither <u>quick</u> nor <u>interesting</u> appear in the January data and so were dropped from the final factor. <u>Aggressive</u>, <u>patient</u>, and <u>righteous</u> do not form part of the final factor as they had significant loadings only in January.

The Final Semantic Differential Test

<u>Résumé</u>

The purpose of the revised test was to develop a twenty-scale test with the factors more clearly defined than in the pretest. The scales with the highest total correlations were chosen. The relative size of these factors follows Osgood's finding that

> . . . evaluation accounted for approximately double the amount of variance due to either potency or activity, these two in turn were approximately double the weight of any subsequent factors.[17]

[16]<u>Ibid.</u>, p. 325.

[17]<u>Loc. cit.</u>

Factor I Sociability	Factor II Achievement	Factor III Enthusiasm
nice	creative	ambitious
polite	refined	active
friendly	rich	effective
kind	progressive	
considerate	intelligent	
sympathetic	productive	
warm		
generous		
good		
obliging		
sociable		

The factors of the final test seem to answer the following questions: What are these people like? What have they done? How much enthusiasm did they put into doing it?

The final semantic differential test was printed up and given to all modern language students[18] at Valley Forge High School in early November, 1968. The plan is to give them again in May, 1969. When or if they will be scored is at present uncertain. However, the raw data will be available for a number of studies both within and between languages.

Reliability and validity of the final semantic differential test

Although a test-retest correlation was run on the semantic differential pretest, the reliability and validity of the final test were not established.

---

[18]Six hundred and fifty students are enrolled in French, German, Russian, and Spanish.

Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum present evidence in Chapter Four of the Measurement of Meaning[19] in support of the reliability and validity of the semantic differential technique. Some of their findings will be reported here.

"The reliability of an instrument is usually said to be the degree to which the same scores can be reproduced when the same objects are measured repeatedly."[20] Osgood and his associates found that an individual's score on a particular scale is too consistent to yield data for test-retest correlations. However, they have checked the scale reliability for forty scales for one hundred subjects. They found that the average errors of measurement for a group of scales was always less than one scale unit. The average error of measurement for an evaluative scale is about one-half a scale unit, while for a potency or activity scale, it is approximately three-quarters of a scale unit.[21] Other research established confidence limits beyond which the researcher can say that a deviation is significant. Confidence limits were established for scales, for an individual's factor score, and also for the factor score of a group of subjects.

A change of factor score of more than 1.00 for the evaluative factor, more than 1.50 for the potency

---

[19]"Evaluation of the Semantic Differential," pp. 125-188.

[20]Osgood, op. cit., p. 126.

[21]Ibid., p. 130.

factor, and more than 1.33 for the activity factor
is significant at the five per cent level.[22]

When group factor scores are compared on a test-retest, a

shift of only about four-tenths of a scale unit is signifi-

cant for any factor at the five per cent level.[23]

"An instrument is said to be valid when it measures

what it is supposed to measure."[24] If the results of a

test correlate highly with some criterion of whatever is

being measured, this is a quantitative measure of the

validity of the new instrument. A semantic differential

purports to measure meaning. However, there is no commonly

accepted criterion of a quantitative measure of meaning; so

it is impossible to determine the validity in this way.

Osgood was forced to rely upon "face validity," that is,

the results correspond to what one would expect from common

sense or logic. Several studies are reported whose results

have high "face validity," although most of these relate to

the evaluative factor. There are some studies of election

results, for instance, which correlate highly with the sub-

jects' scores on concepts related to political issues. The

author discusses the validity of the semantic factors them-

selves. He asks whether evaluative, potency, and activity

are the major dimensions which people "naturally" and

---

[22]Ibid., p. 139.

[23]Ibid., p. 140.

[24]Loc. cit.

"spontaneously" use in making meaningful judgments, and offers some evidence to indicate that they are.[25] He also summarizes data which show that there is some basis in fact to the assumption of equal intervals within the scales.[26]

One conclusion derived from their studies is that

> . . . evaluation is a highly generalizable attribute which may align itself with almost any other dimension of meaning, depending on the concept being judged--and it is often the most dominant attribute of judgment.[27]

An examination of Tables 13, 15, and 17 indicates that the scales had a high degree of stability across all the concepts judged. This is to be expected, however, as all of the concepts are ethnic groups.

Administration of the Tests

Amount of Time Needed

Both the Bogardus and the twenty-scale semantic differential tests can be administered in forty minutes. Most students will be finished in thirty-five. Even the fifty-scale semantic differential and the Bogardus were given in a fifty-five minute class period.

It has already been mentioned that two versions of the Bogardus and semantic differential were prepared. The second version differed from the first in that the countries

[25]Ibid., p. 145.

[26]Ibid., p. 152.

[27]Ibid., p. 188.

were listed in reverse order. In addition to giving one version to one experimental and control class and the other version to the others, the order of taking the two tests was also reversed. One control and one experimental took the Bogardus first in January; the others took the semantic differential first. This order was reversed in May.

Student Reaction

The student reaction to the pretests was almost explosive in the first class. When they got to the Bogardus, which they took last, many of them could not contain themselves. In a few minutes there was almost as much excited conversation going on in the room as there is between classes! Apparently they had never been asked about their prejudices before and were eager to compare them. The writer was able to quiet them down by pointing out that she was sure that whoever made out the test wanted to know how they felt about the test items, not how their neighbors felt. The reaction was similar in the next two classes. The last two classes of the day were quiet all period. On subsequent occasions, most classes have remained quiet, but occasionally there will be a class in which the students "erupt" when they take the Bogardus.

The writer thinks that the semantic differential is more subtle than the Bogardus and that it is harder to hide one's attitudes on it. However, a lengthy note at the

bottom of a pretest semantic began, "I'm not prejudiced, but . . ."; so probably none of the subjects was unaware of what the semantic was about. One or two students in every class would make comments such as, "How am I supposed to know about the Russians? I've never seen one." "How can you be expected to rate a group if you have never met any-one from there?" "Even knowing one person doesn't mean that the rest are like that." "All the other groups have something distinct about them, but this is stupid for Ameri-cans because they are all so different." A few students protested silently. Five or six tests out of 125 came back with "Stupid" written on them. Two students protested by marking the middle space for every scale. Two others were a bit more original; their X's formed a zig-zag pattern down the page. (Tests such as these last four were not scored.) The great majority of the subjects, however, had no difficulty in rating ethnic groups en masse.

Personal Data Sheet

A personal data sheet serves two main functions: to identify the student and to secure such information as age and sex which one may want to use later in the analysis of the data. Even the personal data sheet was revised after the pretest. It can be seen in Appendix A.

Although anonymity is desired on an attitude test, nevertheless the subject must be identified in some way in

order to compare scores before and after treatment. The
telephone number was used for this purpose in the pretest.
However, students were suspicious about giving their phone
number; and two or three in each class refused to do so.
On the revised test, therefore, they were asked to give
their birthdate; and everyone supplied it without question.
The rest of the information asked for was merely an attempt
to mask the purpose of the test.

It was found to be most helpful to ask for "Today's
date." It is also convenient to have a space labeled
"Leave blank."

The key-punching goes faster if the personal data
is listed on the sheet in the same order as it is to be
key-punched.

Summary

The Bogardus Social Distance Scale went through two
stages--a pretest and a revised test. Fifteen countries
(ethnic groups) and seven social distances were used in
both tests. The social distances were arranged beginning
with the most remote one. The countries were reordered on
the revised test; and two new social distances were sub-
stituted.

There were three versions of the semantic differen-
tial test--a pretest, a revised test, and a final test.
Three factors were tentatively defined from the twenty-scale

pretest. Additional scales were added to each of these factors to help define them. This fifty-scale test was then submitted to factor analysis, and the factors defined as _sociability_, _achievement_, and _enthusiasm_. The scales with the highest loadings in each factor were used to form a final test of twenty scales. The revised test was scored by using only those scales which formed the factors of the final test.

No tests were run to establish the reliability or validity of the revised semantic differential. Nevertheless, Osgood and his associates offer evidence that the semantic differential technique is a reliable and valid measure of meaning.

CHAPTER V

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The scores from the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale administered in November, 1967, and the individual scores from the Bogardus and semantic differential scales administered in January and May, 1968, were submitted to a series of tests of one-way analysis of covariance. The program used was BMD04V (Analysis of Covariance for Multiple Covariates) prepared at the Health Sciences Computing Facility at UCLA on June 17, 1964. It was run at the computer center of The Ohio State University on the IBM 7094 computer.

The data was analyzed only for those seventy-eight students who were present on the three testing days. There were forty-six controls and thirty-two experimentals.

These one-way tests of covariance had two basic designs: sometimes the independent variable was the treatment, i.e., controls vs. experimentals; at other times the independent variable was the countries--Mexico, Argentina, Puerto Rico, and Spain.

The tables on the following pages will show that the results follow a pattern. There was never any

significant difference between the experimentals and controls. However, when all the scores were combined and countries were used as the independent variable, there was always a significant difference, Puerto Rico being rated significantly lower than the others.

The students had not been randomly assigned to class sections. Covariance analysis is a way of equating groups statistically rather than through randomization. In this study it was hypothesized that four covariates might significantly affect the posttest score: the pretest score, the dogmatism score, sex, and age. The analysis of covariance controlled for original differences between the control and experimental groups on these covariates, which could have had a significant effect on the posttest scores. The tables will indicate a pattern for the covariates. The pretest always correlated significantly with the posttest score, while sex frequently did.

In addition to the tests of one-way analysis of covariance, correlations were run among the following seven variables: the semantic factor I pretest, the semantic factor II pretest, the semantic factor III pretest, the Bogardus pretest, the Dogmatism scale, sex, and age. The program used was the BMDO2R and was also run on the IBM 7094 computer.

The results of the various one-way analyses of covariance and the correlation matrix will be presented in

this chapter. A two-way factorial analysis of covariance using program BMDO3V was also run on the data in order to check for interaction between treatments and countries. No significant interaction was found. The tests of main effects confirmed the results of the one-way analysis.

. All of the following tables are from the one-way analyses of covariance.

Bogardus

Controls vs. Experimentals

Mexico

Table 19 shows the results of the one-way analysis of covariance of the Bogardus posttest scores on Mexico for controls vs. experimentals. The F ratio of .02 is not significant.

TABLE 19.--Analysis of covariance test of Bogardus posttest: controls vs. experimentals for Mexico

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	1	.62	.62	.02	n.s.
Within Groups	72	2799.47	38.88		
Total	73	2800.09			

Table 20 gives t-values for the covariates on the preceding test. The pretest score is significant at the .01 level and is the only one of the covariates which correlated significantly with the Bogardus posttest score.

TABLE 20.---t-values of covariates of Bogardus posttest: controls vs. experimentals for Mexico

Covariate	Coefficient	Standard Error	t-Value	p
Pretest	0.37	0.09	4.22	.01
Dogmatism	0.00	0.03	0.13	n.s.
Sex	1.47	1.41	1.04	n.s.
Age	0.15	0.90	0.16	n.s.

Argentina

Table 21 indicates that there was no significant difference on the Bogardus posttest for Argentina between the control and experimental classes.

TABLE 21.---Analysis of covariance test of Bogardus posttest: controls vs. experimentals for Argentina

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	1	27.12	27.12	.94	n.s.
Within groups	72	2072.93	28.79		
Total	73	2100.05			

As shown in Table 22, the pretest was the only one of the covariates which correlated significantly with the Bogardus posttest scores.

TABLE 22.---t-values of covariates of Bogardus posttest:
controls vs. experimentals for Argentina

Covariates	Coefficients	Standard Error	t-value	p
Pretest	.42	0.08	5.42	.01
Dogmatism	.00	0.03	0.01	n.s.
Sex	.51	1.24	0.41	n.s.
Age	-.10	0.78	-0.12	n.s.

Puerto Rico

Table 23 gives the results of the control vs. experimental groups on the Bogardus posttest data for Puerto Rico. An F ratio of 1.14 is not significant.

TABLE 23.---Analysis of covariance test of Bogardus posttest:
controls vs. experimentals for Puerto Rico

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	1	52.06	52.06	1.14	n.s.
Within Groups	72	3289.69	45.69		
Total	73	3341.75			

The t-values shown in Table 24 show that for Puerto Rico age as well as the pretest correlated significantly with the Bogardus posttest. The pretest correlated at the .01 level, while age correlated significantly at the .05 level.

TABLE 24.—t-values of covariates of Bogardus posttest: controls vs. experimentals for Puerto Rico

Covariate	Coefficients	Standard Error	t-value	p
Pretest	0.49	0.10	5.00	.01
Dogmatism	-0.07	0.04	-1.86	n.s.
Sex	0.38	1.57	0.24	n.s.
Age	-2.00	0.98	-2.03	.05

Spain

The results of the control vs. experimental Bogardus posttest data for Spain are shown in Table 25. As for the other three countries, there was no significant difference. An F ratio of 3.98 is needed for significance at the .05 level.

TABLE 25.—Analysis of covariance test of Bogardus posttest: controls vs. experimentals for Spain

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	1	75.09	75.09	3.63	n.s.
Within Groups	72	1489.93	20.69		
Total	73	1565.02			

As indicated in Table 26, the pretest was the only covariate which correlated significantly with the Bogardus posttest.

TABLE 26.---t-values of covariates of Bogardus posttest:
controls vs. experimentals for Spain

Covariates	Coefficients	Standard Error	t-values	p
Pretest	.47	0.07	6.46	.01
Dogmatism	-.02	0.02	-0.71	n.s.
Sex	-.14	1.09	-0.13	n.s.
Age	.13	0.67	0.19	n.s.

Comparing Countries

A separate one-way analysis of covariance was run
using the combined scores of all four classes and comparing
countries. The results are shown in Table 27. Since F =
5.75 is significant at the .01 level, the students did not
rate all countries the same on the Bogardus posttest.

TABLE 27.---Analysis of covariance test of Bogardus posttest:
combined scores comparing countries

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	571.63	190.54	5.75	.01
Within Groups	304	10072.90	33.13		
Total	307	10644.53			

Again the pretest was the only covariate which cor-
related significantly with the posttest scores, as given in
Table 28.

TABLE 28.—t-values of covariates of Bogardus posttest:
combined scores comparing countries

Covariates	Coefficients	Standard Error	t-value	p
Pretest	.45	.04	10.43	.01
Dogmatism	-.02	.02	-1.28	n.s.
Sex	.58	.68	0.85	n.s.
Age	-.46	.43	-1.07	n.s.

The adjusted means for the Bogardus posttest scores are presented in Table 29. A subsequent t-test of differences between countries indicated that Puerto Rico is significantly worse at the .01 level.

TABLE 29.—Adjusted means for countries on Bogardus posttest

Country	Mean	Error	p
Mexico	22.90	.65	. .
Argentina	23.78	.65	. .
Puerto Rico	20.57	.65	.01
Spain	24.00	.65	. .

Semantic Factor I

Controls vs. Experimentals

Mexico

A one-way analysis of covariance was run comparing the results of the control vs. experimental scores on the Semantic Factor I posttest data for Mexico. The F ratio

shown in Table 30 reveals that there was no significant

difference between the two groups.

TABLE 30.—Analysis of covariance test of Semantic Factor I
posttest: controls vs. experimentals for Mexico

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	1	26.46	26.46	.51	n.s.
Within Groups	72	3775.76	52.44		
Total	73	3802.22			

Table 31 gives the coefficients of the covariates

on the preceding test.   Both the pretest and sex correlate

significantly at the .01 level.

TABLE 31.—t-values of covariates of Semantic Factor I post-
test: controls vs. experimentals for Mexico

Covariates	Coefficients	Standard Error	t-value	p
Pretest	0.64	0.08	7.95	.01
Dogmatism	0.05	0.04	1.45	n.s.
Sex	-4.72	1.70	-2.78	.01
Age	0.54	1.06	0.50	n.s.

Argentina

The results of the Semantic Factor I data for the

control vs. experimental groups for Argentina on Semantic

Factor I are shown in Table 32.   There is no significant

difference between the two groups.

TABLE 32.--Analysis of covariance test of Semantic Factor I
posttest: controls vs. experimentals for Argentina

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	1	103.53	103.53	1.67	n.s.
Within Groups	72	4459.79	61.94		
Total	73	4563.32			

The covariates for this test are shown in Table 33.
The pretest scores correlated significantly for Argentina
at the .01 level while sex correlated at the .05 level.

TABLE 33.--t-values of covariates of Semantic Factor I post-
test: controls vs. experimentals for Argentina

Covariates	Coefficients	Standard Error	t-value	p
Pretest	0.53	0.10	5.06	.01
Dogmatism	0.03	0.04	0.70	n.s.
Sex	-4.59	1.85	-2.48	.05
Age	0.12	1.15	0.10	n.s.

Puerto Rico

Table 34 presents the results of the test comparing
controls vs. experimentals for Puerto Rico. The F ratio is
not significant.

TABLE 34.--Analysis of covariance test of Semantic Factor I
posttest: controls vs. experimentals for Puerto Rico

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	1	83.62	83.62	1.93	n.s.
Within Groups	72	3124.22	43.39		
Total	73	3207.84			

In Table 35 the covariates are given for the pre-
ceding test. Both the pretest and sex correlated signifi-
cantly at the .01 level.

TABLE 35.--t-values of covariates of Sematnic Factor I post-
test: controls vs. experimentals for Puerto Rico

Covariates	Coefficients	Standard Error	t-value	p
Pretest	0.61	0.07	9.03	.01
Dogmatism	0.06	0.03	1.91	n.s.
Sex	-4.33	1.60	-2.70	.01
Age	0.36	0.96	0.38	n.s.

Spain

The Semantic Factor I results for Spain for the ex-
perimental vs. control groups are given in Table 36. The F
ratio of 1.31 is not significant.

TABLE 36.—Analysis of covariance test of Semantic Factor I
posttest: controls vs. experimentals for Spain

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	1	69.75	69.75	1.31	n.s.
Within Groups	72	3835.68	53.27		
Total	73	3905.43			

Table 37 shows the covariates for Spain on this test. The pretest scores at the .01 level and sex at the .05 level each correlated significantly with the posttest scores for Semantic Factor I.

TABLE 37.—t-values of covariates of Semantic Factor I posttest: controls vs. experimentals for Spain

Covariates	Coefficients	Standard Error	t-value	p
Pretest	0.57	0.09	6.42	.01
Dogmatism	0.02	0.04	0.65	n.s.
Sex	-3.71	1.73	-2.14	.05
Age	-0.99	1.06	-0.91	n.s.

Comparing Countries

In Table 38 a comparison of countries was made using all scores combined on a one-way analysis of covariance. The F test of 4.84 is significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 38.—Analysis of covariance test of Semantic Factor I
posttest: combined scores comparing countries

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	747.21	249.07	4.84	.01
Within Groups	304	15653.37	51.49		
Total	307	16400.58			

The coefficients of the covariates for this same
test appear in Table 39. Three covariates correlated sig-
nificantly with the Semantic Factor I posttest scores. The
pretest and sex correlated at the .01 level, while the
scores of the dogmatism scale correlated at the .05 level.

TABLE 39.—t-test of covariates of Semantic Factor I post-
test: combined scores comparing countries

Covariates	Coefficient	Standard Error	t-value	p
Pretest	0.60	.04	14.56	.01
Dogmatism	0.04	.02	2.25	.05
Sex	-4.27	.87	-4.93	.01
Age	0.01	.53	0.02	n.s.

Table 40 shows the adjusted means for the coun-
tries. A subsequent t-test of differences between countries
indicated that Puerto Rico is significantly worse at the .01
level.

TABLE 40.—Adjusted means for countries on Semantic Factor I posttest

Country	Mean	Error	p
Mexico	33.89	.81	. .
Argentina	34.81	.81	. .
Puerto Rico	37.88	.81	.01
Spain	34.42	.81	. .

Semantic Factor II

Controls vs. Experimentals

For the Bogardus and Semantic Factor I data, a one-way analysis of covariance was run for each country separately. This was not done for the scores from Semantic Factors II and III. Instead a one-way analysis of covariance was run for these two factors across all four countries together rather than individually.

Table 41 compares Semantic Factor II posttest scores for the control vs. experimental classes across all four countries. The F ratio does not reach the level of statistical significance.

TABLE 41.—Analysis of covariance test of Semantic Factor II posttest: controls vs. experimentals across all four countries

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	1	3.81	3.81	.21	n.s.
Within Groups	306	5610.62	18.34		
Total	307	5614.43			

Table 42 gives the covariates for the above test. The pretest and sex were the two covariates which correlated significantly with the Semantic Factor II posttest, both at the .01 level.

TABLE 42.---t-test of covariates of Semantic Factor II posttest: controls vs. experimentals across all four countries

Covariates	Coefficients	Standard Error	t-value	p
Pretest	0.54	.05	10.05	.01
Dogmatism	-0.01	.01	-0.92	n.s.
Sex	-1.42	.50	-2.86	.01
Age	-0.33	.31	-1.05	n.s.

Comparing Countries

The results of the test of the combined scores for Factor II comparing countries is given in Table 43. An F ratio of 4.43 indicates a significant difference at the .01 level on how the students rated the four countries.

TABLE 43.---Analysis of covariance test of Semantic Factor II posttest: combined scores comparing countries

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	235.35	78.45	4.43	.01
Within Groups	304	5379.09	17.69		
Total	307	5614.44			

The covariates for this test are presented in Table 44. Again the pretest and sex correlated significantly at the .01 level.

TABLE 44.--t-test of covariates of Semantic Factor II posttest: combined scores comparing countries

Covariates	Coefficient	Standard Error	t-value	p
Pretest	0.54	.05	10.05	.01
Dogmatism	-0.01	.01	-0.92	n.s.
Sex	-1.42	.50	-2.86	.01
Age	-0.33	.31	-1.05	n.s.

The adjusted means for the countries on Semantic Factor II are given in Table 45. Subsequent t-tests indicated that Argentina was significantly better at the .01 level, while Puerto Rico was significantly worse at the .05 level.

TABLE 45.--Adjusted means for countries on Semantic Factor II posttest

Country	Mean	Error	p
Mexico	18.88	.47	..
Argentina	17.32	.47	.01
Puerto Rico	19.75	.47	.05
Spain	18.59	.47	..

Semantic Factor III

Controls vs. Experimentals

The controls vs. experimentals were compared across all four countries in the test whose results appear in Table 46. There was no significant difference between the two groups for Semantic Factor III posttest scores.

TABLE 46.--Analysis of covariance test of Semantic Factor III posttest: controls vs. experimentals across all four countries

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	1	3.28	3.28	.41	n.s.
Within Groups	306	2459.79	8.04		
Total	307	2463.07			

The covariates for the above test are shown in Table 47. Two covariates correlated significantly, the pretest and sex, both at the .01 level.

TABLE 47.--t-test of covariates of Semantic Factor III posttest: controls vs. experimentals across all four countries

Covariates	Coefficients	Standard Error	t-value	p
Pretest	.46	.05	8.51	.01
Dogmatism	-.01	.01	-0.73	n.s.
Sex	-.88	.33	-2.66	n.s.
Age	-.04	.21	-0.21	.01

Comparing Countries

All the scores were combined and a one-way analysis of covariance was run comparing countries for Semantic Factor III. The results are shown in Table 48. There was a statistically significant difference (.01) in the way the countries were rated.

TABLE 48.—Analysis of covariance test of Semantic Factor III posttest: combined scores comparing countries

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	110.66	36.89	4.77	.01
Within Groups	304	2352.41	7.74		
Total	307	2463.07			

Table 49 shows the covariate coefficients for the Semantic Factor III data. Both the pretest and sex correlated at the .01 level of significance.

TABLE 49.—t-test of covariates of Semantic Factor III posttest: combined scores comparing countries

Covariate	Coefficient	Standard Error	t-value	p
Pretest	.46	.05	8.51	.01
Dogmatism	-.01	.01	-0.73	n.s.
Sex	-.88	.33	-2.66	.01
Age	-.04	.21	-0.21	n.s.

Table 50 shows the adjusted means for each country on the Semantic Factor III posttest. A t-test showed that Puerto Rico was significantly worse at the .01 level.

TABLE 50.—Adjusted means for countries on Semantic Factor III posttest

Country	Mean	Error	p
Mexico	10.52	.32	..
Argentina	9.83	.32	..
Puerto Rico	11.41	.32	.01
Spain	11.08	.32	..

Correlations among Seven Variables

Table 51 shows the correlation matrix for seven variables: sex, age, and the underline pretest scores on the three measuring instruments used, namely, the semantic differential scale, the Bogardus Social Distance Scale, and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. The number of cases was 312 (78 subjects x 4 countries).

TABLE 51.—Correlations among seven variables[a]

	SemI Pre.	SemII Pre.	SemIII Pre.	Bog. Pre.	Dog. Pre.	Sex	Age
Variable Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1		0.51	0.44	-0.25	0.05	-0.27	-0.03
2			0.70	-0.23	-0.01	-0.17	-0.03
3				-0.19	-0.01	-0.19	-0.03
4					0.12	0.15	0.01
5						-0.07	-0.24
6							-0.08
7							

[a]On 300 df correlation coefficients of .113 are significant at the .05 level; coefficients of .148 at .01 level.

Table 52 is a summary of significant correlations. In order to interpret the negative signs on the preceding tables, the reader should know that 1 was the code for boys and 2 for girls; that a low score on the semantic differential and dogmatism scales indicated a more favorable rating, while a high score on the Bogardus indicated greater acceptance. Correlations below .40 are considered weak, even though they may be statistically significant; those in the .40-.60 range are considered respectable; while those greater than .60 are rated as strong.

TABLE 52.--Summary of significant correlation on seven variables

Variable	Corr. Coeff.	Variable	Corr. Coeff.
Sem I/Sem II	.51	Sem III/Bog.	-.19
Sem I/Sem III	.44	Sem III/Sex	-.19
Sem I/Sex	-.27		
Sem I/Bog.	-.25	Bog./Sex	.15
		Bog./Dog.	.12
Sem II/Sem III	.70		
Sem II/Bog.	-.23	Dog./Age	-.24
Sem II/Sex	-.17		

The strongest correlation is that between Semantic Factors II and III. Factor II was the achievement factor and Factor III was defined as the enthusiasm factor. The reader will recall that several of the scales which were ultimately placed in Factor II had also loaded significantly on Factor III. Since these two factors shared loadings on

the factor analysis, this high correlation, then, is not surprising.

The correlations between Factor I and the other two factors suggest a certain consistency among the factors. Perhaps the Protestant work ethic is still operative, for these subjects seem to like people whom they adjudge to be enthusiastic achievers and vice versa.

Although the Bogardus scale correlated with all three factors of the semantic differential test at the .01 level, nevertheless the correlations were weak.

It is interesting to observe that the dogmatism scale did not correlate at all with any of the semantic factors and that its correlation with the Bogardus scale, while statistically significant at the .05 level, was very weak.

Girls gave consistently more favorable responses on all factors of the semantic differential and on the Bogardus, although they were not significantly more open-minded than the boys as measured on the dogmatism scale.

The final table, Table 53, presents the pre- and posttest means for the Bogardus scale and the three factors of the semantic differential. Inspection of the means shows differences so small that apparently very little attitude change occurred in either the control or experimental group.

TABLE 53.—Pre- and posttest non-adjusted mean scores for
controls vs. experimentals across all countries

Measure[a]	Pretest[b]	Posttest
Bogardus	21.68 22.59	22.14 23.78
Semantic I	37.54 32.74	36.79 33.03
Semantic II	19.22 17.55	19.32 17.66
Semantic III	11.15 10.06	11.13 10.12

[a]On the Bogardus a high score is more favorable;
on the semantic differential a low score is more favorable.

[b]Upper score is for the control group; lower score
is for the experimental.

Summary and Conclusions

The hypothesis of this study was that it is possible
to develop more positive attitudes toward native speakers
of Spanish. The hypothesis was not proved, for there was
no statistically significant difference between the control
and experimental groups.

The objectives of the study were two-fold: (1) to
develop techniques which would foster more positive atti-
tudes and (2) to develop techniques for measuring attitudes
toward native speakers of Spanish.

The first objective was not met, for the techniques
used did not produce a difference between the two groups.

The writer suggests four possible reasons why these techniques were ineffectual. (1) Attitudes cannot be changed in the classroom setting. (2) These techniques are not good ones; they should be discarded and new ones developed. (3) These techniques are good but not sufficient; they should be supplemented. (4) More time is needed to produce attitude change. The writer at this point is unwilling to concede that attitudes cannot be changed in the classroom, nor that the techniques were poor. She believes that not enough techniques were employed, that the ones used should be supplemented by others, and that the program should extend over the entire school year. Chapter VI is devoted to additional suggestions.

The second objective, that of developing techniques for measuring attitudes, was met. Two tests were devised in order to measure the cognitive, affective, and conative aspects of attitude. Factors II and III of the semantic differential, identified as achievement and enthusiasm factors, measure the cognitive aspect, while Factor I, the sociability factor, measures the affective aspect. The Bogardus Social Distance scale measures the conative aspect. Because the semantic differential is more time-consuming to administer and to score than the Bogardus, it was hoped that the correlation between them would be strong enough to justify using only the Bogardus as the measuring instrument.

However, the correlation was not high. Apparently these aspects are sufficiently discrete that they should be measured independently. The writer therefore recommends that both the semantic differential and the Bogardus be used to measure attitude change in future investigations of this type.

The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale measures open- and closed-mindedness. It is believed by some that those who are more open-minded will be more likely to change than those who are more closed-minded. That is really a separate hypothesis. The dogmatism scale is not necessary for the design of this study. Furthermore, there was no correlation between it and the semantic differential, and its correlation with the Bogardus was extremely weak. Therefore, there is no need to include the dogmatism scale on further research using this design.

CHAPTER VI

FURTHER TECHNIQUES FOR DEVELOPING MORE
POSITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARD NATIVE
SPEAKERS OF SPANISH

The results of the attitude tests which were pre-
sented in Chapter V show no significant difference between
the attitudes of students in the experimental and control
classes. It would seem that the few activities described
in Chapter III were not sufficient to produce the desired
change. A more comprehensive, year-long program may be
needed. If the writer were repeating the experiment, she
would try to incorporate into her teaching all of the ideas
and suggestions which will be presented in this chapter.

In 1968 both North Carolina and Illinois published
guides for high-school teachers who are concerned with
building a better understanding of other cultures. The
North Carolina guide was prepared by Tora Tuve Ladu and is
called Teaching for Cross-Cultural Understanding.[1] Dr. How-
ard Lee Nostrand of the University of Washington was one of
the consultants, and the materials reflect his cultural-

---

[1]Tora Tuve Ladu, Teaching for Cross-Cultural Under-
standing (Foreign Language Curriculum Series Publication No.
414; Raleigh, North Carolina: State Department of Public
Instruction, 1968).

anthropological orientation. The three main headings are "Culture," "Social Structure," and "Ecology." In the "Culture" section, the value system, underlying assumptions of fact, art forms, the language, and paralanguage and kinesics are discussed for both the French and Hispanic cultures separately. The following topics are discussed under the Hispanic system of "Social Structure": the family, leisure-time activities, education, religion, political and judicial institutions, economy, communications, social stratification, and social proprieties. (The French system has similar though not identical topics.) The subjects discussed under the Hispanic section of "Ecology" are the attitude toward physical and social environment, housing, travel and transportation, and technology. In addition to an annotated bibliography, there are also suggestions to the teacher for integrating these materials into the classroom.

The Illinois materials were prepared under the editorship of H. Ned Seelye, who taught at the Colegio Americano in Guatemala City and who incidentally has attempted to develop a test of the awareness of typical Guatemalan cultural patterns.[2] It is called A Handbook on Latin America for Teachers[3] and is designed for social studies as well as

---

[2]H. Ned Seelye, "Field Notes on Cross-Cultural Testing," Language Learning, XVI (Nos. 1 and 2, 1966), pp. 77-85.

[3]H. Ned Seelye (Ed.), A Handbook on Latin America for Teachers (Springfield, Illinois: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1968).

Spanish teachers. It, too, contains an annotated bibliog-
raphy.

These two handbooks will provide the interested
teacher with enough materials and ideas to supplement lan-
guage instruction for a whole year. Neither one claims to
be the final word, but each provides a usable foundation
which can be expanded later as the teacher discovers how
the students react to the materials.

The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to
ideas which the writer has developed since the 1967-68
school year. They can be roughly classified into ideas re-
lated to information and concepts which may help develop
more positive attitudes and ideas pertaining to attitudes
themselves, how they develop, and the role that they play
in personality.

Ideas Related to Information and Concepts

Latin American Values

Suggestions have already been given in Chapter III
for developing an awareness of the concept of values and
for examining American values.

John Gillin discusses Latin American values in a
paper which can be found in Contemporary Cultures and Soci-
eties of Latin America.[4] He cites the following values:

---

[4]John Gillin, "Ethos Components in Modern Latin
American Culture," Contemporary Culture and Societies of
Latin America, ed. Dwight B. Heath and Richard N. Adams
(New York: Random House, 1965), pp. 503-517.

individuality, dignidad, machismo, personalismo, acceptance
of social inequality, and the idealistic or transcendental
world view (the Latin American tends to place greater value
on spiritual than on pragmatic concerns).

The discussion of Hispanic values in the North Car-
olina materials[5] follows closely the themes presented by
Nostrand in an article appearing in Hispania in 1961.[6] In
addition to the values which Gillin discusses, Nostrand also
discusses regionalism, serenidad, beauty, leisure and work,
human nature mistrusted, cultura vs. realidad, and rising
expectations.

The Gillin materials are somewhat livelier in style
(making them more appealing to teen-agers) and make more
comparisons with the North American counterparts of these
values (making them more understandable to a young audi-
ence).

The writer recommends preparing a synthesis of the
discussions of both these authors, duplicating enough copies
so that each student can have one, and spending a portion
of class time reading them over together and discussing
them. If this is done early in the school year, there will
be many opportunities to relate the Latin American value
system to other class activities.

―――――――――――――――

[5]Ladu, op. cit., pp. 14-20.

[6]Howard Lee Nostrand, "Literature, Area Study, and
Hispanic Culture," Hispania, XLIV (September, 1961), pp.
465-472.

Reading list of books set
in an Hispanic culture

The teacher may want the class to read some materi-
als which translate values from an abstraction into a potent
force which directs man's actions. Following is an anno-
tated list of books for high-school students which are set
in an Hispanic culture. In sharing their reactions to
these books with their classmates, it is recommended that
students note differences between their own value systems
and that of the hero of the book, problems which are dif-
ferent from those which American teen-agers have to solve,
or solutions which are different from North American ones.
Since individuals' perceptions vary, this assignment may be
more fruitful if several people read the same book and
share their reactions to it.

Alegria, Ciro. Broad and Alien Is the World. Translated
        by Harriet de Onis. New York: Farrar and Rine-
        hart, 1941.
            About Indian serfs on a Peruvian hacienda.

Brown, Vinson. Black Treasure. Boston: Little, Brown,
        1951.
            Dween sets out to seek hidden treasure in the
        Panamanian jungle but settles down to farm. Ad-
        venture and love.

Colman, Hila. The Girl from Puerto Rico. New York:
        Morrow, 1961.
            A middle-class Puerto Rican girl suddenly finds
        herself living in a slum in New York City. Well-
        written.

Clark, Ann Nolan. Santiago. New York: Viking Press, 1955.
            A young Indian boy in Guatemala is raised as a
        middle-class ladino. Later he is taken back to his
        grandfather's Indian village. As a teen-ager he
        leaves the village and makes his way alone in the
        world.

Daly, Maureen. Twelve Around the World. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Co., 1957.
    Each chapter describes a teen-ager in a different country. One chapter is about Luis Hernandez of Malaga, Spain. He is dissatisfied.

Elliot, Elisabeth. No Graven Image. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.
    Written by the widow of a missionary killed by Quichua Indians. Not a religious book. Shows conflict of culture values in a non-Christian society. Highly recommended.

Hobart, Alice Tisdale. The Peacock Sheds His Tail. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1945.
    A Mexican girl of the upper class marries an American working in Mexico. Older girls.

Laszlo, A. My Uncle Jacinto. Translated by Isabel Quigly. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1958.
    One day in Madrid. An old ex-bullfighter and his seven-year old nephew. Wit and gentle humor. Not sentimental but touches the heart.

Laverty, Maura. No More than Human. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1944.
    A young Irish girl goes to Spain as a governess. After a tempestuous love affair there, she returns to Ireland and a beau.

Lopez y Fuentes, Gregorio. The Indian. Translated by Anita Brenner. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1961.
    About the Mexican Revolution of 1910.

Mayerson, Charlotte L. (ed.) Two Blocks Apart: Juan Gonzales and Peter Quinn. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.
    Based on actual conversations with a Puerto Rican boy who has migrated to New York City and a boy of Irish extraction who lives just two blocks away.

McClarren, J. K. Mexican Assignment. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1957.
    About young veterinarians who go to Mexico to help stamp out aftosa.

Means, Florence C. Alicia. New York: Houghton, Mifflin, 1953.
    A Mexican American of Denver is looked down on at home but learns to appreciate her heritage during

her junior year at the Universidad Nacional in
Mexico.

Niggli, Josephine. Mexican Village. Chapel Hill, N. C.:
University of North Carolina Press, 1945.
    Ten short stories about everyday life in a
Mexican village near Monterrey.

_____. Step Down Elder Brother. New York: Rinehart
and Co., 1948.
    About the problems of a Mexican family.

Rivera, Jose Eustacio. The Vortex. Translated by Earle K.
James. New York: Putnam, 1935.
    About rubber gatherers in the Colombian jungle.

Steinbeck, John. The Pearl. New York: Viking Press,
1957.
    About a poor fisherman who finds a valuable
pearl.

Trevino, Elizabeth Bolton. My Heart Lies South. New York:
Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1953.
    An American marries a Mexican and tells about
how she became adjusted to the Mexican way of life.

_____. Where the Heart Is. New York: Doubleday and
Co., Inc., 1962.
    Written by the same author about twelve years
later when her boys are teen-agers. Describes
their middle-class life in Mexico City.

Whitney, Phyllis A. A Long Time Coming. New York: David
McKay Co., 1954.
    About a self-centered eighteen-year-old mid-
western girl who comes into contact with the migrants
who work in her father's cannery. Prejudice and
discrimination, juvenile delinquency, role of
churches re social issues, hostility between vari-
ous social groups, plight of migratory workers, and
personality problems plus romance make an intriguing
plot.

Wiley, Karla. Assignment: Latin America: a Story of the
Peace Corps. New York: David McKay Co., 1968.
    The country is not named, but the girl works
with women weavers.

Young, Bob and Jan. Across the Tracks. New York: Julian
Messner, 1958.
    Betty Ochoa, a third-generation Mexican-Ameri-
can, is surprised to find that she is prejudiced
against her own cultural group.

Impressions of the United States[7]

    . This book, a collection of letters supposedly written by foreign students studying in the United States, has already been mentioned in Chapter III, where discussion questions were suggested for two of the letters, "Jose invites a girl on a date," and "Eusebio observes the dog's life in America." Altogether there are nine letters by Latin American students. The letters can be read out loud to the class in five to ten minutes. The book itself suggests discussion questions for each letter; some additional ones will be presented here.

    In "Pilar attends school with the teen-ager," a girl from Cordoba, Spain, reacts to the American high school. This letter provides an opportunity to introduce the concept of ethnocentrism. Which school system does Pilar prefer? Which system do you prefer? Why do you prefer your school system and Pilar hers? It is natural to assume that the way one is used to doing things is the norm. It is also easy to think that the norm is the best way. This type of thinking is called ethnocentrism.

    Pilar's reaction to dating at age fourteen is another example of ethnocentrism. In Mexico middle- and upper-class girls do not begin to date until they are fifteen. In Spain the age is eighteen. Since Pilar considers

---

[7]Sophie Smith Hollander, Impressions of the United States (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1964).

eighteen as the proper age to start dating, naturally she is shocked that American girls begin four years earlier.

There seems to be a different attitude toward cheating not only in Latin America but also in some other parts of the world. If the teacher cares to discuss this topic, this letter provides an entree. The class should first acknowledge that cheating occurs in American schools and should try to establish what the American attitude toward it is. In so doing, the students may discover that frequently we have values which operate at two different levels and may be contradictory, i.e., ideal values and norms. The American ideal frowns on cheating, although it may, in fact, be condoned in certain situations. A news article which appeared early in 1969 reported that students in India wanted the government to permit cheating in university examinations. It may be that other cultures do not frown on cheating, even as an ideal value. Pilar suggests that cheating is a way of showing friendship.

The telephone is mentioned as a teen-age status symbol. This could be a springboard to a discussion of status symbols in general, not only teen-age, but also American middle-class. The teacher might point out that the solid gold bracelet is a status symbol for middle-class Latin American and Spanish women, as is the expensive watch for men.

The letter "Munoz from Peru takes a walk" illustrates the difference between the Peruvian and American attitude toward the police. The Peruvian considers the police as "loud, ignorant bullies who are eager to show their power."[8] The teacher might ask the class what their attitude toward policemen is. Do they think all Americans share their attitude? The teacher can point out that in Latin America traffic policemen and criminal policemen are two separate groups.

The custom of the mordida, the bribe paid to the traffic policeman, could be included in a discussion of this letter. If the teacher cares to expand the custom of the mordida and the role it plays in other aspects of Mexican life, the teacher is referred to the discussion in Erasmus' book, Man Takes Control.[9]

Another idea which can be brought out after reading this letter is that the Latin American refuses to be controlled by a machine. For this reason there are few traffic lights in Latin American cities, traffic being controlled by policemen.

This letter could be followed very logically by a presentation of the difference in the American and Mexican view of law enforcement as illustrated by Hall's account of

---

[8] Ibid., p. 21.

[9] Charles J. Erasmus, Man Takes Control (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1961), pp. 225-230.

traffic enforcement in a town in Southwestern United States.[10]

"Margot from Colombia finds a job, but--" tells about a middle-class Latin American girl who decides to emulate her American college classmates by getting herself a part-time job. She quits at the end of the first day. It is an excellent illustration of Latin American values in relation to social classes and manual labor.

Ask the girls in the class if they would have taken this job? Kept it? Why not? Talk about the relationship between occupation and social class in the United States. Discuss the fact that we draw the limit on manual labor at a different point from where the Latin American draws it. This concept of different limits can be related to ideas as disparate as off-shore territorial limits, the racial color-line, and the physical liberties permissible between boys and girls on a date.

Ask the students to note Margot's frequent references to her feelings. Ask them if they think they would have expressed their feelings this often in one letter. Do they remember as a child being taught to suppress displaying certain feelings in public? Which feelings? Point out that some Latin Americans believe that Americans are very cold because we do not express our feelings openly. Can

[10]Edward T. Hall, The Silent Language (A Premier Book, No. d117; Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1963), pp. 81-83.

they suggest any culture groups which are more reserved than we about expressing our feelings? (The teacher must be careful not to unwittingly create the impression that only Spanish speakers do things differently. It might be wise to read and discuss an occasional letter from students from other parts of the world.)

The letter "Papa wants Yoland to be a success" is more entertaining than anything else. It may, however, make a few students realize for the first time that it is just as hard for others to learn English as it is for them to learn Spanish. The most serious idea which this letter can bring out is the contrast in Yolande's reason for learning English and theirs for studying Spanish.

An interesting activity suggested in the text following the letter "Alfredo buys a second-hand car" is for the students to list as many things as they can that have been woven into the pattern of American life because of the automobile. The teacher might also ask them how they think their lives will change when they are able to drive.

"Graciela finds him quick to smile but slow to shake hands" is a good letter to read following a discussion of the Latin American distrust of strangers.[11] In it Graciela tells what a pleasant surprise it is to be greeted by strangers with a smile and even an "Hello."

---

[11] Ladu, op. cit., p. 19.

On the other hand, she is puzzled by the fact that women do not shake hands here. Discuss when Americans do shake hands. This would be a good time to teach or review Latin American greetings between friends, relatives, men, women, and children. Let them do a little role-playing and actually perform the greetings.

On page 104 Graciela says,

> If we did not shake another's hand with enthusiasm in Buenos Aires we would be regarded as impolite and exceedingly cold, and we would then even offend the other person.

The teacher might use this statement to introduce the idea which Hall develops in The Silent Language, namely, that we communicate in many ways besides speech. (Suggestions for using The Silent Language will be given in a later section of this chapter.)

After reading "Jorge observes Thanksgiving--homecoming day for Americans," the teacher might ask whether the conversation or activities in their homes on Thanksgiving Day would give a foreign visitor any indication of the reason for the holiday. Where did they learn about the reason for Thanksgiving? The teacher might want to follow a reading of this letter by a discussion of a holiday which is unique to Latin America, such as the Day of the Dead or Carnaval.

Por esas Espanas[12]

---

[12]Pedro Villa Fernandez, Por esas Espanas (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963).

A Spanish reader designed to show insight into certain Hispanic customs and attitudes is <u>Por esas Espanas</u> by Pedro Villa Fernandez. It is suitable for high-school classes in the third year or late in the second year. The teacher who is in a position to select a new reader is advised to consider this one. Six of the stories are especially recommended.

"El estudio del elefante" is a delightful example of stereotyping and a pleasant starting point for a look at other ways of thinking. It is the familiar story of the professor at an international university who assigns each of his graduate students to do a study of the elephant. The French student writes about "Romanticism in the Elephant"; the American's study is called "Bigger and Better Elephants" and is profusely illustrated with photographs; the Argentinian decides not to cooperate in the study; and so on for seven different nationalities.

"Idilio chileno" is about an American young man who has fallen in love with an upper-class Chilean girl. Although the Chilean dating customs at first appear very restrictive to him, with the help of his sweetheart he discovers that there are some loopholes in the system which will permit him to see her alone frequently.

"La politica del buen vecino" is a cleverly written account of the first impressions of a North American and a Latin American couple as they look at each other across a

restaurant. Once introduced, however, their negativism
vanishes.

"Mr. Yoni" describes how a bustling young North
American engineer on his first job in Guatemala and overly
concerned with meeting deadlines, discovers the necessity
for the workmen's leisurely pace.

"Toda una senora" is a vignette about an elderly
Spanish widow living in genteel poverty who refuses to
travel because she can no longer afford to do so first
class. An American couple invite her to accompany them on
a trip. With great dignity she mingles with the other
first-class passengers, satisfied that she is where she
belongs; for she is, after all, a lady. The sketch re-
flects class consciousness and la dignidad de la persona.

"Un raro" reveals that a foreigner who believes
himself completely accepted in the host country is still
considered an outsider.

Social Class

Latin Americans are much more aware of social class
than are many Americans. When describing life in a Span-
ish-speaking country, it is important to specify the social
class to which the description applies. Therefore it is
recommended that the teacher spend some time developing the
concept of class. There are perhaps two reasons why many
American high-school students are relatively unaware of

social class. Because so many of them belong to the middle class and because the middle class is the largest in the United States and the one whose values predominate, these students assume--and with some justification--that most Americans live much as they do. Furthermore, the American ideal value which stresses the equality of all persons under the law and before God also tends to make them reluctant to acknowledge social class distinctions.

Social class in the United States

Sociologists have discovered that social classes do exist in the United States. In order to move from the known into the unknown, it would therefore seem advisable to spend some time developing an awareness of social class in the United States before discussing the class concept in Latin America.

The teacher might want to begin with a description of the six social classes defined by Warner;[13] upper-upper, lower-upper, upper-middle, lower-middle, upper-lower, and lower-lower. The Warner study, originally published in 1945, has been criticized on the one hand because of the method by which he arrived at these social classes--by asking people to tell the social class to which other members of the community belonged--and on the other hand because he

---

[13]W. Lloyd Warner, Social Class in America (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960), pp. 11-15.

has confused social status with social class. Nevertheless references to Warner's classification are frequent, and this will probably be the students' first look at their society in terms other than upper-, middle-, and lower-class.

A study by Centers was published in 1961.[14] He prefers to define society in terms of the four classes which came out of a study conducted by Fortune magazine in 1945. These are upper class, middle class, working class, and lower class.[15] These names resulted from asking people to tell to which class they themselves belonged. Centers develops the idea that social classes are interest groups which share certain attitudes.

> The status and role of the individual in relation to the means of production and exchange of goods and services gives rise in him to a consciousness of membership in some social class which shares certain political and economic attitudes, values, and interests.[16]

The teacher may want to point out that attitudes other than political and economic ones may also be associated with certain classes. Cleanliness, neatness, and thriftiness, for example, are American middle-class values which are not necessarily shared by members of the lower class.

---

[14]Richard Centers, The Psychology of Social Classes: a Study of Class Consciousness (New York: Russell & Russell, 1961).

[15]Ibid., p. 77.

[16]Ibid., p. 207.

Resssman's is the most comprehensive of the three sources which are here suggested for gaining background on a study of American social classes.[17] He emphasizes economic factors in determining not only social class but also the power structure at the local and national level. Reissman says that occupation is the most frequently-used index of class, either alone or in combination with other indices.[18] He gives the North-Hatt Occupational Prestige Scale.[19] The teacher might try having his students rank these occupations.

Reissman believes that industrialization, by providing a new basis for wealth, status, and political power, is a major force for social change. Industrialization opens up the ranks of the middle class, who lead a fight on two fronts: one against the aristocratic elite and a second against encroachment by other more powerful nations that threaten them.[20] This latter idea might be useful in explaining the nationalism which is evident in many Latin American countries. After examining contemporary American society Reissman has come to the conclusion that "when a country becomes fully industrialized, the power comes to

[17]Leonard Reissman, _Class in American Society_ Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1959).

[18]_Ibid._, p. 144.

[19]_Ibid._, pp. 153-155.

[20]_Ibid._, pp. 390-393.

rest again within the upper class."[21] He, therefore, does not agree with those who believe that America is headed toward middle-class dominance.

> The sources of power are being shifted and located in an elite group that is far outside of the range of middle-class standards, even though historically it emerged from the middle class.[22]

The teacher can find simple definitions and examples of status and role in Goldschmidt's _Exploring the Ways of Mankind_.[23] _Status_ usually refers to one's position on a vertical scale. _Ascribed_ status is determined by birth; _achieved_ status is one which a person reaches through his own abilities, interests, and ambitions. _Status symbols_, such as the gold bracelet or expensive watch in Latin America, give public expression to status. Let the students discuss American, middle-class and even teen-age status symbols. Every status carries with it an appropriate mode of behavior. A _role_ is not the behavior itself but the rules and expectations of how one should behave. Some examples of social position for which our American society has determined appropriate behavior are lover-sweetheart, employer-employee, doctor-patient, teacher-student. Goldschmidt points out that a similar status in

---

[21]_Ibid._, p. 395.

[22]_Ibid._, p. 398.

[23]Walter Goldschmidt, _Exploring the Ways of Mankind_ (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1966), pp. 316-321.

two different cultures may require quite dissimilar roles. The class might discuss what behaviors are appropriate to the roles of teacher-student in America and then, when they have a Spanish-speaking visitor, try to determine in what ways these roles are similar or different in the visitor's country. The same thing could be done with the parent-child roles. Another way of comparing dating customs, always of interest to high-school students, would be to compare the lover-sweetheart roles across cultures.

Social class in Latin America

The Latin American Tradition by Charles Wagley[24] is recommended reading for the Spanish teacher interested in understanding Latin American culture. The author is an anthropologist with much field experience in Latin America. This book is a collection of some of his essays which had previously appeared in a variety of journals. Social class is discussed in the section of Chapter II called "Social Class, not Race" (pages 50 to 55). In it Wagley points out that the North American is accustomed to base social distinctions on race, while the Latin American bases them on social class. Two other entire chapters are devoted to the concept of social class: Chapter V, "The Concept of Social Race in the Americas," and Chapter VII, "The Dilemma of the Latin American Middle Class." Wagley notes that middle-

[24]Charles Wagley, The Latin American Tradition (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968).

class Latin Americans tend to identify not with the middle

class but with the aristocracy. "They adopt aristocratic

values and imitate aristocratic behavior."[25] Estimates of

the size of the middle class range all the way from less

than twelve percent to as high as 35% for countries like

Argentina and Uruguay.[26] Wagley gives four characteristics

of the middle class in Latin America: its members have

white-collar occupations, but not the most lucrative or

prestigeful ones; it is an overwhelmingly urban class; its

members are literate; and it is a traditionalistic and

nationalistic class.[27]

Erasmus in Man Takes Control has an extensive de-

scription of the middle class in Navojoa and the surround-

ing area in the state of Sonora in Northwestern Mexico.[28]

He determined a person's social class according to the club

to which he belonged.[29] He makes frequent reference to how

people in the different classes live, commenting, for ex-

ample, on newcomers to the middle class who purchase re-

frigerators, tile their floors, and install indoor plumb-

ing. (An unrelated but interesting section of this book is

---

[25]Ibid., p. 53.

[26]Ibid., p. 201.

[27]Ibid., pp. 198, 198.

[28]Erasmus, op. cit., pp. 194-208.

[29]Ibid., p. 195.

devoted to the folk beliefs pertaining to health practices of the lower classes of Quito, Ecuador.)[30]

A teacher of fourth-year classes might want to have his students read all or parts of Lewald's Buenos Aires.[31] The author spent several years living in Buenos Aires. This book attempts to give a picture of contemporary porteña society by bringing together descriptions written by many Argentinian authors. The selections are generally brief, frequently excerpts from a longer work. Four chapters relate directly to social classes: Chapters VIII to XI, entitled "La clase alta," "La clase media," "La clase obrera," and "La lucha de clases." Altogether a score of aspects of porteña life are sketched.

Poverty

The writer believes that many middle-class Americans have negative attitudes toward the poor. Because most Latin Americans are poor it may therefore be necessary to alter student attitudes toward the poor before one can expect to develop more positive attitudes toward Spanish speakers.

During November and December of 1967 Western Reserve University in Cleveland sponsored a series of

---

[30]Ibid., pp. 38-53; 336-338.

[31]H. Ernest Lewald, Buenos Aires (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968).

interdisciplinary lectures on poverty designed to trace the philosophical and historical antecedents of current attitudes toward poverty.

The writer synthesized the main ideas of these lectures and presented them to her students, also in lecture form. For the teacher who may be interested in touching on middle-class attitudes toward poverty, the principal ideas of the Western Reserve lectures will be outlined in the remainder of this section.

In Old Testament times certain measures were taken to prevent poverty: all debts were cancelled every seven years; hired help were to be paid their wages daily (this was to keep them from getting into debt); the underprivileged must be granted justice in the courts; the poor were protected in loan procedures; the gleanings were to be left for the poor (a form of economic aid); and the tithe was to be used for charitable purposes as well as to feed the priests(this amounted to practically full maintenance for those who could not work).

In New Testament times, Jesus was the champion of the poor. Many people believe that Jesus felt that one of the fundamental purposes of religion was to eliminate the causes for poverty. This heritage has inspired the great social achievements of the Judeo-Christian world.

After the Reformation, one of the burning questions in Calvinist Geneva was, "Am I one of God's elect?" The

answer was not clear. The questioner was told, "If you are, then you must show your thanks to God by glorifying Him in all your daily activities. You must be good, be a punctual workman, etc. And if you are not, you still are under obligation to God for the gift of life." In time, therefore, a corps of dependable workmen developed; and capital was accumulated which could be invested in new businesses, etc. This coincided with the rise of capitalism. In 1905 Max Weber, a German sociologist, published a theory called the Protestant Ethic, which holds that religious belief may have been one of the factors which contributed to the rise of capitalism in the Protestant countries of Northern Europe. Returning to the question, "Am I one of God's elect?" material success came in time to be interpreted by many people as an indication of God's favor.

The Puritans were influenced by Calvinist teachings. Their interpretation of the Protestant Ethic is sometimes called the Puritan Ethic. Man's first duty is to glorify God in his vocation. Work is a positive good, the key to order, and the primary requisite of social discipline. This work ethic placed high value on honesty, thrift, industry, diligence, and on simplicity and frugality of living. Concerning the poor, the Puritans felt there were two kinds of poor people. The first were the industrious poor, those who were poor through no fault of their own. These deserved alms. The others were the lazy poor or the idle poor, such

as thieves and vagabonds. These did not merit charity; and, in fact, the Puritan felt that it was demoralizing to both giver and receiver to give alms to such as these. Poverty in the idle poor was to be condemned rather than relieved.

Within two generations this Puritan Ethic had become secularized into what has sometimes been called Yankeeism. Benjamin Franklin's ideas represent this secularization. (Students may have discussed the Puritan Ethic and Franklin's ideas in their English class.)

Darwin's theory of evolution published in 1859 had great impact on the thinking of the early 1900's. Herbert Spencer, another Englishman and a contemporary of Darwin, tried to apply evolutionary ideas to society. One aspect of this social Darwinism was a negative view of human nature. In the struggle for survival only the fittest will survive. Human nature is ineradicable. There are degenerate stocks for which nothing can be done. Poverty comes from these groups.

William Graham Sumner was Spencer's American disciple. In his book called Folkways, he set up a barrier to welfare laws on a scientific basis. The bottom layer of society is the natural result of inferiority; therefore don't interfere with things as they are.

Business leaders like to use Darwinist language. Poverty is a natural product of inferiority and failure. You are successful because you are superior.

At the same time, there developed another group of
thinkers known as Reformed Darwinists. These people be-
lieved that intelligence can direct the forces of society.
It was the Reformed Darwinists in England who started the
Salvation Army (which believed in conversion after the
needs of the flesh had been satisfied), the YMCA and the
YWCA, and the settlement house movement. Jane Addams
brought the settlement house movement to the United States
when she opened Hull House in Chicago. At the turn of the
century the first child-guidance clinics were established.
New attitudes toward children meant rewriting our laws con-
cerning child labor. The founding of the Girl Scouts and
Boy Scouts also reflected a new interest in raising the
status of children.

The federal government in 1961 defined poverty as
the economic level of a family of four whose income was less
than $3,100.

One of the lecturers was a political scientist who
believes that our class system perpetuates poverty. He re-
ferred to a Law of Cumulating Advantages (or Disadvantages).
According to this law, upper-class people have opportuni-
ties and resources not granted to those in lower-class
positions. These are education, contacts (personal and
family), occupation, influence, and power. Upper-class
people take advantage of these opportunities and pass them
along to their heirs. Conversely, lower-class people have

cumulative disadvantages such as little education, low power, and little exposure to the normal benefits available to most members of society. They, too, are likely to pass these same disadvantages along to their children.

In the last thirty years, a permanent sub-class of poor people has developed in the United States. Most of its members are urban, female, and Negro. The speaker feels that they have little hope of rising out of their class position; for they are tied at home with small children, and they lack employable skills.

Early programs to help these very poor were based on the belief that they suffered from psychological handicaps, such as their inability or unwillingness to plan ahead; their fatalism or feeling that they cannot affect what's happening to them; and their extreme distrust and suspicion of other persons, so extreme that they cannot trust each other enough to engage in a cooperative endeavor to better their own lot.

The speaker was among those who believe that the only thing wrong with poor people is that they don't have any money. He feels that there would be vast changes in the behavior of the poor if they were guaranteed $3,100 per year. However, there is no assurance that their behavior would meet the approval of middle-class society. Three proposals for guaranteeing the poor a minimum annual income are known as guaranteed annual income, negative income tax, and family allowance.

In the United States most support for Negro demands for redistribution of status has come from the upper classes and the least from lower- and middle-class whites. The more money, education, and status a person has, the more tolerant he is likely to be; for such a person perceives the Negro as less threatening.

The final lecturer pointed out that we now have unemployment along with affluence in the United States. Back in the thirties there was mass unemployment during the depression. In the sixties we have sector unemployment, i.e., localized depressions invisible to most American white- and blue-collar workers. The blue-collar jobs for which the Negro is now somewhat able to compete are the very jobs which are becoming scarcer because of automation. Someone has even gone so far as to say that automation will make the Negro unneeded and unnecessary. The lecturer, a sociologist, feels that retraining is virtually nil in its impact on poverty. On a large scale it upsets the balance between unions and industry. He observes that if we really accepted the idea of uselessness, we would get more support for the guaranteed annual income. However, our Protestant Ethic prevails; and therefore work is the only acceptable link between the individual and the distribution of wealth.

(Time should be provided, on the following day if necessary, for student reaction to the ideas presented here.)

Culture Areas of Latin America

In order to understand Latin America today the student should be aware of the three large culture areas which are found there: Indo-America, Afro-America, and Ibero-America. Wagley first mentions these briefly on pages 14 and 15 and later describes them more fully on pages 30 to 37. Although he uses ethnic terms to name them, he says that the basic characteristics of these regions do not derive so much from the ethnic or racial composition of their populations as from the interaction of the people with the physical and social environment of the region.

> Thus the criteria for establishing the Indo-American region include the structural relationships resulting from the exploitation of masses of indigenous labor by the Spanish minority, the presence of "free" Indian villages and haciendas . . . as well as the persistence in the region of American Indian culture traits.[32]

Indo-America includes Mexico, Central America, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, and northern Chile.

> Ibero-America is characterized by the arrangements resulting from the presence of large numbers of relatively recent European immigrants vis-a-vis the colonial Spanish settlers as well as the culture patterns which the recent immigrants brought with them.[33]

Wagley includes Argentina, Uruguay, most of Chile, southern Brazil, and Paraguay in Ibero-America.

----

[32]Wagley, op. cit., p. 15.

[33]Ibid.

The presence of an African cultural heritage
fused with the Iberian traits as well as the pat-
terns produced by the plantation-slave-monoculture
institutions give the Afro-American region its
distinctive characteristics.[34]

The Afro-American region is found in the lowland
tropical areas surrounding the Caribbean and includes the
West Indies, the Guianas, a large portion of Brazil, and
the lowland portions of Venezuela and Colombia.

The teacher will want to read John Gillin's study
of "Mestizo America."[35]   This is his term for what Wagley
calls Indo-America. His paper is much more comprehensive
than Wagley's. In addition to a fairly detailed description
of Indo-American culture, he also discusses, though less
fully, the natural resources of the area, land and agri-
cultural problems, mining and industry, standards of living,
and political, religious, and educational features.

H. Ernest Lewald of the University of Tennessee is
a Spanish professor who is interested in teaching American
students the culture of Latin America with an anthropologi-
cal orientation. He classifies Latin American culture in
the following way:[36]

---

[34]Ibid.

[35]John Gillin, "Mestizo America," Most of the World:
the Peoples of Africa, Latin America, and the East Today,
ed. Ralph Linton (New York: Columbia University Press,
1949), pp. 156-211.

[36]Part of an eleven-page mimeographed "Inventory of
Culture Themes" sent to the writer in January, 1968.

Demographic Regions
    Rural
    Urban

Geographic Areas
    River Plate
    Andean
    Brazil
    Mexico
    Caribe and
    Central America
    Tropical

Social Classes
    Upper
    Middle
    Lower

Ethnic Groups
    Criollo
    Indian
    African

Historical Backgrounds

The teacher who prefers an historical orientation should become acquainted with a product of the World History project at Northwestern University. It is called Latin America and was prepared by a team of university and high-school teachers under the direction of Professors Stavrianos and Blanksten.[37] This 75-page soft-cover booklet is supplemented by a volume of Readings in World History. The materials are organized on the flashback technique. The three main sections of the booklet are "Politics," "Economics," and "Culture." Each begins with an analysis of existing conditions and institutions and then flashes back in time

[37] Leften S. Stavrianos and George I. Blanksten, Latin America: a Culture Area in Perspective (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965).

in order to make clear how these conditions and institutions gradually evolved through the ages.

Histories of Latin America are plentiful. Nevertheless, these materials have the advantage of being designed especially for high-school students; and the teacher need not search for appropriate readings, for they are referred to in the text and gathered together in the book of Readings.

The Family

The family usually plays a stronger role in the life of a Latin American than it does in the life of an American. When the Latin American thinks of his family, he usually includes people whom the American would refer to as "relatives," i.e., grandparents, aunts, uncles, and cousins. Latin American families frequently share the same home, buy several apartments in the same apartment house, or buy homes on the same street. Latin American families usually have daily contact, and help one another both financially and psychologically in times of crisis.

As in the study of values and social class, it is suggested that the American family be examined first before looking at the Latin American family. In the following section some discussion questions will be suggested. Divide the class into groups of not more than seven, allow about ten minutes for each group to discuss the questions, then allow five minutes at the end of class for them to share

their ideas. It is a constant source of interest to the writer to note that these discussions do not follow identical paths in each group.

If the school has class periods of fifty minutes or more in length, the teacher may schedule one of these little discussion sessions nearly every day. In a shorter class period, such frequent discussions may not be possible.

The American Family

Before beginning a study of the American family, the teacher might find useful the discussion presented in chapter three of O. Z. White's little book Changing Society.[38]

Each paragraph of the remainder of this section will consist of a series of questions related to one aspect of American family life. They might constitute the basis for a ten-minute discussion session as suggested above.

What functions does the family perform? Did a farm family one hundred years ago serve any different functions? (For example, the farm family produced its own food and clothing and provided its own entertainment.)

Family roles. What is the role of the father? The mother? Has the mother's role changed in the last fifty to one hundred years? What is the role of children in today's

---

[38]O. Z. White, Changing Society (Philadelphia: The Geneva Press, 1968), pp. 54-72.

family? Has this role changed since the family left the farm? Do you think your role as mother or father will be different from that of your parents?

Siblings. Do you feel responsible for the actions of your siblings? Or they toward you? (Lower-class Mexicans are raised to feel responsible for one another, especially the older ones toward the younger ones.)[39] When you were little, did you play mostly with your siblings? Were you encouraged to play with the neighbor's children or schoolmates? (Mexican Americans are not.)[40] What social activities do you attend with your siblings? (In some Latin American countries, middle- and upper-class girls are accompanied to a dance or party by an older brother or cousin. On a date she may be accompanied by a younger brother.)

How are you as teen-agers dependent upon your family? How are you independent? (E.g., what decisions can you make for yourself?) How could you support yourself if you left home tomorrow? (Many urban, lower-class Latin American children can and do support themselves. How?)

[39]Theodore William Parsons, Jr., "Cleavage in a California School" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University, 1965), pp. 123-143. This study of a small farming community of central California presents many culture patterns of the Mexicans who constitute 50% of the population and shows how these culture traits are a basis for Anglo discrimination. It is especially recommended for teachers interested in developing more positive attitudes toward Spanish-speaking groups living in the United States.

[40]Ibid.

Where did you become acquainted with your closest friend(s)? If you did not attend a coeducational school, how do you suppose you would meet friends of the opposite sex?

During the past year on what occasions were you with your relatives? Can you recall an occasion when all of your relatives were together? (E.g., special holidays, funeral, wedding, christening.) Do you have a family reunion? How many of your mothers speak daily with a relative?

What daily meals do you eat together as a family? On the week-end? (In some Latin American middle-class homes, young children are fed by the maids and do not eat with the family. When the children reach teen-age, school and, later, work schedules are such that the family often does not sit down together to eat.) During the past week, what away-from-home activity have you done as a family? With part of the family? During the past week-end, what activities did you engage in without your family and away from home? Who was with you, or were you alone?

How many of you live in the home of another relative (either with them or they own the house)? How many live on the same street as a relative? Within two miles? How many of you have no relatives in Cleveland? How many of your parents have borrowed from or loaned money to relatives?

Mobility. How many of you are living in the house where you were born? Determine how many moves have been made by all the members of the class.

The Latin American Family

Wagley in The Latin American Tradition has a description of the Latin American family on pages 55 to 58. On pages 58 to 60 he discusses the compadrazgo, a form of ceremonial kinship which plays an important role in Latin American society. On pages 69 to 75 he sets forth the roles of male and female.

After their discussions about the American family, the class can decide which aspects of Latin American life they would most like to learn about and formulate suitable questions to send in a letter to their pen pals.

Before having a class visitor, they can also decide which questions about the family they would like to ask.

The students may keep a diary in Spanish for one week. This can be sent to their pen pal in order to give him an idea of American family and daily life. The student will request that his pen pal do something similar. When these have been received, the class may want to compare them to see what patterns are common to all of the Latin American countries represented. They might try to relate the differences to social, economic, age, rural-urban, or geographic factors.

The Silent Language

One can be aware of the Latin American's value system, understand the role that social class plays in his life, be familiar with his family ties and daily life, and still be puzzled, hurt, or even angered because of certain behaviors. The thesis of Hall's book, The Silent Language, is that words are not the only means of communication. In our own culture we are aware that tone of voice and body posture can also convey meaning. We are perhaps unaware that our use of time and space also conveys meaning. Of interest to Spanish teachers is the fact that some of the things which we communicate silently to members of our own culture are understood differently by Latin Americans and vice versa.

Reference has already been made on page 193 to the difference between the American and Mexican attitudes toward law enforcement. The handling of time and space are two other areas of major difference between Latin Americans and North Americans which the teacher will want to bring out.

In the United States, if two friends have an appointment and one is five minutes late, he hardly feels it necessary to mumble an apology. A five-minute wait does not communicate anything. On the other hand, if he does not appear in forty-five minutes, his friend will feel highly insulted and will probably leave without waiting further.

The tardy friend will certainly owe an apology. In Latin America, a forty-five minute wait corresponds to our five-minute waiting period. No one feels hurt, and no apology is necessary. On pages 17 to 19 of The Silent Language, Hall describes how a United States official stormed angrily out of the office of a Latin American dignitary after waiting forty-five minutes for his appointment. He felt that both he and his office had been insulted. On pages 136 and 137 Hall discusses the time concept again.

The usual speaking distance in the United States for normal, impersonal conversation, either between friends or business associates, is four to five feet. For the Latin American it is one to two feet. We stand this close to a person, however, only when we are interested in them romantically and are whispering sweet nothings into their ear or when we are very angry with them and are shouting at them menacingly. When the Latin American moves in to a distance of one to two feet, we are therefore uncomfortable and take a step backward to establish the distance at which we feel comfortable. He is puzzled by our retreat, wonders what he has done to offend us, and steps forward again to reestablish the distance at which he feels comfortable. "I have observed an American backing up the entire length of a long corridor while a foreigner whom he considers pushy tries to catch up with him."[41] Recently the writer brought up this

_____

[41] Hall, op. cit., p. 160.

matter in conversation with Argentinian friends who have lived in the States for five years. The face of the husband, who has a managerial position in an electronics plant, broke into a relieved smile. "Ya comprendo!" he exclaimed. "I thought I had bad breath!" Hall discusses the handling of space on pages 160 to 164.

Most of Hall's illustrations come from the American Indians and Mexican Americans of our own Southwest, other parts of Latin America, and from the French and Arabic cultures. Although it is recommended that the teacher read the entire book, the Latin American references will be listed in the following paragraph.

Latin American businessmen keep simultaneous appointments. The North American businessman may therefore discover that he must share his appointment with someone else. (Pages 19, 20.) At first the tourist finds that things in the foreign country look similar. If he stays long enough, he later begins to feel the differences. (Pages 43, 44.) Latin Americans attach a stigma to manual labor. (Pages 48, 49.) Latin American men cannot resist women. (Pages 49, 50.) Catholicism is a formal part of Latin American culture. (Page 75.) The Spaniards overcame the Aztecs rather easily during the conquest because they fought to kill whereas the Aztecs fought to take prisoners. (Pages 79, 80.) The same sets may be valued differently. (Page 101.) Americans react to a bullfight differently

from Latin Americans. (Page 113.) As in France, street names may change after an intersection. (Page 153.) Americans expect more of a neighbor than do the Latin Americans. (Page 156.) Standing in line violates the Latin American's sense of individuality. (Page 158.)

Examining Other Cultures

If the teacher suspects that the students are unconsciously learning that Spanish speakers are the only ones who do things differently from Americans, he may want to bring in illustrations from other cultures. Tradition and Change in Four Societies is a book of readings for high-school students.[42] It is part of the new Holt Social Studies Curriculum prepared under the general editorship of Edwin Fenton. It uses an inquiry approach. The four cultures are South Africa, Brazil, India, and China. There is a chapter on Chinese values and another on Indian village family life. Lower-class urban life can be compared in descriptions of slums in Johannesburg and Rio de Janeiro.

As has already been mentioned, The Silent Language includes references to other cultures. Hall has a more recent book called The Hidden Dimension,[43] which focuses on

---

[42]Richard B. Ford, Tradition and Change in Four Societies (New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc., 1968).

[43]Edward T. Hall, The Hidden Dimension (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1966).

man's use of space. In the last two chapters he gives many
illustrations from England, Germany, France, Japan, and Arabic culture which high-school students would find interesting.

Ideas Related to Attitudes

There is some evidence to indicate that prejudice
may be part of the individual's personality structure and
that the person who is prejudiced against one ethnic group
is likely to be prejudiced against others.[44] The writer
believes that a discussion of prejudice, stereotypy, ethnocentrism, and even some information on personality formation may result in attitude change on the part of some
students. The latter part of this chapter, therefore, will
be devoted to references and suggestions for doing these
things.

Prejudice

Because middle-class Americans value tolerance,
students are likely to be on the defensive if the teacher
announces that they are going to discuss prejudice.

The students will want to discuss prejudice themselves after seeing the film "The High Wall." It is a
twenty-five minute black-and-white film which begins with
the wailing of sirens. Two high-school seniors are brought

---

[44]Gordon W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice (Boston: Beacon Press, 1954), p. 75.

into the emergency room of a hospital after attacking each other in a gang fight. One of the boys is of Polish extraction. The picture shows how the other boy had learned to hate the Poles from his parents. It is obvious that the film is about prejudice. It is also rather hard on parents, as they are represented in this film as being the sole cause for the prejudice.

The film is a perfect entree for a discussion of prejudice at Valley Forge High School, for there are a number of families of Polish extraction in the school district. It seemed almost silly to these students for anyone to hate the Poles. Yet once they got into discussion groups, they (not the teacher) made the obvious transfer to other ethnic groups, especially the Negroes, who are the biggest threat to this all-white community.

The students were given twenty-five minutes after the film to react to it in their groups. After five minutes or so, a couple of groups in each class had said all they cared to say about the film. At this point the teacher had two new members come into each group to replace two members who were assigned to other groups. The newcomers were instructed to inform their new groupmates of the ideas which they had discussed in their first group. The introduction of "new blood" into each group had the desired effect, and discussion flowed freely and even heatedly till the bell rang at the end of the period.

On the following day, the writer said that she had
been thinking about the film they had seen the day before
and had some questions she wanted to ask them about it.
The following are some of the questions used:

Some of you are of Polish descent. Have you ever
felt prejudice because you were Polish? Have any of you
ever felt prejudice because of your nationality background?

Let us stop a moment and define prejudice. Is
there anything unfair about prejudice? What?

Suppose you were a Polish student in that school and
someone made fun of you or did something mean to you be-
cause you were Polish. How would you react? (All those
who spoke to this question said they would react aggressive-
ly, even the girls.) By reacting in this way, do you think
you would lessen the prejudice of the person who was mean
to you or ridiculing you?

How do you think the prejudice against Polish people
we saw in the film could be eliminated? If you have never
felt prejudice here in Parma Heights, what has happened to
the prejudice against the Poles? If they said, "Because the
Poles have spread out and don't all live together," the
teacher asked if there are any groups that have experienced
prejudice in the United States which have not been permitted
to spread out. Are there any groups which have not wanted
to spread out and assimilate? (Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Amer-
icans.) If they said that prejudice can be overcome by some

kind of group action, then the teacher asked if there are any groups that have experienced prejudice that have tried to overcome it by group action. (Negroes.)

The teacher recalled that a couple of times during the film the camera focused on babies in a hospital nursery as the narrator commented that no one is born with prejudice. Do you believe this? (Several in both classes thought that people were born with prejudices.) Psychologists are pretty well agreed that no one is born prejudiced. What can be done to prevent children from acquiring prejudices? The teacher concluded the discussion by observing, "This film has touched on some of the problems that are troubling our society, and perhaps some of you can help solve them."

Cultural Pluralism

As a follow-up to the suggestion made in the discussion of the film "The High Wall" that there are certain ethnic groups within the United States which have been reluctant to assimilate, the teacher might duplicate for the class the following description of cultural pluralism and let the students react to it.

> A tremendous increase of interest in and activity on behalf of better relations between persons of different colors, creeds, and national origins has marked the past three decades in the United States. A major trend within the programs of both official and private voluntary agencies . . . is the acceptance of "cultural democracy" or "cultural pluralism," as contrasted with the formerly

dominant "melting pot" approach to persons who are
not included among the "WASPS" (white Anglo-Saxon
Protestants). Sometimes this approach is called,
by analogy, "orchestration," or "tapestration."
It implies that "unity with diversity" is the
ideal of the democratic citizen of the United
States, that just as violins or colorful threads
make their contribution to a symphony or a tapes-
try, so the "strangers in a strange land" need not
divest themselves of their cultural heritage.[45]

Stereotypy

Davis suggests

instead of admonishing against stereotyping,
it might be more effective to present subjects
with concrete examples of stereotyping . . . and
then expose or explain this tendency, cautioning
against stereotyping or prejudging.[46]

"El estudio del elefante" has already been suggested as a

delightful way to introduce the concept of stereotypes.[47]

(Serious topics need not always be dealt with soberly.)

Let the students define stereotype and discuss what

harm can come from stereotyping. The teacher may want to

point out that stereotypes may be either favorable or un-

favorable, based on truth, or entirely unjustified. All-

port defines stereotype thus:

A stereotype is an exaggerated belief associ-
ated with a category. Its function is to justify
(rationalize) our conduct in relation to that cat-
egory.[48]

---

[45]Clarence Senior, The Puerto Ricans: Strangers
then Neighbors (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961), p. 62.

[46]E. E. Davis, Attitude Change: a Review and Bibli-
ography of Selected Research (Paris: UNESCO, No. 19, 1964),
p. 31.

[47]See p. 14.

[48]Allport, op. cit., p. 191.

The writer believes that in order to overcome prejudice and the effects of negative stereotypes, one should stress the idea of learning to accept people as individuals.

Ethnocentrism

O. Z. White in Changing Society has a brief discussion of ethnocentrism on pages 35 to 39. The teacher may want to read to the class the lengthy description from Ralph Linton describing how much modern Americans owe to other cultures. The letter "Pilar attends school with the teen-ager," already discussed on page 191, illustrates this concept.

Personality Theory

A study by Katz, Sarnoff, and McClintock showed that more attitude change toward Negroes occurred utilizing materials designed to give insight into the mechanisms and motivations of an ego-defensive nature that could be the cause of prejudice.[49] The materials used are not included in the description of the study. However, the teacher may find that two chapters in Allport's Nature of Prejudice might serve the purpose. These are Chapter XXV, "The Prejudiced Personality," and Chapter XXVII, "The Tolerant

---

[49]Daniel Katz, Irving Sarnoff, and Charles McClintock, "Ego Defense and Attitude Change," Approaches, Contexts, and Problems of Social Psychology: a Book of Readings, ed. Edward E. Sampson (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1965), p. 282.

Personality." The teacher can present the materials in lecture form and then allow time for the students to ask questions or to discuss the ideas among themselves in groups. If the teacher is interested in calling to the attention of his students what happens to people who are the victims of prejudice, Chapter IX, "Traits Due to Victimization," can be used.

Culture Shock

People who go abroad to work or study frequently enjoy a "honeymoon" period at first. They expect to find differences and are delighted to find so many unexpected similarities. The initial differences are novel and fun. After about three months, however, the novelty has worn off and many of the differences have become annoyances. Further, they begin to notice that the natives behave in strange ways which the foreigner cannot understand. This reaction is known as "culture shock." Usually the foreigner makes some adjustments in his own attitudes and habits so that he can accommodate himself to his new milieu. If he cannot do this, he may have to return home.

Foster has a good chapter on culture shock which the teacher may want to read to the class.[50]

---

[50]George M. Foster, Traditional Cultures and the Impact of Technological Change (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), pp. 187-194. This book has frequent illustrations from Latin America, especially of the lower classes, which the teacher may find useful.

Two chapters in a book entitled <u>Assignment: Over-</u><u>seas</u>[51] highlight some of the problems likely to befall Americans abroad and suggest that the key to getting along is developing cultural empathy. They are Chapter V, "Many Cultures and Our Own Witness," by Eugene A. Nida and Chapter IV, "Cultural Empathy," by Gerard Mangone. Mangone has been associated with the Maxwell Graduate School at Syracuse University, which has been studying the problem of educating and training Americans for overseas service. He is co-author of <u>The Overseas Americans</u>.[52] Teachers will find many ideas and illustrations which they may want to share with their classes in Chapters III, "Culture Shock," and X, "Cultural Empathy."

Role Playing

In Chapter II several studies were cited which indicated that attitude change frequently occurs after someone has done role playing. The change does not occur, of course, if he plays a role supporting his original position; but it may occur if he plays a role contrary to his own beliefs.

There are some simple devices which the teacher might try in order to get the students used to acting

---

[51]John Rosengrant <u>et al.</u>, <u>Assignment: Overseas</u> (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1960).

[52]Harlan Cleveland, Gerard J. Mangone, and John C. Adams, <u>The Overseas American</u> (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960).

things out in front of the class. They could act out how
two friends in Mexico greet each other using the handshake
or abrazo. The teacher could bring in paper plates, knife
and fork, and some bread. Have the students pretend that
the bread is a slice of meat and try to eat it holding
their knife and fork Latin American (European) style. Stu-
dents would probably enjoy acting out a conversation be-
tween a Latin American and a North American, with the North
American retreating and the Latin American advancing to re-
establish a comfortable speaking distance. Middle-class
Argentinians think it strange that the American rejoinder
to a compliment is always "thank you." They do not normally
say "thank you" but instead make some pertinent comment.
For example, if someone admires a dress, the wearer might
say, "I just got it," or "I've been looking for a long time
for something this color," or "I was looking for something
with long sleeves, but this was such a good buy that I
couldn't pass it up." Try having pairs of students compli-
ment one another and making some rejoinder other than
"thank you." This is not easy!

Another type of role playing is for the students to
act out some situation. The teacher might read them a
story, stopping before the end. As a class, let them dis-
cuss possible endings. Then assign parts and let them act
out different endings. The teacher might take an incident
from Two Blocks Apart. Today's Education for March, 1969,

has a story about a gang fight between Mexican-Americans and Anglos that would lend itself to role playing.[53]

A third way to introduce role playing is to suggest a problem or a situation and let the students act it out. Let the participants have five minutes to coordinate their roles. For example, what would happen if a member of the class invited a Mexican to his home? Three possibilities suggest themselves. Have the students act out what would happen when the parents were told that their child had invited a Mexican home, have them act out what happened when the Mexican was at the house, or have them act out what happened after the Mexican left.

Summary

In this chapter many sources have been cited for information pertaining to Latin America and to attitudes per se. Suggestions have been given for incorporating these materials into the classroom. Readings, lecture, group discussion, and role playing are the techniques advocated. It is not expected that any one of these things alone will produce much attitude change. Future researchers are urged to incorporate all of these things into a continuous, year-long program and test to determine if they do develop significantly more positive attitudes toward native speakers of Spanish.

[53]"Classroom Incident," Today's Education. NEA Journal (March, 1969), pp. 73, 81.

APPENDIX

BOGARDUS PRETEST SPRING, 1967
SCHOLASTIC SURVEYS
Columbus, Ohio

We are interested in how high-school students feel about the following statements.

Please put an X in the block after each statement with which you agree.

Work straight down each column, considering all the statements for one country before moving on to the next country.

Try to make a separate and independent judgment for each country. Work quickly; it is your first impression which is most important. There are no right or wrong answers.

Your Nationality background   Religious Preference   Political Preference   Age   Sex   Grade   Phone Number

I would be willing to accept a person from the country listed to the right...	Russia	Ireland	France	America	Italy	Mexico	American Negro	Germany	Spain	Great Britain	Nationalist China (Formosa)	Argentina	Poland	Puerto Rico	Red China
1) ... as a visitor to my country															
2) ... as a citizen of my country															
3) ... as a co-worker on a job															
4) ... as a classmate in my school															
5) ... as a neighbor on my street															
6) ... as a friend															
7) ... into kinship by marriage															

235

SAMPLE PAGE: SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL PRETEST SPRING, 1967

15.   How would you describe the people of Red China?
(People's Republic of China)

(In each line, circle the number
that best represents your opinion.)

1.	Dark-complexioned	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fair-complexioned
2.	Big	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Small
3.	Sad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Happy
4.	Friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unfriendly
5.	Clean	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dirty
6.	Proud	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Humble
7.	Uninteresting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Interesting
8.	Good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bad
9.	Stubborn	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Cooperative
10.	Progressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Backward
11.	Healthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sickly
12.	Aggressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Submissive
13.	Polite	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Rude
14.	Rich	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Poor
15.	Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Stupid
16.	Lazy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Hard-working
17.	Cruel	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Kind
18.	Colorful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Drab
19.	Handsome	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Homely
20.	Excitable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Calm

Other adjectives describing these people (write in):

_____

_____

REVISED BOGARDUS   JANUARY & MAY, 1968
SCHOLASTIC SURVEY
Columbus, Ohio

We are interested in how high-school students feel about the following statements.

Please put an X in the block after each statement with which you agree.

Try to make a separate and independent judgment for each country. Work quickly; it is your first impression which is most important. There are no right or wrong answers.

(Leave blank)	Sex	Grade	Religious Preference	Political Party Preference

Today's Date	Your Date of Birth	Your Nationality Background

I would be willing to accept a person from the country listed below...	...as a visitor to my country	...as a citizen of my country	...as a member of my church	...as a classmate in my school	...as a neighbor on my street	...as a member of my "crowd"	...into kinship by marriage
Great Britian							
Nationalist China (Formosa)							
Mexico							
Russia							
France							
American Negro							
Argentina							
Germany							
Spain							
Red China							
Italy							
Puerto Rico							
America							
Poland							
Ireland							

SAMPLE PAGE: REVISED SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL JAN. & MAY, 1968

7a.   (I.)   How would you describe the Spanish people in Spain?

For each pair of adjectives put an X in the space along the line which best represents your opinion.

1.	Uninventive	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Creative
2.	Small	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Big
3.	Light	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Dark
4.	Slow	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Quick
5.	Successful	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Failing
6.	Ambitious	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Unaspiring
7.	Rebellious	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Conservative
8.	Uncooperative	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Cooperative
9.	Inconsiderate	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Sympathetic
10.	Right	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Wrong
11.	Ineffective	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Effective
12.	Happy	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Sad
13.	Meek	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Violent
14.	Warm	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Cold
15.	Disorderly	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Orderly
16.	Aggressive	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Submissive
17.	Unproductive	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Productive
18.	Unfriendly	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Friendly
19.	Unaccommodating	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Obliging
20.	Non-believing	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Religious
21.	Clean	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Dirty
22.	Excitable	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Calm
23.	Mature	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Childish
24.	Proud	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Humble
25.	Crude	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Refined

SAMPLE PAGE: REVISED SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL JAN. & MAY, 1968

7b. (I.) How would you describe the Spanish people in Spain?

For each pair of adjectives put an X in the space along the line which best represents your opinion.

No.	Left	Scale	Right
26.	Passive	: : : : : : : :	Active
27.	Patient	: : : : : : : :	Impulsive
28.	Nice	: : : : : : : :	Nasty
29.	Undependable	: : : : : : : :	Dependable
30.	Withdrawn	: : : : : : : :	Outgoing
31.	Confident	: : : : : : : :	Chicken-hearted
32.	Lazy	: : : : : : : :	Hard-working
33.	Unsociable	: : : : : : : :	Sociable
34.	Generous	: : : : : : : :	Stingy
35.	Considerate	: : : : : : : :	Thoughtless
36.	Stupid	: : : : : : : :	Intelligent
37.	Bad	: : : : : : : :	Good
38.	Weak	: : : : : : : :	Strong
39.	Interesting	: : : : : : : :	Uninteresting
40.	Virtuous	: : : : : : : :	Corrupt
41.	Backward	: : : : : : : :	Progressive
42.	Enterprising	: : : : : : : :	Cautious
43.	Righteous	: : : : : : : :	Erring
44.	Sympathetic	: : : : : : : :	Inconsiderate
45.	Thorough	: : : : : : : :	Slipshod
46.	Rude	: : : : : : : :	Polite
47.	Handsome	: : : : : : : :	Homely
48.	Healthy	: : : : : : : :	Sickly
49.	Cruel	: : : : : : : :	Kind
50.	Poor	: : : : : : : :	Rich

SAMPLE PAGE: FINAL SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL   SEPTEMBER, 1968

1. (VII) How would you describe the Mexican people in Mexico?

For each pair of adjectives put an X in the space along the line which best represents your opinion.

1.	Unsociable	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Sociable
2.	Warm	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Cold
3.	Cruel	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Kind
4.	Backward	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Progressive
5.	Considerate	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Thoughtless
6.	Nice	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Nasty
7.	Unfriendly	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Friendly
8.	Effective	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Ineffective
9.	Generous	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Stingy
10.	Stupid	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Intelligent
11.	Bad	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Good
12.	Rude	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Polite
13.	Productive	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Unproductive
14.	Passive	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Active
15.	Refined	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Crude
16.	Sympathetic	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Inconsiderate
17.	Ambitious	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Unaspiring
18.	Unaccommodating	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Obliging
19.	Rich	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Poor
20.	Uninventive	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Creative

PERSONAL DATA SHEET: REVISED AND FINAL SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

SCHOLASTIC SURVEYS
Columbus, Ohio

Personal Data

(Leave blank)   Sex   Age   Grade   (Today's date)   (Birth date)

List courses from the 9th grade up to (and including) this year.

Social studies course(s) studied   Science course(s) studied

Foreign Language course(s) studied   Language(s) you speak

Language(s) spoken at home   Your nationality background

Religious preference   Political party preference

Have you studied an Arts Seminar course?   Yes   No   (Circle one)

Have you studied a Humanities course?   Yes   No   (Circle one)

List the states outside of Ohio where you have lived and for how long?

List the countries outside of the U. S. where you have lived or traveled
and for how long?

HIGH SCHOOL OPINION SCALE NO. 1

You will see that on each line there are two words, such as:

    intelligent :   :   :   :   :   :   :   : stupid

Between these two words is a straight line marked off into spaces. Somewhere along the
line between the two words (or extremes) is your impression about something. If you were
asked your impression about television news programs, you might put an X as follows:

    intelligent :   : X :   :   :   :   :   : stupid

In some cases you may not have a feeling one way or the other, in which case you would
put your X in the middle of the line:

    intelligent :   :   :   : X :   :   :   : stupid

Work as rapidly as you can. It is your first impression which is the most important.
There are no right or wrong answers. Yet please be serious, as we are very interested in
how high-school students feel about these questions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Adorno, T. W., et al. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper & Bros., 1950.

Allport, Gordon W. The Nature of Prejudice. Boston: Beacon Press, 1954.

Broudy, Harry S., Smith, B. Othanel, and Burnett, Joe R. Democracy in American Education. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

Centers, Richard. The Psychology of Social Classes: a Study of Class Consciousness. New York: Russel & Russel, 1961.

Cleveland, Harlan, Mangone, Gerard J., and Adams, John C. The Overseas Americans. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960.

Cohen, Arthur R. Attitude Change and Social Influence. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.

Duran, Manuel and Alvarez, Federico (eds.) Voces espanolas de hoy. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, Inc., 1965.

Erasmus, Charles J. Man Takes Control. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1961.

Fernald, James C. Funk & Wagnall's Standard Handbook of Synonyms, Antonyms, and Prepositions. New York: Funk & Wagnall Co., 1947.

Ford, Richard B. Tradition and Change in Four Societies. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1968.

Foster, George M. Traditional Cultures and the Impact of Technological Change. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Fruchter, Benjamin. Introduction to Factor Analysis. New York: Van Nostrand, 1954.

Goldschmidt, Walter. Exploring the Ways of Mankind. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1966.

Hall, Edward T. The Silent Language. (A Premier Book, No. d 117.) Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1963.

_____. The Hidden Dimension. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1966.

Heath, Dwight B., and Adams, Richard N. Contemporary Culture and Societies of Latin America. New York: Random House, 1965.

Hollander, Sophie Smith (ed.) Impressions of the United States. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc., 1964.

Insko, Charles A. Theories of Attitude Change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Jahoda, Marie and Warren, Neil (eds.) Attitudes: Selected Readings. (No. UPS3.) Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, Inc., 1966.

Lecturas sobre Puerto Rico. Vol. I: Aspecto social: lecturas para estudiantes de octavo grado. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Departamento de Instrucción Pública, 1960.

Lewald, H. Ernest. Buenos Aires. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968.

Linton, Ralph (ed.) Most of the World: the Peoples of Africa, Latin America, and the East Today. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.

Mayerson, Charlotte L. (ed.) Two Blocks Apart: Juan Gonzales and Peter Quinn. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1965.

Osgood, Charles E., Suci, George J., and Tannenbaum, Percy H. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Reissman, Leonard. Class in American Society. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1959.

Rosengrant, John, et al. Assignment: Overseas. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1960.

Sampson, Edward E. (ed.) Approaches, Contexts, and Problems of Social Psychology: a Book of Readings. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1965.

Scherer, George A. C., and Wertheimer, Michael. A Psycholinguistic Experiment in Foreign-Language Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1964.

Senior, Clarence. The Puerto Ricans: Strangers then Neighbors. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961.

Shaw, Marvin E., and Wright, Jack M. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1967.

Sherif, Carolyn W., and Sherif, Muzafer. Attitude and Attitude Change: the Social-Judgement-Involvement Approach. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1965.

Stavrianos, Leften, and Blanksten, George I. Latin America: a Culture Area in Perspective. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1965.

Steichen, Edward (ed.). The Family of Man. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1955.

Villa Fernández, Pedro. Por esas Españas. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1963.

Wagley, Charles. The Latin American Tradition. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.

Warner, W. Lloyd. Social Class in America. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960.

White, O. Z. Changing Society. Philadelphia: The Geneva Press, 1968.

Articles

Bogardus, Emory S. "Measuring Social Distance," Journal of Applied Sociology, IX (March-April, 1925), 299-308.

_____. "A Social Distance Scale," Sociology & Social Research, XVII (January, 1933), 265-271.

_____. "Racial Distance Changes in the United States during the Past Thirty Years," Sociology & Social Research, XLIII (1958), 127-134.

"Classroom Incident," <u>Today's Education. NEA Journal</u>, (March, 1969), 73, 81.

Diab, N. L. "Factors Affecting Studies of National Stereotypes," <u>Journal of Social Psychology</u>, LIX (1963), 29-40.

Freeman, Stephen A. "Let Us Build Bridges," <u>Modern Language Journal</u>, LII (May, 1968), 261-268.

Janis, I. L., and King, B. T. "The Influence of Role Playing in Opinion Change," <u>Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology</u>, XLIX (1954), 211-218.

Kelman, Herbert C. "Process of Opinion Change," <u>Public Opinion Quarterly</u>, XXV (1961), 57-78.

Kemp, C. Gratton. "Improvement of Critical Thinking in Relation to Open-Closed Belief Systems," <u>Journal of Experimental Education</u>, XXXI, No. 3 (1963), 321-323.

King, B. T., and Janis, I. L. "Comparison of the Effectiveness of Improvised vs. Non-improvised Role Playing in Producing Opinion Change," <u>Human Relations</u>, IX (1956), 177-185.

Mitnick, Leonard L., and McGinnies, Elliott. "Influencing Ethnocentrism in Small Discussion Groups through a Film Communication," <u>Journal of Abnormal Psychology</u>, LVIII (1958), 82-90.

Mueller, Klaus A., and Wiersma, William. "The Effects of Language Laboratory Type upon Cultural Orientation Scores of Foreign Language Students," <u>Modern Language Journal</u>, LI, No. 5 (May, 1967), 258-263.

Nostrand, Howard Lee. "Literature, Area Study, and Hispanic Culture," <u>Hispania</u>, XLIV (September, 1961), 465-472.

Riestra, Miguel A., and Johnson, Charles E. "Changes in Attitudes of Elementary-School Pupils toward Foreign-Speaking Peoples Resulting from the Study of a Foreign Language," <u>Journal of Experimental Education</u>, XXXIII (Fall, 1964), 65-72.

Seelye, H. Ned. "Field Notes on Cross-Cultural Testing," <u>Language Learning</u>, XVI, Nos. 1 & 2 (1966), 77-85.

Steward, Julian H. "Culture Patterns of Puerto Rico," The
    Annals of the American Academy of Political &
    Social Science, 285 (January, 1953), 95-103.

Sutherland, Margaret B. "A Study of the Effects of Learn-
    ing French on Attitudes toward the French," British
    Journal of Educational Psychology, XVI (February,
    1946), 44.

Reports, Handbooks, Booklets, and Pamphlets

Davis, E. E. Attitude Change: a Review and Bibliography
    of Selected Research. Paris: UNESCO, No. 19, 1964.

"Family Income Advances, Poverty Reduced in 1967," Current
    Population Reports. U. S. Department of Commerce,
    Series P-60, No. 55 (August 5, 1968).

Georgetown University. Report on a Conference on the Mean-
    ing and Role of Culture in Foreign Language Teach-
    ing, Institute of Languages and Linguistics, Edmund
    A. Walsh School of Foreign Service. Georgetown,
    March 10 and 11, 1961. (Mimeographed.)

Ladu, Tora Tuve. Teaching for Cross-Cultural Understand-
    ing. (Foreign Language Curriculum Series, Publica-
    tion No. 414.) Raleigh, North Carolina: State
    Department of Public Instruction, 1968.

Lambert, Wallace E., et al. A Study of the Roles of At-
    titude and Motivation in Second-Language Learning.
    Final Report. Montreal: McGill University,
    November 25, 1961. (Mimeographed.)

Nostrand, Howard Lee. Experiment in Determining Cultural
    Content: Pretesting the Questionnaire "How the
    Americans See the French." Department of Romance
    Languages and Literature. Seattle: University of
    Washington, July, 1964. (Mimeographed.)

Ramirez, Rafael W. Como vivian nuestros abuelos. San
    Juan, Puerto Rico: Instituto de Cultura Puertor-
    riquena, 1957.

Seelye, H. Ned (ed.). A Handbook on Latin America for
    Teachers. Springfield, Illinois: Office of the
    Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1968.

Unpublished Materials

Kelbley, Thomas. "Psychologist's Report for Arts and Humanities for Leisure Time." Report prepared for Faculty Planning Team of Parma City Schools, Parma, Ohio, August, 1966. (Dittoed.)

Parsons, Theodore William, Jr. "Ethnic Cleavage in a California School." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University, August, 1965.

Young, Eleanor Culver. "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Intensive Reading of Selected Materials in a Foreign Language upon Certain Attitudes." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1962.

Other Sources

Western Reserve University Lecture Series on Poverty

November 6, 1967. "The Bible and the Poor." Professor Roland Wolfe, Religion Department.

November 13, 1967. "The Puritan Ethic." Professor Lee W. Gibbs, Religion Department.

November 20, 1967. "Darwinism and the Early War on Poverty." Professor Harvey Wish, History Department.

November 27, 1967. "Poverty and the Class Struggle." Professor Donald R. Bowen, Political Science Department.

December 4, 1967. "The Great Society." Professor Mark Lefton, Sociology Department.