

*Readings in
Social Psychology*

Readings in Social Psychology

Prepared for the Committee on the Teaching of Social Psychology of The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues

NEW YORK • 1947
HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

Copyright 1947 by Henry Holt and Company, Inc.

February, 1950.

Printed in the United States of America

Foreword

SINCE its formation in 1936, the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues has undertaken many projects. It has published three yearbooks, in which it has attempted to assemble the best available psychological research and thought concerning the problems of industrial conflict, of civilian morale, and of enduring peace. It publishes the quarterly *Journal of Social Issues*, each issue of which is devoted to the presentation and interpretation of research findings in some special area of human relations. It has subsidized cooperative research among university centers in this country. It is cooperating in efforts to organize social scientists throughout the world who see much to be gained by pooling their efforts to solve common human problems. It has issued public releases from time to time concerning issues which it believes can be illuminated by psychological understanding.

These activities, however, have left largely untouched that part of the public to which many members of the Society devote the major part of their professional time—college and university students. As early as 1943 the Society was convinced that the teaching of social psychology in this country (much of which was carried on by its members) was being unnecessarily handicapped by the paucity of teaching materials. Good texts were available; but no text, however good, could adequately portray the empirical foundations upon which social psychology rests. Even Kimball Young's *Source Book for Social Psychology*, which did much to define the field in 1927, was no longer representative of the rapidly growing discipline. It was clear, moreover, that the library resources of colleges and universities would not be adequate to meet the demands of the increasing numbers of students who would be drawn to social psychology after the war.

A committee was therefore appointed by the Society to investigate ways and means of providing more adequate teaching materials for students of social psychology. Its recommendation was that a volume of readings should be prepared which should be, insofar as possible, representative of the reports of research in social psychology and of the methods by which its conclusions are reached. It was also recommended that the interdisciplinary nature of the field be stressed and that due attention be given to more recent developments, some of which had been stimulated by wartime research. It is perhaps significant that the basic plans for the present volume were laid by a team of social psychologists while they were engaged in such a research project in Bad Nauheim, Germany, in the summer of 1945.

The Society offers this volume not as an inclusive or definitive portrayal of social psychology as it exists in 1947, but rather as an illustrative selection of empirical studies and of approaches to problems which may supplement systematic presentations and conceptual formulations to be found elsewhere. Social psychology faces

three necessities: it must adhere to rigorous canons of scientific procedure; it must draw hypotheses from all of the relevant psychological and social sciences; and it must bring such hypotheses and such methods to bear in systematic research upon problems of human importance. This volume is offered as an aid to teachers and students in facing these tasks.

The Society owes a deep debt of gratitude to Theodore M. Newcomb and Eugene L. Hartley, who are primarily responsible for this volume. They have devoted a tremendous amount of time and work to its preparation. The quality of this volume attests the value of their work, that of the Editorial Committee who assisted them, and of the authors who contributed material.

RENSIS LIKERT, President
Society for the Psychological Study
of Social Issues.

Preface

THE aims of this volume

Teachers of social psychology have for some years been finding that their problems were increasing *pari passu* with the development of their field. They have been forced to take account of recent advances in such diverse fields as ethnology, statistics, clinical psychology, and psychiatry—fields which, a few short student generations ago, would have been thought of as belonging to other disciplines. At the same time, paradoxically enough, they find themselves increasingly self-conscious about having a discipline of their own. New sources of evidence and new tools of research, instead of forcing the social psychologist into a centrifugal whirl, have helped him to bring into clearer focus his own function. It is the peculiar province of the social psychologist to bring to bear upon his study of the behaving organism all relevant factors, from whatever sources and by whatever methods ascertained, which inhere in the fact of association with other members of the species. Most of these factors in the case of human beings have to do in some way with membership in groups.

Our aim in preparing this volume has therefore been to present illustrative selections of the ways in which the influence of social conditions upon psychological processes have been studied. Since we have tried to keep in mind the needs of student and teacher, we have deliberately sacrificed representativeness for what we hope will prove to be usefulness. We make no claim to have "covered the field." Many teachers will find that certain areas have been omitted entirely. We have, for example, included nothing in the field of animal social psychology. There is no section labeled "Personal-

ity," though many readings in other sections deal with social influences upon personality. The topic of delinquency and crime has been omitted altogether. The "great names" in the history of social psychology are not represented; we have not included selections from Tarde, LeBon, James, Cooley, McDougall, Ross, or Freud because their writings are elsewhere available, because brief passages from them are rarely satisfying, and because we have preferred to stress reports from the more recent period in which social psychology has come of age. We have also eschewed all discussions of the nature of the field of social psychology.

Editorial responsibility

Matters of policy by which the selection of readings in this volume was determined represent not merely our own predilections. Every major problem of policy and of selection has been referred to the Editorial Committee, and the original outlines have been many times revised at their suggestion. The specific selections included, as well as the policies by which their choice was determined, represent in nearly every case an editorial consensus. The Editorial Committee has performed far more than a nominal function. The original list from which nearly all the finally selected readings were chosen was submitted by them, and most of the proposals for revising and supplementing the early outlines came from them rather than from us. Though we have consulted them at every point except where last-minute decisions had to be made, they have granted us freedom of action whenever we thought we needed it. The general complexion of this volume, in short, reflects the wishes of the Editorial

Committee, but for many of its details the responsibility is ours.

For many reasons we have imposed heavier burdens upon some editors than upon others. Gordon W. Allport has been indefatigable both in initiating proposals and in complying with a wide range of requests. Margaret Mead, with help from Clyde Kluckhohn, has served as "consulting expert" concerning ethnological materials. By relying upon her judgment rather than solely upon our own, we believe that many of the selections in this area have been more wisely made than they might otherwise have been. The section on Industrial Morale is very largely the work of Arthur W. Kornhauser. Goodwin Watson has been our principal adviser for the section on Mass Communication and Propaganda, and Daniel Katz for that on Public Opinion. Eli S. Marks has performed invaluable service in preparing the statistical appendix, under cruel limitations of time.

We are happy to include several original contributions, prepared especially for this volume. In some instances these are newly prepared versions of research previously reported; some are anticipatory versions of fuller reports that will be made later. To these authors, whose contributions in terms of time have been very great, we are particularly indebted. We are especially fortunate in having one of the last articles to come from the pen of Kurt Lewin, whose name we have kept on the list of editors in spite of his untimely death just as this volume was going to press.

How to use this book

This book, as "an illustrative selection of empirical studies and of approaches to problems which may supplement systematic presentations and conceptual formulations," does not attempt to provide an over-all theoretical framework for the materials of social psychology. It can be only a supplement to and not a substitute

for the continuity and systematization to be found in the standard textbooks, or which may be provided by a series of lectures by a single individual.

There are sixteen major sections, each of which includes a number of specific readings. Though each selection included has merit, though each major section is important, we have included more material than is usually assigned as required supplementary reading in a one-semester introductory course in social psychology. This makes it possible for the instructor to "tailor" his assignments to his students by omitting whole sections, or by reducing the number of readings required in those sections where he feels that more than enough is provided.

Each selection in the volume is reprinted as a unit, and there is practically no "connective tissue" provided by the editors. We have resisted the pressures (and, shall we confess, the temptations) to provide such textual continuity, recognizing that many instructors will wish to adapt the material not only by the deletions suggested above, but also by modifying the context in which single readings or whole topics are considered or by shifting their order. The sequence of the major sections and the ordering of the readings within the sections represents the orientation of the editors, but those who use the book are by no means bound to follow the order as presented. To provide better integration with a particular textbook or lecture sequence, an instructor may choose to recommend readings in almost any order he finds preferable. It may prove desirable to change the order of the major sections or of the assignment of readings within sections. Also, we should like to call attention to the possibility of cross-referencing the readings to reinforce one another or to establish new major units. (For example, should it be desirable to consider the material on "race" and "race prejudice" as a unit, there could be brought together the materials by

Klineberg in section I, Marks in section II, the Clarks in section III, Hayakawa and Katz and Braly in section IV, some of the frustration and aggression materials from section VI, Sims and Patrick in section VII, Fromm in section IX, Allport and Postman, and Sar- gent in section XIII, as well as the material in section XII.) Many of the readings could have been classified in any one of several sections, and the instructor may well desire a specific selection to be read in a context other than the one in which it appears here.

We emphasize the flexibility with which the materials of this volume can be used because of our conviction that nearly all teachers of social psychology, no matter how much they may differ in theoretical interpretations, have in common the need for reports of well-designed, objectively conducted, empirical studies. Theoretical controversies and differences of opinion apply to the context in which one chooses to consider the materials and the details of how the findings are to be interpreted. Fundamental theory is of paramount importance, of course, in the planning of research and in interpreting data but in the social sciences it is not true, as so many of the uninitiated insist, "that it is all a matter of opinion." The objective studies and empirical investigations cannot be gainsaid.

In the preparation of the selections for inclusion in this volume, we have taken liberties in the case of many of the readings in omitting some of the lengthier discussions of previous work in the field. The footnote references which are included here may be interpreted in accordance with the following principle: the numbered footnotes originated with the authors of the readings; those indicated by a symbol (asterisk, dagger, double dagger) represent the comments and insertions of the editors.

To help the student who is unfamiliar with the statistical analyses used in the

readings here included, an appendix has been prepared which gives the minimal definitions of the concepts used. This will make it possible for the student to read the studies with fair comprehension of their significance. The appendix cannot, of course, substitute for appropriate training in methods of statistical analysis and interpretation so necessary for full participation (even as a reader) in contemporary social psychological research.

Future editions

We have a lively sense of some of the inadequacies of the following selection of readings. There are doubtless other shortcomings to which we hope our attention will be called by those who use it. Both the publishers and the Committee on the Teaching of Social Psychology of the S.P.S.S.I. are convinced that substantial improvements in the present volume are possible if the experience of teachers and students with it is properly exploited. The Committee will therefore not only welcome spontaneous comments and criticisms from those who have used the volume; it also plans to make a systematic inquiry of all teachers known to have used the volume who are willing to express grounds for satisfaction and dissatisfaction. In such manner, we hope to make sure that future editions will not only keep up with current developments but will also meet the changing needs of teachers. We see no reason why social psychologists should fail to apply their own methods to problems which they themselves face as teachers.

June 1, 1947

THEODORE M. NEWCOMB
Departments of Sociology
and of Psychology
University of Michigan

EUGENE L. HARTLEY
Department of Psychology
College of the City of New York

*Readings in
Social Psychology*

Contents

I. UNIFORMITIES AND VARIATIONS UNDER DIFFERING SOCIAL INFLUENCES

1. How Differences in Environment Affected Separated One-egg Twins — <i>H. H. Newman</i>	1
2. Adolescence in Primitive and in Modern Society— <i>M. Mead</i>	6
3. Psychological Types in the Cultures of the Southwest— <i>R. Benedict</i>	14
4. Negro Intelligence and Urban Residence— <i>O. Klineberg</i>	24
5. Gestural Behavior and Social Setting— <i>D. Efron and J. P. Foley, Jr.</i>	33
6. Does Culture Appreciably Affect Patterns of Infant Behavior?— <i>W. Dennis</i>	40
7. The Change from Dry to Wet Rice Culture in Tanala-Betsileo— <i>R. Linton and A. Kardiner</i>	46
8. The J-Curve Hypothesis of Conforming Behavior— <i>F. H. Allport</i>	55

II. MEMORY, JUDGMENT, PERCEPTION, MOTIVATION AS INFLUENCED BY SOCIAL CONDITIONS

1. Social Factors in Recall— <i>F. C. Bartlett</i>	69
2. The Definition of the Situation— <i>W. I. Thomas and F. Znaniecki</i>	76
3. Group Influences upon the Formation of Norms and Attitudes— <i>M. Sherif</i>	77
4. A Social Determinant of the Level of Aspiration— <i>D. W. Chapman and J. Volkmann</i>	90
5. Value and Need as Organizing Factors in Perception— <i>J. S. Bruner and C. C. Goodman</i>	99
6. The Learning and Forgetting of Controversial Material— <i>J. M. Levine and G. Murphy</i>	108
7. Skin Color Judgments of Negro College Students— <i>E. S. Marks</i>	116
8. Social Planning and the Concept of "Deutero-learning"— <i>G. Bateson</i>	121

III. SOCIALIZATION OF THE CHILD

1. Social Factors in Child Development— <i>L. B. Murphy</i>	129
2. Socialization and Adolescent Personality— <i>A. Davis</i>	139
3. Educative Effects of Social Environment as Disclosed by Studies of Primitive Societies— <i>M. Mead</i>	151
4. Social Factors in Moral Development— <i>J. Piaget</i>	158
5. Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children— <i>K. B. Clark and M. P. Clark</i>	169

IV. LANGUAGE

1. Language and the Development of the Self—*G. H. Mead* 179
2. Meaning, Symbols and Levels of Abstraction—*S. I. Hayakawa* 190
3. Verbal Stereotypes and Racial Prejudice—*D. Katz and K. W. Braly* 204
4. Science and Linguistics—*B. L. Whorf* 210
5. A Linguistic Approach to a System of Values—*D. D. Lee* 219

V. SUGGESTION, IMITATION, AND SYMPATHY

1. Suggestibility and Levels of Difficulty—*T. E. Coffin* 225
2. An Experiment on the Operation of Prestige Suggestion—*H. B. Lewis* 232
3. Imitation and Independent Learning—*N. E. Miller and J. Dollard* 243
4. Variations in Sympathetic Behavior on the Playground—*L. B. Murphy* 246

VI. SOCIAL FRUSTRATION

1. Frustration and Aggression
 - A. The Frustration-aggression Hypothesis—*N. E. Miller and others* 257
 - B. Definitions and Principles—*J. Dollard and others* 258
 - C. Adult Reactions in a Frustrating Situation—*R. R. Sears and others* 261
 - D. The Hostile Act—*D. M. Levy* 263
 - E. The Frustration-aggression Hypothesis and Culture—*G. Bateson* 267
 - F. Hostility and Fear in Social Life—*J. Dollard* 269
 - G. Deprivation, Threat, and Frustration—*A. H. Maslow* 281
2. Experimental Studies of Frustration in Young Children—*R. G. Barker, T. Dembo, K. Lewin, and M. E. Wright* 283
3. A Study of Children's Reactions to Failure and an Experimental Attempt to Modify Them—*M. E. Keister and R. Updegraff* 291

VII. EFFECTS OF GROUP SITUATIONS

1. An Experimental Analysis of Some Group Effects—*J. F. Dashiell* 297
2. A Comparison of Individuals and Small Groups in the Rational Solution of Complex Problems—*M. E. Shaw* 304
3. An Experimental Study of Leadership and Group Life—*R. Lippitt and R. K. White* 315
4. Group Decision and Social Change—*K. Lewin* 330
5. Some Patterned Consequences of Membership in a College Community—*T. M. Newcomb* 345
6. Attitude toward the Negro of Northern and Southern College Students—*V. M. Sims and J. R. Patrick* 358

VIII. ROLE AND STATUS

1. Concepts of Role and Status— <i>R. Linton</i>	367
2. The Adjustment of the Individual to His Age and Sex Roles— <i>L. S. Cottrell, Jr.</i>	370
3. Sex Roles in Polygynous Mormon Families— <i>K. Young</i>	373
4. Changes in Sex Groupings of School Children— <i>J. L. Moreno</i>	383
5. The Rating and Dating Complex— <i>W. Wailer</i>	388
6. The Professional Thief— <i>E. H. Sutherland</i>	394

IX. LEADERSHIP

1. Leader-follower Relations in Street-corner Society— <i>W. F. Whyte</i>	403
2. Leadership and Sociometric Choice— <i>H. H. Jennings</i>	407
3. Hitler and the Nazi Authoritarian Character Structure— <i>E. Fromm</i>	413
4. Conditions of Effective Leadership in the Industrial Organization— <i>D. McGregor</i>	427

X. INDUSTRIAL MORALE

1. Morale in War Industry— <i>D. Katz and H. Hyman</i>	437
2. Group Factors in Worker Productivity— <i>G. C. Homans</i>	448
3. Labor and Management Responsibility for Productive Efficiency— <i>C. S. Golden and H. J. Ruttenger</i>	461

XI. SOCIAL CLASS

1. The Class System of the White Caste— <i>A. Davis, B. B. Gardner, and M. R. Gardner</i>	467
2. The Class System	
A. Learning the Class System in Plainville, U. S. A.— <i>J. West</i>	475
B. The Family in the Class System— <i>W. L. Warner and P. S. Lunt</i>	477
C. The Social Role of the Teacher— <i>W. L. Warner, R. J. Havighurst, and M. B. Loeb</i>	479
3. The American Class Structure: A Psychological Analysis— <i>R. Centers</i>	481
4. Social Status and Child-rearing Practices— <i>M. C. Ericson</i>	494

XII. PREJUDICE

1. The Measurement of Social Distance— <i>E. S. Bogardus</i>	503
2. Development of Attitude toward Negroes— <i>E. L. Horowitz</i>	507
3. Factors Associated with Attitudes toward Jews— <i>A. A. Campbell</i>	518
4. Tolerance and Personality Traits— <i>E. L. Hartley and R. E. Hartley</i>	527
5. The Antidemocratic Personality— <i>E. Frenkel-Brunswick, D. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford</i>	531
6. Opinions about Negro Infantry Platoons in White Companies of Seven Divisions— <i>I and E Division, U. S. War Department</i>	542

XIII. MASS COMMUNICATION AND PROPAGANDA

1. The Basic Psychology of Rumor—*G. W. Allport and L. J. Postman* . . . 547
2. Stereotypes and the Newspapers—*S. S. Sargent* . . . 558
3. Psychological Gratifications in Daytime Radio Listening—*H. Herzog* . . 561
4. The Effects of Presenting "One Side" versus "Both Sides" in Changing
Opinions on a Controversial Subject—*I and E Division, U.S. War Department* . . . 566

XIV. PUBLIC OPINION

1. How Surveys Are Made—*E. E. Maccoby and R. R. Holt* . . . 581
2. Public Opinion in Flux—*H. Cantril* . . . 591
3. Social Factors in Voting—*P. F. Lazarsfeld, B. Berelson, and H. Gaudet* . . 605

XV. CRITICAL SOCIAL SITUATIONS

1. The Invasion from Mars—*H. Cantril* . . . 619
2. Individual and Mass Behavior in Extreme Situations—*B. Bettelheim* . . 628
3. The "Phantom Anesthetist" of Mattoon: a Field Study of Mass Hysteria—
D. M. Johnson . . . 639
4. The Funeral of "Sister President"—*J. H. Douglass* . . . 650

XVI. WAR AND PEACE

1. The Psychologists' Manifesto . . . 655
 2. Anthropological Research and World Peace—*C. Kluckhohn* . . . 657
- Appendix . . . 664
- Name Index . . . 673
- Subject Index . . . 677

Uniformities and Variations under Differing Social Influences

1.

HOW DIFFERENCES IN ENVIRONMENT AFFECTED SEPARATED ONE-EGG TWINS

By Horatio H. Newman

In each of twenty cases of separated one-egg twins every effort was made to reconstruct life experiences of the twins and to discover any differences in environment or experience that might have tended to produce differences in ability, personality or physical condition. We roughly subdivided environment into three categories: educational, social and physical-health.

It was found that whenever the educational experiences of a pair of twins differed to a marked extent the twin with the greater amount of education had a distinctly higher score on all ability and scholastic achievement tests, while in those cases where there was no difference in education, or only a small difference, the scores of the twins of a pair tended to be about as similar as the average of one-egg twins reared together. A few examples of this close correlation between differences in education and those in mental ability will make this important point clear.

THE EFFECTS OF DIFFERENCES IN EDUCATION

In the case of twins *Gladys* and *Helen*, Gladys stopped school after the third grade, while Helen went on through col-

lege and became a teacher. There was a difference of about thirteen years of formal schooling in favor of Helen. In the Stanford-Binet test Helen's I.Q. was 116 (high normal) and Gladys's was 92 (low normal), a large difference of 24 points. On the Otis S.A. test Helen had an I.Q. of 106 and Gladys 94, a difference of 12 points. On the International test Helen scored 188 points and Gladys 143 points, a difference of 45 points. On the Stanford Achievement test Helen had a mental age of 18 years, 10 months and Gladys a mental age of 13 years and one month, a difference of 69 months. It seems certain that in the case of Gladys the great deficiency in education had inhibited the development of the rather high grade of mental ability with which she was endowed by heredity and which was well developed in her sister.

In the second case, that of twins *James* and *Reece*, the differences in both education and ability were less striking but quite noteworthy. James completed grade and high school in a town of about 2,000 inhabitants, while Reece attended a rural grade school in the mountains which was open only during five months in the year. He attended only when he

From Horatio H. Newman, *Multiple Human Births* (New York: Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc., 1940) Copyright, 1940, by Horatio Hackett Newman. Reprinted by permission of the author and Doubleday & Company, Inc.

felt like it and stopped at the eighth grade. On the Stanford-Binet test James's I.Q. was 96 (almost up to average), while Reece's I.Q. was only 77 (commonly regarded as bordering on the "dull and backward" classification), a difference of 19 points. On the Otis S.A. test James's I.Q. was 104 (above average) and Reece's was 84, a difference of 20 points. On the International test James scored 124 points, Reece 89, a difference of 35 points. On the Stanford Achievement test James had a mental age of 16 years and Reece of 13 years, one month, a difference of 35 months.

In the third case, that of twins *Eleanore* and *Georgiana*, Eleanore stopped school at the end of the fifth grade, while Georgiana finished grade school and high school and then had three years at normal school, a difference in favor of Georgiana of ten years of schooling. In this case, though both girls were quite efficient as office assistants, their mental rating was considerably below the average. Nevertheless, Georgiana was consistently superior to Eleanore. Georgiana's I.Q. on the Stanford-Binet was 78, and Eleanore's was only 66, a difference of 12 points, but in a part of the scale where a few points are rather significant. On the Otis S.A. test Georgiana's I.Q. was 84 and Eleanore's 69, a difference of 15 points. On the Stanford Achievement test Georgiana's mental age was 14 years, one month and Eleanore's 10 years, 11 months, a difference of 28 months. This case shows that with a good education a poorly endowed person can improve his ability to a moderate degree but cannot reach the level of a potentially able but poorly educated person such as the twin Gladys of our first case. Some comment might be made here as to the minimal endowment necessary for successfully completing a course in some normal schools and qualifying as a teacher.

The fourth and last case where there was a considerable difference in education

is that of twins *Mabel* and *Mary*. Mary was educated through grade school and three years of high school in a medium-sized city and finished her last year in the high school of a large city. Mabel finished the eighth grade in a small country school near the farm home. As is usually the case in country schools, the terms were short. The difference in years of education was actually about five. On the Stanford-Binet test Mary had an I.Q. of 106 and Mabel of 89, a difference of 17 points. On the Otis S.A. test Mary's I.Q. was 111 and Mabel's 97, a difference of 14 points. On the International test Mary scored 104 points and Mabel 96, a difference of only eight points, but in the same direction as the other differences. On the Stanford Achievement test Mary had a mental age of 17 years, three months and Mabel of 14 years, five months, a difference of 34 months.

Out of the twenty cases studied, these four cases were the only ones in which the differences in schooling between twins of a pair differed by more than a year or two. It will be noted that in each of these four cases the better educated twin had a distinctly higher rating on *all* the tests. The consistency of the results on the various tests increases our confidence in the validity of the tests themselves and in the reality of the differences in mental ability of the twins examined. One can hardly question the conclusion that mental ability within certain limits can be improved by education, or suffer from the lack of it. In each of these cases we must assume that the twin with the lower I.Q. had an inherited capacity to reach at least the capacity of the twin partner with the higher I.Q. If the differences in education had been greater, presumably the differences in I.Q. would have been greater. One's I.Q., then, is not fixed by heredity alone but may be raised or lowered many points according to the type and amount of education the individual experiences.

Remarkably enough, however, the

remaining sixteen cases of separated twins, in which differences in education had amounted to no more than a year or two, showed an average difference in I.Q. even slightly less than that of one-egg twins reared together. From this we may draw the conclusion that small differences in education do not appreciably affect ability, but that large differences in education may induce important differences in ability.

EFFECTS OF DIFFERENCES IN SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Differences in social environment are difficult to estimate in terms comparable to those in education. The method of estimating these differences was that of rating them by five independent judges and averaging their estimates. When these rated differences in social environment were compared with differences in scores on personality tests there was no reliable correlation of the group as a whole between differences in social environment and differences in personality traits. What is the explanation of this unexpected result? There seem to be two possible answers to this question. Either differences in social environment have no effect on personality traits or else the tests of personality do not bear any direct relation to our rather rough-and-ready estimates of differences in the total social environment. We regard the second answer as more probable than the first.

We find in some cases of separated twins that the chief difference in social environment is one between city life and country life. In other cases the difference is one between relative wealth and relative poverty. In still other cases the difference is mainly one of contacts with cultured as over against relatively uncultured family groups and associates. In one pair of twins one twin had led a respectable life and the other had had a more or less lawless career. In another pair the life of one twin had been full of

stimulating social contacts, while the other had led a decidedly sheltered and isolated existence without stimulating contacts of any sort. In another case one twin had a large family of children to whom she had devoted all her energy and affection, while the twin sister, though married, was childless and had followed a professional career. In still another case one twin had spent most of her life in London, England, while the other had, since eighteen months of age, lived in a small town in Ontario. These varied types of social environmental difference are so unrelated to each other that one would not expect any summation of such differences to be correlated with differences in scores made on any particular kind of personality test.

If, then, we are to discover any relation between differences in social environment and differences in personality we shall have to find them through the study of individual cases. When this was done we found clear evidence that differences in social experience actually do produce differences in personality.

Perhaps the most striking personality difference of all was that found between twins *Mildred* and *Ruth*. Mildred was the foster child of a banker who was also the mayor of a medium-sized city. He was a well educated man whose home was a gathering place of interesting and cultured people. Mildred entered into all of these activities. Ruth, on the other hand, was the foster child of a man of little education who was a foreman of laborers. The foster mother disapproved of Ruth's normal associates and kept her at home after school hours, with dolls as her only companions. On all the personality tests Ruth showed an inhibited character, shy, diffident, silent, with lisping speech and an unhappy expression, while Mildred was much more confident, unembarrassed, talkative, happy in facial expression and spoke without a trace of lisping. Although both girls were high school seniors in two different cities and

had had equal educational opportunities, Mildred's I.Q. on both the Stanford-Binet and Otis S.A. tests was 15 points higher than that of Ruth. From this it might be inferred that the cultured and stimulating home life of Mildred, as contrasted with the barren home life of Ruth, had made a difference in mental ability equal to that of several years of formal schooling in some of the other cases.

Another interesting case was that of *Mary* and *Mabel*. These twins, in addition to the educational differences already described, had lived very different lives. Mary had lived all her life in a town and had devoted herself to her studies and to music and music teaching. Mabel had lived on a large and prosperous farm, participating actively in all the work commonly done by an able-bodied farm woman. On all of the personality tests the scores of these 29-year-old women were among the most different of the whole twenty pairs. Mabel, the farm woman, was slow and phlegmatic; Mary was far more excitable and responsive, almost neurotic. On the other hand, Mabel was more aggressive and was evidently the leader and manager. She had fewer fears and was less readily shocked by unpleasant words and ideas. She walked about with a firm, almost masculine stride, in contrast with Mary's ladylike step and manner. The two women seemed totally unlike in overt behavior and gave the impression of having very different personalities.

The case of *Gladys* and *Helen*, who had the greatest difference in schooling, also illustrates the effects of social differences on personality. These social differences are inherent in the fact that Helen had gone through college and was a teacher, while Gladys had been an industrial worker most of her life. In some of the personality tests the scores were very similar; on others very different. It appears that these twins are alike in fundamental personality traits

but differ greatly in their reactions to different social situations. The largest contrast was in overt behavior. Helen, the teacher, was much more suave and polished, was much more interested in her personal appearance and made more of an effort to produce a favorable personal impression. Gladys, however, was all business, without social charm or concern about how she impressed others.

In contrast to these cases, in which the differences in social environment seemed definitely to have produced appropriate differences in personality, was the case of twins *James* and *Reece*. James had always lived in town with his maternal grandparents. He had had a good high-school education and was engineer for a sand-and-gravel company. He was a steady, respected citizen. Reece, on the contrary, had lived the life of a mountaineer, had never worked steadily, had engaged in illegal pursuits characteristic of his environment and had been caught and punished several times. In spite of this great difference in social experience, these twins, who had never spent a night together since babyhood, were almost indistinguishable as to their behavior when with us. They made highly similar scores on all the personality tests. It appears that the differences in environment and experience have not modified their fundamental personality traits but have merely served to direct the primitive impulses, common to both, into modes of behavior in one case characteristic of a primitive environment and in the other case into those more in accord with the ideals of a higher level of civilized life. Neither of these men is criminalistic in character, but both are rather individualistic, rather stubborn and both tend to resist opposition vigorously. One expressed his strong character by primitive modes of action; the other restrained his primitive impulses in favor of actions which are more socially acceptable in a modern urban community.