THE CONCEPT OF INTERACTION HAS ALWAYS BEEN REGARDED AS CENTRAL TO
social psychology as well as to sociology. From birth on, the survival of the
human being depends on the intercession of another individual, normally
his mother or mother-surrogate. As he grows up, he lives in social inter-
action with other members of his family and later with individuals in other
primary associations; finally, he moves into the world of specialized second-
arly and segmentalized groupings. Thus from birth on he is part and parcel
of a series of interconnected, interactional units, the model of which is the
dyadic parent-child, child-child, or adult relationship.

TYPES OF INTERACTION

Earlier sociologists and social psychologists dealt with various forms of
interaction. This is amply clear in the writings of Ward, Small, and Giddings,

* Social psychology, as interpreted in this chapter, seems to the editors to embrace
a realm of subject matter that has in great part been traditionally studied by other disci-
plines. The wide range of topics treated here—for example, the group, social processes
(cooperation, etc.)—points to an interpretation of social psychology as a kind of impe-
rialistic social science, a tendency working against a fruitful division of labor among the
several social sciences. However, it must be granted that this encyclopedic view has many
adherents among contemporary social psychologists; it should therefore be carefully
considered. For a more restricted delimitation of the field of social psychology, the
reader is urged to compare this chapter with another in which the same senior author
participated: Kimball Young and Douglas W. Oberdorfer, “Psychological Studies of
Social Processes,” in H. E. Barnes, Howard Becker, and Frances B. Becker (eds.), Con-
temporary Social Theory (New York, 1940), Chap. 12.
to mention only three earlier American writers. Yet it remained for Park and Burgess in their *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (1921) to give us a more systematic statement of social processes. Drawing heavily upon the German philosopher and sociologist Simmel, they extended the analysis and stimulated various studies which used such concepts.¹

*Competition and Cooperation as Forms of Interaction.* A more organized attack on the concepts of opposition and cooperation was stimulated in the twenties by certain committees of the Social Science Research Council that were interested in the emerging field of personality and culture. Margaret Mead compiled and edited a book entitled *Cooperation and Competition among Primitive People* (1937), which consisted of chapters on selected non-literate peoples illustrating model patterns of cooperation, competition, and individualistic enterprise. A second publication was a brochure by May and Doob in which they reviewed concepts and contributions centering around competition and cooperation.²

*Language as Interaction.* Language, which is a system of phonetic symbols, is the chief agent of communication, and is hence of central concern to social psychology. Much of the early work on language, however, had an ethnocentric bias. This is clearly seen in the old argument that there was a basic language or *Urspache*, an idea linked with certain racialist dogmas in Germany and elsewhere. Similarly, bias is evident in generalizations concerning the growth of vocabulary formed on the basis of studies the overwhelming bulk of which took their data from middle class, and usually professional, families. Yet with the extension of interest to non-European societies and their cultures, much of this earlier limitation has disappeared. Not only has the former ethnocentrism been dissipated, but earlier discussions about the origin of speech, such as the interjectional and onomato poetic theories, as well as attempts at rigid classification of languages in terms of form, no longer greatly interest students of language.³

Language plays a large part in socialization. The acquisition of speech itself is necessary to most later learning. Furthermore, along with the use of tools, language is the *sine qua non* of culture. It is the basic carrier of culture, and the growth of one’s vocabulary is a measure on one’s encultur-

Psychologists have worked out the stages of linguistic development for children in our Western society, but whether like stages are to be found in all societies is not known. In any case, it is clear that in learning any given language, the individual uses only a fraction of the potential phonetic elements possible in human speech. Although many psychologists would not agree with Watson that thinking is essentially subvocal talking, no one doubts that language and thought are closely linked. Furthermore, language is essential to the development of the social self, as George H. Mead so definitely indicated. In this connection, speech plays a central part in the moral training of the child and thus becomes an important feature of social control. Finally, speech and non-linguistic vocalisms provide a means of expressing individuality. All societies and their cultures permit a certain range of idiosyncratic verbal habits that serve to reveal individual variation.

Status and Role in Processes of Interaction. The interpersonal relations of individuals who make up a group have, with increasing astuteness, been analyzed in terms of roles and statuses. Some important theoretical consideration of these matters, moreover, came from cultural anthropology rather than from psychology or sociology. Linton’s discussion of status and role has become something of a landmark in the literature. There have been several cross-cultural studies of personality that have made use of the role-status formulation. (See pp. 564-567.) In this connection, Linton developed his concept of status personality. Essentially, he attempted to show that the “basic personality” is largely unconscious. Other aspects of personality, however, at a more conscious level, revolve around taking on, and functioning with respect to, certain known status positions and their associated roles. Of these, he notes, occupation is one of the most important.

INTERACTION AND GROUP DYNAMICS

Viewed in a larger perspective, so-called “role theory” has taken on a great deal of importance in social psychology. This is partially the result of the fact that it has become enmeshed in another new area known as “group

---


6 Linton’s first discussion of role and status appears in his Study of Man (New York, 1936). A later and somewhat expanded treatment is found in his The Cultural Background of Personality (New York, 1945). See also W. F. Ogburn, Social Change (New York, 1922).


dynamics." As a theory as well as a methodology, group dynamics owes its origin to Lewin. At the outset of his professional career Lewin had more or less followed the Gestalt school of psychology; but later he developed his own "field theory." Unhappily, communication of the new theory to those working in social psychology at the time was made difficult because Lewin had invented a number of new terms for what were old and well-recognized dimensions of group behavior.

Not content to stop with theoretical formulation, Lewin and his students set up an experiment to test his thesis. The chief experiment aimed to study variations in productivity and interactional patterns among groups of subjects—junior-high-school pupils—working at given tasks under three distinctive conditions: (1) an "authoritarian" type of control wherein directions and advice were handed down from a predesignated director; (2) a "democratic" type in which the participating subjects discussed the project in advance, agreed on a certain division of labor, and sought advice from the director on a permissive level; and (3) a working condition called "laissez faire" in which there were only general directions and little or no planning or supervision.

This study showed clearly that groups may be investigated under reasonably well-controlled conditions. Unfortunately, many long-range and unwarranted generalizations have been made from this research with respect to the advantages of "democracy" over "totalitarianism." Such an extension does raise the broader problem of the applicability of the findings of studies on small groups to wider and more highly institutionalized ones. Then, too, critics have pointed out that the subjects in the Iowa investigation came from middle-class families with their heavy emphasis on competitive attitudes and habits. Children from a cultural setting that stressed strong authoritarian controls might have performed quite differently.

The expansion of this type of research was rapid. In 1945 the Massachusetts Institute of Technology established The Research Center for Group Dynamics. In 1948, after the death of Lewin, the center was moved to the University of Michigan. As was the case with sociometry, a certain cult developed in connection with this whole program, but fortunately some of the cultish attitudes have been dissipated.  


10 Note should be made of the fact that a good deal of the research done under the aegis of the Tavistock Institute in London, England, follows the Lewin tradition. The Center at Michigan and the Tavistock Institute publish jointly a periodical, Human Relations, which devotes much of its space to publications in this area.
It would take us too far afield to attempt to list, let alone to summarize, the varied aspects of social behavior that have been investigated under the rubric of group dynamics. But some of the more important and suggestive topics may be mentioned. Lewin was much concerned with the topic of intergroup conflict, especially as it was related to prejudice. One study dealt with the relative effectiveness in problem-solving of group-members working under conditions of cooperation or competition. Others dealt with group decision making, with the conditions making for group cohesiveness or division, with the emergence and role of leaders, and with the place of the isolate or peripheral member.  

The Group. The term group has been used to conceptualize the fundamental interactional process—that is, the dyadic $A \leftrightarrow B$ unit of interstimulation and response. In this generic sense as a substantive, it is synonymous with the concept of society. To speak or write of “group effects” is the same as to make statements about “social effects.” Of course, the terms “society” and “group” also refer to specific ordering and functioning of individuals with respect to some particular goal and the interactional patterning related thereto. However, in this context it is usual to think of society as a larger and more complex aggregate of individuals, and the group as a sub-element of the larger society.

The Primary Group and Its Significance. Two early studies of patterned group behavior stand out: those of Sumner and Cooley. In Folkways (1901) Sumner gave us the basic functional distinction between the in-group or we-group and the out-group. Cooley’s theory of the primary, face-to-face group was made explicit in his Social Organization, A Study of the Larger Mind (1909), although it had been foreshadowed in his earlier Human Nature and the Social Order (1902), in which he treated the development of the self within the matrix of the family. The family, in one form or another, is the universal primary group and is found in all societies. Play groups of children and the small village are other examples of universal or near-universal primary association. Surely the family is the first human collectivity with which the infant and child comes into contact and from which he learns the fundamental attitudes, values, and habits of his society.

In contrast to the primary group is the secondary or specialized group. Although Cooley did not develop the significance of the secondary group in any great detail, or even refer to it as such, his discussion of the extension

---

11 Some of these researches are reported in Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander (eds.), Group Dynamics: Research and Theory (Evanston, Ill., 1953); see also F. L. Strodtbeck (ed.), “Special issue on small group research,” ASR, 19 (Dec., 1954).

of the social order covered many of its important features. The secondary
group is characterized by its limited-interest motivation, that is, by the fact
that it concerns only a specialized sector of social behavior.

Farewell to the Group-Mind Approach. Although the group-mind
theory is no longer seriously discussed, no serious history of social
psychology can completely ignore it. The older notion of group-mind has
a way of reappearing under different guises. As G. W. Allport has pointed
out, the basic problem of some unit larger or over and above the
individual has sorely tried philosophers and psychologists for ages. He
notes an ancient analogy between human society and a combination of
individual men operating as a supermind and superman. This was essen-
tially the idea of Thomas Hobbes in his *Leviathan* (1651). Then there was
the idea of some collective unconscious larger than the conscious or unconscious
parts of the individual mind. Jung’s “racial unconscious” is a modern
instance of this.

G. W. Allport has tried to meet the recurrent problem of the individual
as related to the group in what he calls a theory of “common and reciprocal
segments of behavior.” For him, groups, institutions, culture patterns, etc.,
are high-level abstractions, or perhaps projections “of certain attitudes and
beliefs from the personal mental life of individuals.” Individuals share with
others “common segments,” that is, they have attitudes and habits similar
to those of their fellows with respect to given institutions and groups. Indi-
viduals are, in addition, in certain “reciprocal relations” to each other.
That is to say, within the framework of interaction there are certain recip-
rocral roles in operation.

The Social Group and Social Control. Another perennial topic concerns
the function of the group as the carrier and enforcer of the social norms.
The earlier treatment of norms and their influence on personal conduct tended
to be couched in terms of social control, a topic of continuing interest
to sociologists. A classic in this area was Ross’ *Social Control* (1901), which
for nearly a quarter of a century was regarded as the standard work in this
subject. Seen against the background of psychology and sociology of that
day, it was an important contribution to an understanding of the way in
which the norms—both formal and informal—impinging on individuals and
groups to keep them in line with the fundamental values of a given society.
An important and incisive cross-cultural note in the study of social control
was introduced in Thomas and Znaniecki’s *The Polish Peasant in Europe and
America* (1918-1920). Prior to this, Thomas had developed his theory of the
“four wishes” and later linked them to social control through his concept

---

13 G. W. Allport, “The Historical Background of Modern Social Psychology,” in
Lindzey, *op. cit.*


In this study of the problems of adjustment of the old-world peasant to urban, industrialized America, the authors showed clearly the difficulties involved in dropping one set of norms in order to take up a new one. Whatever criticism of this study has been made subsequently, it remains a landmark in the study of the decay of old norms and the acceptance of new ones.

The Emergence of Group Norms. The discussion of norms through the twenties continued largely in the sociological tradition in social psychology. But in the mid-thirties serious research on small groups was begun, and among the early (and still classic) studies was that of Sherif on the process by which group norms arise and function. From the standpoint of the individual, the norm represents a certain prescription of role, a special case of expectation, that tends to be enforced by the carriers of power and authority within a given group or community. Later Sherif went on to make applications of his findings by reviewing material on stereotypes, fashions, and other social phenomena, showing how norms serve as frames of reference in perceiving, interpreting, and controlling social events. There have also been a number of empirical studies on the manner in which the norms, already at hand through the culture or established through the experimental situation, operate with regard to individuals.

Collective Behavior: Crowds. The concept collective behavior has usually been employed in social psychology and sociology to refer to the relatively unstructured activities of aggregations such as crowds, mobs, audiences, followers of fashions and fads, and various publics.

Taking his clue from psychoanalysis, Martin has pointed out the repressed and unconscious formulations behind crowd thinking and acting. He contends that the crowd is essentially filled with that egotism, hatred, and the sense of absolute rightness that characterizes the paranoid. Although his treatment of the crowd is enlightening, it does not recognize the relation of culture to those attitudes and, moreover, it neglects the interactional factors.

16 W. I. Thomas, The Unadjusted Girl (Boston, 1923).
17 Herbert Blumer, An Appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecki's The Polish Peasant in Europe and America (New York, 1939).
The ideas of Freud on group and collective behavior became widely available to the English-speaking world with the publication in 1921 of his *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*. Although he dealt with institutionalized groups, his thesis is that such mechanisms as identification, projection, and rationalization may be used in analyzing crowd behavior. For Freud, the leader, either of a formal group or of a crowd, is a father-figure of some sort.

With but slight elaboration and modification, the basic ideas of Freud, Martin, and F. H. Allport regarding crowd conduct were accepted throughout the twenties and thirties. In 1941 Miller and Dollard, writing largely from the behavioristic standpoint of Hull, recast certain earlier formulations of imitation to make it the crucial form of social learning. On the basis of their interpretation, they made an analysis of the behavior of a lynching mob and of other forms of collective behavior. This marked a definite step away from an eclecticism of the earlier two decades that had somehow tried to keep house with both behaviorism and Freudian psychology.

From time to time efforts have been made to uncover the causal factors in more violent behavior, such as that found in the Negro-white conflicts in this country. In general, the attempted explanations range from contentions that the fundamental factor is economic—either low standards of living and unemployment or intense competition between whites and Negroes—to contentions of a social-psychological nature. A number of studies have reported on the economic backgrounds, and there have been some perceptive analyses of social-psychological and cultural factors that enter into such violence. Although it might seem almost impossible to set up satisfactory experiments to study mob behavior, a few such efforts have been reported. Panic, likewise, has to be studied ex post facto.

**Fashion Distinguished from Crowd Behavior.** Fashion is a phase of coll...
ative action that has much in common with crowd behavior. It rests in large part on physical contiguity, but today is dependent for its spread and persistence on rapid communication and transportation. It is, therefore, related to the behavior of the public as well as to that of the crowd. Fashions are not in the mores; they are a phase of the non-moral folkways. In modern Western society, with its swift changes and heightened animation of life, its mobility and rapid communication, fashions shift rapidly, and such changes are really a part of social ceremonial. Moreover, fashions move in cycles, and certain fashions run to extremes. Fads, crazes, rages, and "mental epidemics" likewise reveal varying features of emotionalized crowd behavior.25

The Audience and the Public. Although audiences vary in degree of structuring and cultural definition, for the most part both situation and convention tend to control them. Historically there has been rather limited research on audience behavior. In 1916 Bentley discussed needed research in a number of topics in social psychology, including the audience. His student, Woolbert, followed this up with a theoretical analysis of the audience with some concrete examples. Bentley and Woolbert studied more formal audiences which Brown terms intentional rather than casual. Formal or intentional audiences have been subdivided into information-seeking and recreational groups.26

A public is a loosely conjoined secondary grouping, not necessarily dependent on any physical contiguity of participants. It does depend on common interest of members but is often quite transient and only slightly structured. There is not only one public but rather, in our complex world at least, a variety of publics. These revolve around interests or needs such as political, economic, educational, religious, civic, recreational, and esthetic needs, which are some of the more important sources of publics.

The term opinion refers to a belief or conviction or notion regarding some situation, event, or issue. Consequently, the term public opinion refers to belief about some problem or topic that is regarded as of widespread public interest. When a belief or conviction is relatively stable, we may say that public opinion supports this view or that. When the beliefs vary among


people, as they may over public problems, then we say that public opinion is in flux or in the process of formation. Earlier students of public opinion formation accepted an older theory of rational discussion concerning well-recognized issues or differences. Although discussion remains the essential mechanism, we now know that irrational and emotional elements, as well as rational ones, enter into much public debate.

Some important landmarks in the shift from the older rationalist views to more modern views are Wallas' *Human Nature and Politics* (1908), which drew heavily on McDougall's theory of instinct, and his *The Great Society* (1914), which showed clearly how Western peoples had shifted from a localism to a concern with world-wide problems. Then came the brilliant and telling book by Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (1922), in which, through his concept of *stereotype* and by his use of historical examples of the rise of humor and the play of myth and legend, it became clear that emotional and irrational factors entered deeply into opinion formation. In another book, *The Phantom Public* (1928), Lippmann shows the limitations of public discussion of issues in the face of these forces which have grown up in our complicated industrial world.

**PUBLIC OPINION AND THE APPARATUS OF PERSUASION**

The importance of recently developed mass media—motion pictures, radio, television, and comic books—in providing the building blocks of man's belief system has only recently begun to be understood. Very little is known about the possible effects of mass suggestion and mass imitation. We have just begun to glimpse the psychological needs and gratifications of individuals who become emotionally "possessed" by attending motion pictures, from listening to "soap operas," by watching and listening to television, or by becoming absorbed in comic books.

**Propaganda.** As a device to alter people's views, propaganda is as old as written history. In its present-day meaning, the term first came into wide use during World War I. George Creel's *How We Advertised America* (1920) was an unofficial account of the propaganda operations of the Committee


Not long after the close of hostilities, articles and books dealing with wartime propaganda began to appear. The most complete account of that period is H. D. Lasswell's *Propaganda Technique in the World War* (1927).

Another aftermath of World War I was the effort in some quarters to reassess its causes and to attempt to fix the blame elsewhere than on Germany. And in connection with this there was an effort to "debunk" the propaganda associated with the war.\(^{30}\)

The earlier studies were chiefly historical and analytical. But beginning in the thirties there appeared reports on experimental research designed to discover more precisely how propaganda influences individual views and attitudes.\(^{31}\) About the time World War II broke out the word *propaganda* began to be replaced by the concept *psychological warfare*. Yet the techniques were largely the same. There is a vast literature on Nazi-Fascist propaganda, and we can but cite the most readily available bibliographies.\(^{32}\)

The rapid growth of interest in propaganda and in its relation to public opinion is also evidenced in the establishment in 1937 of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis and the inception of its publication, *Propaganda Analysis: A Monthly Letter to Help the Intelligent Citizen Detect and Analyze Propaganda*. This periodical, which gave its chief attention to Nazi propaganda and little, if any, to Communist efforts in this field, voluntarily dissolved in December, 1941. Another indication of the expansion of concern with communication, including propaganda, was the founding in January, 1937, of The Public Opinion Quarterly, under the aegis of the School of Public Affairs, Princeton University. The propaganda of World War II was both extensive and elaborate. One of the most striking differences in the content of propaganda in the two World Wars is brought out by Kris and Leites, who point out that in the World War I much of the propaganda was highly emotional.


(as witness the atrocity stories), moralistic, and often given to outright falsification. Although the Germans and the Russians, each on their own side, indulged in some atrocity stories in World War II, for the most part propaganda from both sides tended to be more factual, sober, and non-moralistic.\(^\text{33}\)

Since the close of World War II, there have been a number of descriptive works on the use of propaganda in wartime. But perhaps more significant has been the continuation of experimental research in this field, which has been concerned with media, content, and forms of presentation.\(^\text{34}\)

**Leadership**

Systematic observation of the rise and functioning of leadership among children began with modern child psychology, but more carefully controlled studies were first made in this country after World War I when a number of institutes were set up to facilitate research in child behavior.\(^\text{35}\) Although patterns of dominance and submission appear in novel and unstructured groups, culture soon sets the stage for appropriate roles. Moreover, at the adult level, students of social behavior usually distinguish voluntary leadership, as in election to a position of high status by the other members of a group, and headship, which is a matter of office derived from an institutional ascription of role.

There have been a number of psychological approaches to leadership. Some have stressed a unit trait or some constellation of traits as the determinant of dominance. Others have emphasized some form of typology such as the old distinction between leadership in action and leadership in thought.\(^\text{36}\) Still others have regarded the interactional factors as basic. This latter position is clearly evident in the followers of Lewin and his field theory.\(^\text{37}\) The


\(^{35}\) The most important of the earlier researches on leadership in children’s groups are summarized in W. I. Thomas and Dorothy S. Thomas, *The Child in America* (New York, 1928).


\(^{37}\) The Lewinian standpoint is illustrated in the following books: David Krech and
Studies in groups and leadership by Moreno, although they represent a less extreme view, would also, in general, tend to fall into this third category. Investigations of leaderless groups, stimulated largely by Lewin and Moreno, have thrown much light on the manner in which dominance emerges in a newly formed group. The device of observing behavior under such conditions was used, among others, in the selection of field operatives for the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) during World War II.

A review of the extensive literature on so-called traits of leadership shows that, whereas group members often perceive particular combinations of traits as adhering to a person whom they regard as a leader, there is no general consensus as to which constellation, if any, always goes with leadership. On the other hand, it hardly seems adequate to attempt to deal with the phenomena of dominance without paying some attention to personality factors. Some suggestive work on personality and leadership, approached essentially through typology, is that of Adorno and his collaborators in their comparisons of the so-called “authoritarian” and “democratic” personalities. Sanford, following up on this work, and using a scale of authoritarian-equalitarian attitudes, has reported that “authoritarians” and “equalitarians” differ in the type of dominance they prefer and in their reactions to leadership.

DIVERGENT APPROACHES TO PERSONALITY

At the beginning of the present century most social psychologists were concerned with matters of collective behavior. Inspired in large part by the French school of group psychology, American scholars such as Ellwood R. S. Crutchfield, Theory and Problems of Social Psychology (New York, 1948); S. E. Asch, Social Psychology (New York, 1952) [no separate chapter on leadership]; and in many papers in Cartwright and Zander, loc. cit.

38 J. L. Moreno, Who Shall Survive? (Washington, 1934); Gibb, ibid.; and Cartwright and Zander, op. cit. The two last-cited sources contain ample lists of publications in this area.

39 OSS assessment staff, Assessment of Men (New York, 1948).


and Ross investigated the mental structure of the crowd, but it was not until the publication of McDougall's *An Introduction to Social Psychology* in 1908 that the attention of American social psychology was shifted to the systematic study of personality.

The central feature of McDougall's system, as originally expounded, is a systematic and definite linkage of instincts and emotions. He listed seven paired instincts and emotions and added some "less well defined" impulses and emotions, such as instinct of reproduction (with sexual jealousy and female coyness associated therewith), the gregarious instinct, and instincts of acquisition and construction. Through experience, the various emotions combine into more complicated forms. When the complex emotions have a relatively stable object about which they are organized, we have the birth of the sentiment, and on the basis of complex emotions and sentiments the self arises. The particular form it takes will be greatly affected by social background. Character of a consistent sort grows up by relating the instincts, and the emotions and habits developed from them, to a goal or ideal.

*Behaviorism* derived largely from the work of the Russian physiologist Pavlov, whose method was introduced into this country by Watson. Their heavy stress on environmental, as against innate, elements in determining behavior, led to a wholesale attack on the instinct theory of McDougall and his followers. The main point of criticism seemed to be that the instinct hypothesis is a naive and particularistic explanation for the complexities of human behavior. The whole argument is well summarized in Bernard's *Infiinit: A Study in Social Psychology* (1924).

A systematic approach to the subject matter of social psychology based upon the reflex hypothesis of the behaviorists is F. H. Allport's *Social Psychology* (1924), which soon gained wide acceptance. Its basic assumption is that "the human being has inherited a number of prepotent reflexes which are fundamental not only in their original potency, but in the control which they exert over habit formation throughout life. Ultimately, as well as genetically, they are prepotent." Allport recognizes six important classes of human prepotent reflexes: starting and withdrawing, rejecting, struggling, hunger reactions, sensitive zone reactions, and sex reactions. Upon these foundations all social behavior is built.

To these reflex theorists the human group is merely an aggregation of individuals. Although some habits may be common to all or to some of the group members, each individual has his own habits and characteristic ways of acting. The mechanism of conditioned response is used to explain how the individual develops his behavior in association with other people. Through such associations the child learns a language and acquires the habits and characteristic modes of behavior of his group. This behavior is a response to sensory stimulation; it is learned through the process of reinforcement in which acceptable acts are rewarded and unacceptable
ones punished. In this manner the individual develops his personality.

Although regularly attacked by the sociologically oriented social psychologists,\textsuperscript{42} this reflex or reinforcement scheme gradually gained currency until it reached its peak just prior to World War II in the writings of Hull. Hull developed reinforcement theory into an hypothetico-deductive general theory of behavior. Using survival as a key concept, he viewed the organism as adaptive in terms of need reduction. A large-scale and somewhat controversial application of Hull’s theory to social psychology was made by Miller and Dollard and published in their book, \textit{Social Learning and Imitation} (1941). This work was followed by a series of empirical studies,\textsuperscript{43} and these in turn were followed by a stream of criticism.

\textit{Contributions of Cooley and Mead.} In contrast to this approach to the study of personality development is that of the symbolic-interactionist school. The chief aim of this group has been to describe and interpret the manner in which the self or personality arises and functions in social interaction. The groundwork of symbolic interactionism was laid by James, Baldwin, Dewey, and Cooley. Cooley’s major contributions to the theory of personality and its relation to society appear in his three books: \textit{Human Nature and the Social Order} (1902); \textit{Social Organization, A Study of the Larger Mind} (1909); and \textit{Social Process} (1918). His chief thesis is the inseparable connection between the person and society. The child’s idea of himself is the reflection of others about him.

Following the basic premises of Baldwin and Cooley, and strongly influenced by functional and behavioristic tendencies in psychology, Mead has presented a naturalistic and more or less objective description and analysis of the processes involved in the rise of the self. Mead published only an occasional paper, but his lecture notes and other unpublished writings have been edited posthumously; his theory of the self is elaborated in \textit{Mind, Self, and Society} (1934). According to Mead, “The self arises in conduct, when the individual becomes a social object in experience to himself. . . . The child gradually becomes a social being in his own experience, and he acts toward himself in a manner analogous to that in which he acts towards others.”

\textit{Role Theory and Personality.} Of all the concepts suggested by the symbolic interactionists, the term \textit{role} has perhaps got most attention. It has been used both by sociologists, including Cottrell, Merton, Hughes, Kuhn, Waller, Parsans, and Kimball Young, and by psychologists such as Cameron,


Newcomb, Sarbin, and Sargent.44 Whereas earlier work was largely qualitative and anecdotal, recent literature includes a growing body of empirical investigations of social roles and the development of the self. The trend is toward explication and empirical establishment of these concepts; it is probable that they will continue to gain adherents in the future.

**Personality as Viewed by Freud and the Revisionists.** Another important and influential theory of human personality is that developed by Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis. The subject matter of psychoanalysis “is human behavior viewed as conflict.”45 The individual is regarded as in a more or less constant state of striving or struggling for satisfactions which a hostile environment, especially the social world, tends to redirect, restrict, and often completely deny him. Freud’s theory is essentially the developmental story of this conflict. (See Chap. 20, “Sociology and Psychoanalysis,” by Gisela J. Hinkle.)

As the practice of psychoanalysis spread from its original center in Vienna, deviations from Freud’s own views were bound to arise. Two of the earlier defections centered around Jung, who stressed the archaic ego and developed a theory of interactive personality types, and around Adler, who viewed life as characterized by a fundamental, inherent, purposive striving toward some anticipated goal of perfect achievement. Of the various deviations from Freud that do not completely reject his work, those of Horney, Fromm, and Sullivan have had considerable vogue, especially among certain social scientists in the United States. Horney’s basic contention is that Freud overemphasizes the importance of instincts and of organic development by inevitable stages from birth to maturity. Fromm approaches the topic of personality as a lay analyst and social psychologist with a strong interest in history and cultural anthropology. He, like Horney, holds that the satisfaction of instinct is not the central task of the individual; rather, it is adjustment or learning in line with the social-cultural demands of time and place. Sullivan, a psychiatrist, was what might be called a quasi-Freudian. Out of his clinical observations he fashioned a “theory of interpersonal relations” or “theory of the self-system.”46

**Social Perception and Personality.** Perception is a basic process in the relating of the individual to his environment, physical and social. Historically, the experimental psychologist dealt chiefly in simpler perceptual judg-
ments, such as are found in the Weber-Fechner phenomena. A consideration of possible social-cultural influences on perception did not interest him. So, too, for a long time the social psychologist took perception for granted and gave his attention to motivation, emotion, and social interaction. Recently, however, under the rubric "social perception," there has appeared a growing interest in studying social-cultural factors in this important adaptive process. In view of the intimate relationship between perception and needs, perceptual processes become the critical intervening variables for this personality theory, and, conversely, personality processes are crucial in determining perceptions.

**Culture and Personality.** Gradually, social psychologists began to take cognizance of the findings of cultural anthropology. What men perceive is influenced, on the learning side, by the content of what is acquired, and most of this will have direct or indirect roots in the culture of a given time and place. Klineberg contributed to the growing appreciation of such factors in his account of the Chinese interpretation of gestures. Adams showed the place of cultural stylization in his comparison of emotional expressiveness of the rural Japanese with that of the Japanese-Americans in Hawaii. LaBarre brought together a wide range of examples to demonstrate deviations in emotional expression. And Efron's study of the gestures of East European immigrants, recently arrived in the United States, with those of second and later generations of these same groups has given us detailed documentation on this general topic.

Historically, the "culture and personality" approach had its chief source in Freud's attempts to explain cultural and social phenomena in terms of his psychoanalytic theory. Freud was largely biologically oriented and tended to regard the individual as a product of growth and maturation along biological lines, modified or redirected by the impact of social or cultural forces. The neo-Freudians place less stress on biological factors and more stress on cultural factors in their interpretation of the dynamics of personality development and function.

From this source, cultural anthropologists, social psychologists, and others have attempted to study the effects of culture upon personality development. In many cases the materials have been largely of a descriptive and historical sort familiar to cultural anthropology. The early study by Benedict and the more recent work of Margaret Mead, Gorer, and others exemplify
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this approach. But others, notably Kardiner and Linton, Hallowell, and DuBois have attempted to present a dynamic picture of cultural learning.

**METHODOLOGY IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY**

Of the phenomenal developments in social psychology since World War I, the most important have been those in methodology. Whereas early social psychologists built their theoretical systems on the basis of meager evidence collected informally, recent research tends to produce limited generalizations on the basis of systematic, controlled study. Whereas older reports involve qualitative anecdote and later more extensive and formal case study, in contemporary research stress is placed upon the collection, processing, and interpretation of mass data. Statistical procedures have been improved and their applications extended. Observational techniques have become more rigorous, interviews more sophisticated, and experiments better controlled. Furthermore, a number of special research techniques have been devised that have enriched the repertory of the social psychologists.

Within the field of social psychology there has been a perennial debate centered around the relative importance of theory and data. In order to understand this conflict, we must look to its origins.

In the beginning, embryonic social psychology emerged from an antecedent tradition of social philosophy. Its initial break took the form of an increased attention to empirical data. Yet the early social psychologists attempted to construct universal encyclopedic schemes that had much in common with the social philosophy of the time. Spencer, Tylor, Durkheim, and LeBon are examples of these encyclopedic theorists. Although the contribution of these men in laying the groundwork for scientific social psychology is undeniable, many of their theories have not stood the test of time.

**Behaviorism.** After World War I behaviorism became increasingly dominant in psychology, and it soon attracted such adherents as F. H. Allport and Kimball Young in social psychology. As a sort of reaction-formation to


50 These approaches are summarized in Alex Inkeles and D. J. Levinson, “National Character: The Study of Modal Personality and Socio-Cultural Systems,” Lindzey, op. cit. The interest in interdisciplinary treatment of social psychology is evident in J. E. Hulett, Jr., and Ross Stagner (eds.), *Problems in Social Psychology: An Interdisciplinary Inquiry* (Urbana, Ill., 1952)

* The editors have not tried to make the terminology of this “methodology” section uniform with Chap. 7, which provides a more extended treatment.

51 For a discussion of the contributions of these men, see Howard Becker and H. E. Barnes, *Social Thought from Lore to Science*, 2nd ed.; (New York, 1952), vol. 1.

the grandiose generalizations of their predecessors, these behaviorists initiated a rigid empiricism. They avoided theory and saw science chiefly as a process of data collection. During this era, the individual who openly admitted an interest in theory invited inquiry into his personal competence, his professional ethics, or both.

However, theory was implicit in the work of even the most rigid of these empirically minded scholars. Today, therefore, most social psychologists demand an integration of theory and data, but many questions are still undecided and controversies continue to arise. Currently, attempts to erect a bridge between theory and data are bogged down because of the question concerning the level upon which theory should be pitched. Should theory be of a broad or narrow nature? Although there is a place for both broad and narrow theory, the latter is certainly more common today and is likely to dominate the field for some time to come.

Along with the shift in the relative emphasis on theory and data there is a second trend. Social psychologists have moved from the descriptive presentation of data toward the analytic or explanatory. Descriptive science is preoccupied with classifying data. Its generalizations are enumerative, resulting in aggregates of facts rather than in systems of knowledge. Explanatory science, on the other hand, stresses the search for systematic interconnections of experiences. It produces generalizations of covariance and cause.

Case Study and Statistics: The Passing of a Controversy. After World War I, most social psychologists could agree that the aim of their research was scientific—to predict and control social interaction. Agreement was lacking, however, on the best means for achieving such prediction. A controversy over the relative merits of case study vs. the statistical method loomed large, and adherents of each position made exaggerated claims.

Formal case-study procedures utilizing the life history and other personal documents were introduced into social psychology by Thomas and Znaniecki in their monumental work, The Polish Peasant in Europe and America (1918-1920). In it the authors attempted to demonstrate the utility of case study in producing scientific generalizations. Their method quickly gained popularity and a number of such studies resulted. More recently, this method has been employed in modified form by Angell in studying the reactions of families to the depression, by Lindesmith in investigating opiate addiction, and by Cressey in his studies of violation of financial trust.

53 See William Healy and Augusta Bronner, New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment (New Haven, 1936); Thrasher, op. cit.; Shaw, op. cit.; H. W. Zorbaugh, The Gold Coast and the Slum (Chicago, 1929); H. D. Lasswell, Psychopathology and Politics (Chicago, 1930); Nels Anderson, The Hobo (Chicago, 1931).

54 R. C. Angell, The Family Encounters the Depression (New York, 1936); A. R. Lindesmith, Opiate Addiction (Bloomington, Ind., 1947); and D. R. Cressey, Other People’s Money (Glencoe, Ill., 1953).
The fruitfulness of the case study method has been a topic of long debate and today we must recognize that it no longer holds the central position in social psychology it once did. However, the comment of Burgess is pertinent: “Almost all sociologists agree upon the usefulness of the case study for the exploration of the problem, for disclosing leads, for deriving hunches, and for raising questions and hypotheses.”

The Quantitative Emphasis: Tests, Scales, and Factor Analysis. The current trend is toward statistical manipulation of mass data in testing hypotheses. Among the first American social scientists to utilize these new statistical procedures were the educational psychologists. Here, the names of Cattell, Thorndike, Terman, and Thurstone are outstanding. These investigators devised tests and measurements of a large number of human attributes, but their primary interest was in statistical application to intelligence testing. The first mass psychological testing in any country was the application of the Army intelligence test during World War I. Following the success of the intelligence testers in the schools and in the Army, social psychologists were quick to pick up statistical techniques. Since opinions and attitudes constitute one of the central substantive elements in the field, the construction of instruments for their measurement became of vital importance. The most striking development was in the use of scales and of factor analysis. The origins of scales in social psychology derive from the application of rating schemes devised by Thorndike for measuring the speed of reading and the like. Then, too, in the mid-twenties Bogardus invented his social-distance test. An early attempt to get at the problem of measurement in a more exact fashion came when Thurstone, applying the techniques of just-perceptible differences, developed a scale that had eleven equidistant units. This means was used for making scales to measure a wide range of social-psychological phenomena: conservatism–radicalism, prejudice–tolerance, and so on. During World War II, Guttman began analyzing the responses to questionnaires collected by the Research Branch of the Information and Education Division of the Army Service Forces, with a view to developing a set of scales of unidimensionality.

Factor analysis had its origin in Spearman’s theory of a general and specific factor as an explanation of the nature and functioning of intelligence. With the aid of matrix algebra, Thurstone began developing techniques to
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handle the results of a wide variety of tests in such a way as to show that the test responses might be interpreted as dependent upon single or multiple factors. More recently Eysenck, Stephenson, and R. B. Cattell have worked out rather elaborate techniques accompanied by theoretical formulations to enable them to deal with a wide range of phenomena, from personality traits to the content of widely diverse culture systems.\(^69\)

Students of social psychology have long wished for some method of handling qualitative data in more objective, preferably statistical, terms. The recent development of the “latent-structure approach” through the use of factor analysis at the hands of Lazarsfeld and Stouffer and others may provide a beginning in this direction.\(^60\)

**Sampling Problems.** Sampling has always been a difficult problem in social psychology. This is particularly true in public opinion polling where the collection of mass data is fundamental. Early public opinion polling gave little attention to sampling. It grew out of the attempts of “inquiring reporters” to take “straw votes” prior to elections. These attempts aroused public interest, and in 1916 the *Literary Digest* began regular forecasts of national elections. The *Literary Digest* was dominant in the field until, in 1936, it made a gross error in predicting the results of the presidential election because of a biased sample. This led the opinion pollsters to re-evaluate their sampling attempts.

Soon the Gallup Poll, Roper’s *Fortune* survey, and the Crosley Poll were gaining stature, and their areal sampling procedures were apparently successful. However, in 1948 the polls again failed in their predictions. A serious error was evident in almost all pre-election polls, and again stock-taking resulted. A controversy immediately arose over the relative effectiveness of quota or cluster vs. probability sampling.\(^61\)

**Participant-Observation and the Interview.** Observational techniques constitute a basic tool of social psychology. Present techniques have grown out of the unsystematized observations of the early social psychologists discussed above. Some refinements and attempts at control were made during the first quarter of the present century by Park and his students. They form-


\(^60\) S. A. Stouffer, “Scaling Concepts and Scaling Theory,” in Marie Jahoda et al. (eds.), *Research Methods in Social Relations* (New York, 1951), vol. 2; and Stouffer et al., *op. cit.*, vol. 4.

alized their procedure into the technique of participant-observation, but they never developed any systematic means to eliminate bias and insure reliability of their data. The first attempts at systematic treatment of these problems were made by Bühler and Thomas. Observational techniques have been receiving increased attention in recent years. The movement has been away from recording the totality of interaction and toward noting only specifically predetermined aspects of behavior. Category sets and rating scales have been developed to specify the phenomena to be observed. In addition to specification of observations, controls have been introduced in recent observational work through application of various mechanical recording devices.

Interviews, in one form or another, are one of the most fundamental tools of social psychology. They range from the deep, intensely personal, free association of psychoanalysis to the brief check-list questionnaires sent through the mail by commercial pollsters. The informal deep-level interview has been employed chiefly in various techniques of psychotherapy. It was outlined first by Freud and his followers, and has recently been adapted by Rogers and his client-centered therapists.

The Experimental Approach. According to Murphy, Murphy, and Newcomb, the systematic study of suggestion by Braid between 1841 and 1860 represents the inception of experimentation in social psychology. From that time forward psychological literature was sprinkled with reports of experimental studies in this field. After World War I, Moede and F. H. Allport outlined their demands that social psychology be placed on an experimental basis. Since that time, experimentation has increased at a rapid rate until, currently, it is one of our major methods. Although, as the discussion above indicates, increased use of experimental research designs has been a major trend in social psychology, modifications in the experimental model itself have also taken place. Most of these have aimed at improving control and eliminating bias. One school of thought has moved toward greater complications in design—resulting from the addition of more experimental and control groups—culminating finally in Solomon's four-group design. Another tradition, stemming from the statistician-biologist, Fisher, has minimized exper-

62 W. F. Whyte, "Observational Fieldwork Methods," in Jahoda et al., op. cit., vol. 2; Charlotte Bühler and H. Hetzer, Testing Children's Developments from Birth to School Age (New York, 1935); Dorothy S. Thomas et al., Observational Studies of Social Behavior (New Haven, Conn., 1933), vol. 1.
64 C. R. Rogers, Counseling and Psychotherapy (Boston, 1941).
65 Gardner Murphy, Lois B. Murphy, and T. M. Newcomb, Experimental Social Psychology (2nd ed.; New York, 1937); W. Moede, Experimentelle Massenpsychologie (Leipzig, 1920); F. H. Allport, Social Psychology (Boston, 1924).
imental controls, utilizing statistical controls instead. Here the emphasis is on random sampling and on the more elegant statistical devices, such as analysis of variance. (See Chap. 7.)

In concluding this discussion of methods some mention should be made of a few of the various special research techniques that have been employed in the field.

**Projective Techniques.** The use of projective techniques has assumed increasing importance. They represent a combination of some quantification with a good deal of qualitative analysis. Projective tests are believed capable of getting at deeper levels of personality than are the devices developed by Thurstone, Likert, Guttman, and others. The interpretation is based on the meaningful content, on the emotional expression accompanying the replies, on gestures, hesitations, and other expressive movements thought indicative of unconscious features of the personality. The projective tests rest on the assumption that the free-flowing associations aroused derive from the unconscious and dynamic underpinning of the personality.

**Sociometric Techniques.** Sociometry may be designated as the study of interpersonal relations, with special reference to determining attractions and repulsions within the group structure. Its chief sponsor, Moreno, has written a natural history of group formation using both statistical and geometric modes of presentation to indicate the dynamics of interindividual relations. Currently, sociometric measures are receiving widespread attention and are being modified through the development of more sophisticated statistical techniques.

**Content-analysis** arose as a device to identify specific or general themes in various forms of verbal material: novels, essays, public speeches, news stories, editorials, and the like. The detection, tabulation, and analysis of such themes provide a means of describing changes through time in political propaganda, in party policies, and in international relations—to note only a few applications. Berelson believes that an examination of content changes over time may give us a way of predicting future trends.

**The Cross-Cultural Approach.** Strictly speaking, cross-cultural study is not a research technique but a means of gathering data. However, its use represents a substantial advance for social psychologists in that it allows them to build generalizations that are not restricted to a single culture. Early studies were performed by Tylor and by Hobhouse, Wheeler, and Ginsberg using cross-cultural comparisons to test evolutionary hypotheses. But it was
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69 Bernard Berelson, *Content-Analysis in Communication Research* (Glencoe, Ill., 1952).
not until the past decade that the cross-cultural method was used to test social-psychological hypotheses. 70
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SOCIOLOGY AND PSYCHOANALYSIS

GISELA J. HINKLE

THEORIES OF SIGMUND FREUD HAVE BECOME PERVERSIVE IN AMERICAN thought-ways of the mid-twentieth century and in contemporary American sociology. Many sociologists are using adaptations of psychoanalytic method, segments of its theories, and such selected and varied concepts as latent qualities, manifest qualities, repression, rationalization, projection, sublimation, identification, frustration, aggression, parental surrogate, superego, guilt feeling, withdrawal, displacement, security, and insecurity. Freudian and neo-Freudian notions have also diffused into many specialized areas of sociology where they are employed both with and without awareness of their intellectual origins. They have been, in a sense, "diluted" to fit into a sociological framework in social psychology; collective behavior, public opinion and communication, sociology of the family, race and ethnic relations, social stratification, bureaucracy, social disorganization, social psychiatry, and sociological theory.¹ "Freudianism" in American sociology may thus be said to involve conscious and unconscious, pure and diluted, and correct and incorrect usage of psychoanalytic ideas.

Ambivalent Attitudes Toward Psychoanalytic Theory. Nevertheless, sociologists have severely and fundamentally criticized psychoanalysis. Occasionally, rejection of Freudianism is categorically based on its excessive emphasis on sex, its use of the recapitulation theory, its theory of totem and

¹ Franz Alexander interprets the "dilution" of psychoanalysis in American social science as evidence of its acceptance. See Franz Alexander and Helen Ross (eds.), Twenty Years of Psychoanalysis (New York, 1953), p. 18.