

HANDBOOK OF
SOCIAL
PSYCHOLOGY

•
YOUNG

HANDBOOK OF
SOCIAL
PSYCHOLOGY

BY
KIMBALL YOUNG

Professor of Sociology, Northwestern University

LONDON
ROUTLEDGE & KEGAN PAUL LTD
BROADWAY HOUSE, 68-74 CARTER LANE, E.C.4

First published in England 1946

Second impression 1946

Third impression 1948

Fourth impression 1951

Printed in Great Britain by
Lowe and Brydone Printers Limited, London, N.W.10

HANDBOOK OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY OF SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION

Editor : Prof. Karl Mannheim



Advisory Board: SIR HAROLD BUTLER, K.C.M.G., C.B.; SIR ALEXANDER CARR-SAUNDERS, M.A., Director of the London School of Economics; SIR FRED CLARKE, M.A. (Oxon), formerly Chairman of the Central Advisory Council for Education; LORD LINDSAY of Birker, C.B.E.

PREFACE

THE FIELD OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY has expanded considerably in the fifteen years since the first edition of this book was completed. Among the many advances there are four which seem to me most important. First, motivation is far better understood today than it was in the 1920's. After a period of overstressing environment and learning in the determination of human motives—itself a counteraction against the stress placed on original instincts by MacDougall and Freud—we now realize that, though social-cultural training greatly modifies original nature and gives it a certain pitch and direction, we cannot escape the fact that there are universal and basic drives which provide the foundation for our adult motives, be they security, mastery, power, love, sociability, or others. Second, it has become increasingly clear that social interaction is absolutely essential to the development of personality. We are not at the outset isolated individuals with drives, habits, attitudes, and ideas, who are later socialized. Rather, from birth on, the individual operates within a social matrix. With regard to this fact, the work of George Herbert Mead has at last become fully recognized. Third, the measurement of traits, opinions, and attitudes has been tremendously extended and improved in objectivity. Personality testing and polling of individuals for opinions have become widely accepted and the results of many investigations are being used for purposes of prediction and control. In this respect, social psychology is gradually taking on the stature of a science. Finally, the linkage of social psychology and the other social sciences, especially cultural anthropology, has become more certain and fruitful. Under the broad rubric of culture and personality, a number of important contributions have been made. The attempt to trace in detail the emergence of personality with reference to constitutional make-up operating in a social and cultural milieu is being rapidly extended to the profit of social psychology and the social sciences. Especially important are the writings of Edward Sapir, Ralph Linton, Ruth Benedict, Margaret Mead, A. I. Hallowell, Gregory Bateson, H. D. Lasswell, John Dollard, Abram Kardiner, Harry Stack Sullivan, Franz Alexander, Karen Horney, A. H. Maslow, E. H. Erikson, and Eric Fromm. In the present book, which is a complete revision of the 1930 edition, an attempt is made to take into account these recent developments. Those phases of social psychology which deal more strictly with the genesis and growth of personality I have described and interpreted in my *Personality and*

Problems of Adjustment (1940). After the chapters needed for a discussion of the roots of interaction and the growth of personality, the present volume deals more especially with the role and status of the individual in relation to his group-oriented life.

For those familiar with the first edition, note should be made of the following topics now either presented for the first time or offered in much expanded and more complete form: (1) In order to show the prehuman sources of social interaction there is a full chapter on the social life of lower animals, especially of monkeys and apes. As indicated in the text, interaction is phylogenetically and individually antecedent to culture and this fact needs to be stressed. (2) Two chapters are devoted to describing the elements and mechanisms which enter into the rise of the social self. (3) The treatment of the nature and function of what I call social-cultural reality has been extended and, I trust, improved. The close connection between the form and content of thought, emotion, and action and the social-cultural environment of the individual is rather fully explored. (4) With regard to the omnipresent fact of human conflict, there are added a chapter on the psychology of revolution and two chapters on the psychology of war and wartime morale. (5) The rapid extension and growing importance of such new forms of mass communication as the motion picture and the radio have made it necessary to give added attention to these new media in the formation of public opinion. (6) So, too, the topic of propaganda has become increasingly central to social control, and two chapters are now devoted to this subject, one of them with particular reference to World Wars I and II. Finally, the revolutionary threat to democratic culture and the appearance of total war in our time raise pertinent questions regarding the nature and use of power. If our liberal, industrialized world is not to disappear, serious consideration must be given to the problems of power: its function in mass society; its various forms; the matter of who shall exercise it; and the central problem of all—the moral responsibility for its use. I have attempted a sketch of this topic in the closing chapter, and particular features of the use of power are discussed at many points throughout. In addition to the many sources properly referred to in the text, I wish to thank Mrs. Elaine Zipes Rothenberg for helping to collect materials for certain chapters, and I am especially indebted to Mrs. Ruth Hill Useem for undertaking to see the book through the press.

KIMBALL YOUNG

New York

HANDBOOK OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

CONTENTS

PREFACE	v
I. Personality, Society, and Culture	i
<i>PART ONE: SOME BASIC RELATIONS OF PERSONALITY TO SOCIETY AND CULTURE</i>	
II. Animal Prototypes of Human Behavior	13
III. Culture and Personality	40
IV. Drives and Emotions	77
V. Some Factors in Human Learning	93
VI. The Foundations and Mechanisms of Personality	120
VII. The Rise of the Self	131
VIII. The Nature of Social-Cultural Reality	157
IX. Stereotypes, Myths, and Ideologies	189
X. Dominance and Leadership	222
<i>PART TWO: SOME ASPECTS OF HUMAN CONFLICT</i>	
XI. Prejudice as a Phase of Conflict	257
XII. Other Areas of Prejudice	282
XIII. The Psychology of Revolution	313
XIV. The Psychology of War and of Military Morale	340
XV. Civilian Morale and Other Problems of War	361
<i>PART THREE: MASS BEHAVIOR</i>	
XVI. Some Forms of Mass Behavior: Crowd and Audience	387
XVII. Fashion	411
XVIII. Public Opinion	429
XIX. The Media of Opinion Formation	460
XX. Propaganda	502

XXI.	Psychological Warfare in International Relations	523
XXII.	Control and Power	547
	GLOSSARY	559
	INDEX OF NAMES	567
	INDEX OF SUBJECTS	573

LIST OF FIGURES

1.	Diagram Showing Opposite Social-Cultural Outlets and Their Correlated Ambivalent Personal Attitudes and Roles	147
2.	The Interrelationships of Object, Thought, Symbol, and Person	185
3.	Attitude Toward Negro of Northern and Southern College Students	272
4.	Scale of Nationality Preferences	293
5.	Some Examples of Human Groupings	389
6.	Change in Attitude Toward the Negro on the Part of 434 High-School Students after Seeing the Motion Picture, <i>The Birth of a Nation</i>	447
7.	Showing Changes in Public Opinion in the United States Toward World War II, and "Other Fundamental Views"	452

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Summary of Principal Features of Training, Discipline, Aggression, Affectionate Responses, Sanctions, Education, and Self-Development among Selected Native Peoples	50
2.	Summary of Principal Features of Training, Discipline, Aggression, Affectionate Responses, Sanctions, Education, and Self-Development among Japanese, Germans, and Americans	58
3.	Classification of Organic Drives	82
4.	Percentages of 1,725 Americans Willing to Respond in the Designated Ways to Selected Nationality Groups	263
5.	Comparative Color Prejudice in France and England	279
6.	Predictions of 1936 Election	450
7.	Error in Percentage Points from Percentage of Major-Party Vote of the Winning Candidate (Roosevelt)	451

Chapter I

PERSONALITY, SOCIETY, AND CULTURE

SOCIAL psychology is the study of persons in their interactions with one another and with reference to the effects of this interplay upon the individual's thoughts, feelings, emotions, and habits. As a field of investigation social psychology has its roots in sociology and psychology, but history, political science, economics, and philosophy have contributed much to the study of man in interaction.

Social psychology is a newcomer in the field of science. It has grown up in various academic and nonacademic sectors, and it is not yet mature enough for a well-rounded theory or method. There is missing a substantial body of carefully tested data on which to construct basic principles and laws of social psychology. Yet this is no reason for dismissing it as an infertile area of study. We do have a vast accumulation of observations of social conduct, and by drawing on a variety of sources we are able to expose a great many important facts and to offer interpretations which aid us in understanding and predicting human thought and action. For the present, however, we shall take an eclectic approach and shall draw upon history, political science, economics, philosophy, and sociology, as well as upon experimental and statistical studies from psychology, for data and concepts with which to comprehend the thinking, feeling, and acting of the individual in society.

In order to orient ourselves in the field before us, let us note some of the important features which will require our attention. One of these has to do with the structure and function of the individual as a reacting organism in a given social-cultural environment. Here the student of social conduct must draw upon the findings of physiology, neurology, and psychology as these concern the mechanics of stimulus and response. This material is important in indicating how man learns or becomes socialized. Secondly, there is the larger and for us more important problem of the "content," or nature, of thought, emotion, and action. That is to say, what are the "pictures" which a given individual has in his head regarding his role as a member of society? More specifically, what images has he of his mother, of his father, or of members of another and competing racial group? How does he conceive of his place as a citizen, workingman, or businessman? What are his concepts of right, justice, liberty, and other values which he

has acquired from his particular class or country? In dealing with such matters we must examine the nature of the person's social and cultural training so as to find out how he derived his particular prejudices, stereotypes, convictions, values, and frames of reference as they affect his conduct.

In terms of data and method, we want to know how to go about examining the mechanisms and content of thought and action. One of the commonest approaches is to study the personality as it develops in society and culture. We draw heavily upon the work of the child psychologists, or genetic psychologists, and upon certain work of the anthropologists. The emergence of the social self can be understood only against the background of the child's contact with parents, siblings, neighbors, schoolmates, teachers, and others. The growth of his language, of his basic attitudes, traits, and habits, has reference to his role and status as a growing member of a wide variety of human associations. This might be called the longitudinal, or genetic, approach.

Or we might undertake to study the traits, attitudes, opinions, and habits of an individual at any given time or place with a view to discovering how these function as phases of his role and status in the group. This approach would neglect the genesis of his roles and status and stress his present activities against the background of his contacts with his fellows. A statistical analysis of a number of students' opinions on certain public questions illustrates this approach. A case study of the occupational behavior of a workman in a given plant, or of a parent-child conflict situation, would be another.

To summarize, we might say that the primary interest of social psychology brings together the particular contribution of psychology as a study of mental and behavior mechanisms and that of sociology or cultural anthropology as a study of the content of thought and action. As we shall see, social psychology has to do not only with the mechanics of individual motivation, learning, and adjustment, nor alone with the mechanics of social interaction, but also with the manner in which the ideas, attitudes, and values of a given group operate within the individual.

Our second large concern really has to do with the manner in which the subject matter of social psychology may be divided for treatment. One fundamental aspect has to do with the emergence of the self or personality out of basic constitutional potentials operating within the social-cultural environment. Then, too, another important body of material relates to prejudice and various forms of conflict in society. Still another has to do with collective or mass behavior. In regard to this last, social psychology is concerned chiefly with the thought and action of individuals in their larger, usually public, relations. Most of the investigations of this area take the functional and cross-sectional approach and are concerned with such mat-

ters as fads and fashions, mob behavior (as in a lynching), speculative booms on the stock market, the formation and function of public opinion, and propaganda. Since the author has dealt rather extensively elsewhere with the development of the personality,¹ the present volume will give major attention to the wider public and mass aspects of behavior.

It is evident from this introductory statement that our discussion must deal with three broad and basic variables: personality, society, and culture. The rest of this chapter will sketch the chief features of each of these. The detailed treatment of them will appear in the appropriate places in subsequent chapters.

THE NATURE OF PERSONALITY

The organic foundations of the personality obviously rest upon the structure and function of the individual as a member of the species *Homo sapiens*. The human being is the product of a long evolutionary history, and that history has produced certain basic and more or less fixed biological characteristics, upon which adaptation to the environment, and hence survival, depend. These characteristics include the fundamental physiological processes: the assimilation of food, the elimination of bodily waste, the respiratory and circulatory functions, the control of temperature and of the internal liquid environment of the body cells, and the neuromuscular functions which co-ordinate these operations into a more or less organic unity.

Related to these physiological processes are certain fundamental drives or impulses which must be satisfied if the individual is to live. Such are hunger, the sexual demand, and the need for bodily protection. These basic wants are related to the rudimentary survival of the individual and the race, and in the course of growing up the individual not only acquires various means of satisfying them but extends tremendously the range and nature of his motives and satisfactions. In view of this fact we are obliged to reckon with another important aspect of the individual, namely, his flexibility—his capacity to modify his actions and to extend the manner in which he secures satisfaction. In other words, we must take into account the individual's learning capacity, his adaptability to new situations and new demands.

On the one hand, then, certain constants in the human organism must operate with a certain effectiveness if the individual is to live at all. On the other hand, a certain flexibility makes possible changes in the adaptive systems. Just as the physiological constants come down to an individual from his family ancestry, so, too, the degree of adaptability or learning ability is, by and large, determined by organic hereditary forces. When the psychologist talks about the inheritance of intelligence or of mental capacities, he is

¹ In his *Personality and Problems of Adjustment*, 1940.

thinking largely of the fact that nature has set the upper limit to one's ability to learn—that is, to acquire new motives, new satisfactions, and new adaptive devices.

This fact, in turn, is bound up with another. Some people learn quickly and with ease, some slowly and with difficulty. We say that these variations reflect individual differences. Moreover, variability is to be found not only in learning capacity but in strength of drives and in the nature of satisfactions as well.

Equipped with his organic constitution, the newborn baby comes into the world of his fellows, and from relations with them and with their more or less fixed patterns or culture his personality emerges. As we shall see, the newborn child is completely dependent for his existence upon his contact with his fellows. His survival rests upon the care his mother gives him. From this intimate situation habits of social adaptation begin to be formed. By the second year he begins to acquire language, and he becomes increasingly bound up with his fellows at every point. In time he learns a set of roles or functions in the family, he is accorded a certain position on a prestige scale (status), and around these two—role and status—he develops specific habits, traits of character, attitudes, and values. It is from this configuration of family members and others closely associated with them that the social self emerges. The child is not born human or social. He is at the outset an organism belonging to an animal species. It is only through his interplay with his fellows that he gets his "human nature" and that combination of acts and thoughts which we label the personality.

Though we begin with acts, not thoughts, it is obvious that in the rise of the personality we witness a gradual internalization of our overt actions so that in time we may speak of the subjective or inner life of the individual. This is the realm of thinking, or mental activity. This internal life profoundly influences external activity and is, in fact, an important feature of personality and social interaction. Apparently this internalization accompanies the development of language habits, and, however we may phrase the relation of thought and language, everyone agrees that the two are intimately bound up together. In view of this development of language and thought on the foundations of overt or externalized adjustments, for purposes of description and study we may distinguish three levels of adaptive activity: (1) the overt, which involves the gross bodily muscles and which we speak of usually in terms of habits; (2) the verbal and other communicative activities; and (3) the thought and internal subjective processes—the private world—of the individual which we can only infer or know about from his responses at one of the two other levels. The relations of these three levels to one another and to social adaptation are among the most important problems in social psychology.

SOCIETY

We have just indicated that the individual cannot become a personality without contact with his fellows, and the very concept of society implies interaction of individuals. Society depends essentially upon what George H. Mead called the "social act."² That is, a social configuration is present whenever any given action tendency is modified by, or is not completed without, the intercession of another human being. The mother-child relationship in nursing is the basic social act, and from this develop in time a host of patterns of interaction. We shall review some of these in due course. But for our present purposes we must note certain of the structural features of society.

There are three general types of social interaction: (1) the person-to-person, (2) the person-to-group, and (3) the group-to-group, considering the group either as a collectivity of individuals or as some symbolic representation of such an aggregation.

The sociologist has conveniently classified group life—with respect to its structure and organization—into two large types: primary and secondary. We are familiar with the former in the family, in the play group, in the rural or village neighborhood, and in those small communities which characterize most primitive and rural people everywhere. The primary group is marked by intimate face-to-face contact and by a certain all-or-none inclusion of functions and statuses. Moreover, it is primary in time, for such groups are the matrix from which grows the personality. The effects on the child of the family and other intimate associations are well-known. The secondary group is much more consciously formed; it represents more or less specialized and segmental interests of its members; and it tends to become institutionalized—that is, to take on codes, rituals, and a fixed hierarchy of authority. The trade union, the corporation, the fraternal order, the extended church organization, the political party, and the state itself are examples of secondary associations.

One of the most significant features of the modern world is the domination of secondary groups over the primary. This condition is largely a product of the Industrial Revolution and its ramifications into urbanism, mobility of peoples, and high division of labor. In our complex, industrialized societies this domination has gone so far as to lead some writers to posit a special concept, mass society, to characterize the phenomenon.³ Mass society is characterized by rationality, impersonal relations, extreme specialization of roles, loneliness for the individual in spite of concentration of sheer numbers, and loss of sense of intimacy and security. In such societies

² See G. H. Mead, *Mind, Self, and Society*, 1934.

³ See K. Mannheim, *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction*, 1940.

suggestion, persuasion, propaganda, demagoguery, and other aspects of crowd behavior are common. The irrational thus comes to stand in sharp contrast to the rationality implied in science, high skill, and deliberative choice. The impress of mass society upon men and their culture constitutes one of our most crucial problems of personality balance, sense of emotional security, and moral use of power. The implications of this new form of social organization will become apparent at many points in our later discussions.

In addition to the classification just noted, there is the familiar dichotomy of the in-group and the out-group. Any primary or secondary group toward which we feel intense loyalty, sense of oneness, and mutual identification of purposes may be designated as an in-group. But these attitudes are significant only when persons forming some other group are considered inimical to the welfare of our own. That is, the out-group is some competing or conflicting body of persons toward whom we feel fear, anger, or dislike, whom we avoid, or whom we oppose with reference to some goal or aim. Not all primary or secondary groups involve out-group relationships, but, once any group comes into opposition with some other group in terms of interests or ends, such patterns of thought and action tend to arise. Obviously, many of these antagonistic reactions are highly culturized and are transmitted from one generation to another. At the primary level we find it in the opposition to, or avoidance of, the "people who live on the wrong side of the tracks." At the secondary and mass-society level we find it exemplified in the struggle between two church bodies or two political parties, between employer organizations and labor unions, and we find it most evident in international conflicts.

As a matter of fact, two basic social and individual interactional processes are revealed in the relations between in-groups and out-groups: opposition and co-operation. Opposition may take the form of either competition or conflict. Competition may be defined as a struggle of persons or groups for some goal or end which is not shared with the opponent person or group. It does not necessarily involve any direct contact with the opponent. The aim is to secure the good or goal, and the particular person or group competing is of secondary importance. In contrast, conflict takes on a much more personal character. In order to obtain the goal, one must damage the opponent directly. Two adolescents fighting over a girl would be a case of conflict, but two students struggling for an academic prize would be an instance of competition. Of course, the line between these two forms of opposition is often not so easy to draw, but the distinction has merit in describing and interpreting certain forms of interaction. Co-operation, in contrast, may be defined as a striving for a goal with the help of another person or group, which goal, if obtained, will be shared by all concerned. Two boys constructing a toy boat, and two religious organiza-

tions combining to effect a moral reform in a community, illustrate co-operation.

There is, however, still another process involved in basic interactions: differentiation. This has to do with the development of the specific functions or roles of an individual as a participant in a group. In the field of economics we use the concept of division of labor, but differentiation of function is evident in all sorts of situations—for example, in the respective roles of the husband and the wife, in the role of the teacher and that of the pupil in the classroom, in the place of the leader as contrasted with that of the follower in a revolutionary movement, and so on. Differentiation of function may be found in connection with either opposition or co-operation. It is of fundamental importance, for it is one of the bases on which occupational, sexual, racial, class, and national lines are drawn.

From these three elemental processes, moreover, many others arise. Stratification, as illustrated in class structure, is a case in point. Accommodative patterns built up out of compromise between conflicting nations would be another. The acculturation or assimilation process studied by sociologists and anthropologists often represents certain combinations of co-operation, competition, and differentiation.⁴ We shall be concerned with these general processes only as they are related to particular analyses of our data.

We cannot introduce the basic aspects of society without pointing out that the roots of interaction lie in our history as a species. Society precedes culture by many millennia. Long before there was any culture, animals lived in close social relations and revealed the processes of conflict and co-operation and even a certain differentiation of function, chiefly in terms of age and sex. This matter is so vital to any understanding of man's social behavior that we shall devote the next chapter to showing in some detail the prehuman foundations of society.

The important matter at this point is a clear understanding that the individual lives within the framework of associations with his fellows and that his personality has no meaning outside this framework. From birth to death his overt acts, his communication, and his inner life will be profoundly affected by the groups in which he operates or toward which he has co-operative or aggressive responses.

CULTURE

The third basic element with which we must deal is culture as this is conceived by the anthropologist. The term refers to the more or less organized and persistent patterns of habits, ideas, attitudes, and values which are passed on to the newborn child from his elders or by others as he grows

⁴ For a discussion of these processes at the sociological level, see R. E. Park and E. W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Society*, 1924; E. A. Ross, *Principles of Sociology*, 3rd ed., 1938; and K. Young, *Sociology: A Study of Society and Culture*, 1942.