437

Changing
Attitudes
Through
Social
Contact

By

Leon Festinger

Harold H. Kelley

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

institute for social research

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Rensis Likert, Director, Institute for Social Research
Ralph A. Sawyer, Dean, Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies
Russell A. Stevenson, Dean, School of Business Administration
Henry F. Vaughan, Dean, School of Public Health
Robert C. Angell, Chairman, Department of Sociology
Donald G. Marquis, Chairman, Department of Psychology
Kenneth E. Boulding, Professor of Economics
Arthur L. Brandon, University Relations Counselor
Arthur W. Bromage, Professor of Political Science

RESEARCH CENTER FOR GROUP DYNAMICS

Dorwin Cartwright, Director
John R. P. French, Jr., Program Director
Ronald Lippitt, Program Director
Alvin Zander, Program Director
Harold B. Gerard, Research Associate
Frank Harary, Research Associate
Bernard Hymovitch, Research Associate
Gilbert Krulee, Research Associate
Lester Libo, Research Associate
Ian C. Ross, Research Associate
Richard Snyder, Research Associate
Guy E. Swanson, Research Associate
Jeanne Watson, Research Associate

SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER

Angus Campbell, Director
George Katona, Program Director
Eugene H. Jacobson, Assistant Program Director
Robert L. Kahn, Assistant Program Director
John B. Lansing, Assistant Program Director
Floyd C. Mann, Assistant Program Director
Stephen B. Withey, Assistant Program Director
Charles F. Cannell, Head of Field Staff
Ronald Freedman, Research Associate
Morris Janowitz, Research Associate
Nancy L. Johnson, Head of Content Analysis
Daniel Katz, Research Associate
Leslie Kish, Head of Sampling Section
George M. Belknap, Study Director
James K. Dent, Study Director
Elizabeth M. Douvan, Study Director
Gerald Gurin, Study Director
Gerald M. Mahoney, Study Director
James N. Morgan, Study Director
Nancy C. Morse, Study Director
Donald Pelz, Study Director
Stanley E. Seashore, Study Director
Kent E. Winter, Study Director

Changing
Attitudes
Through
Social
Contact

An Experimental Study

of a

Housing Project

By

Leon Festinger
University of Minnesota

Harold H. Kelley
Yale University

Institute Editor:

Julia B. Kessler

Foreword

The study described in this book was undertaken while the Research Center for Group Dynamics was located at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Our interest in the Regent Hill housing project was first stimulated by Mr. Burnham Kelly of the Albert Farwell Bemis Foundation and the initial exploratory work on this study received financial support from that Foundation. The work was carried to completion under Contract NR 170 698 with the Office of Naval Research.

The tasks of working in the project, of collecting and analyzing data were carried out by a large group of persons each of whom contributed greatly to the study. It required the wholehearted involvement and effort of persons with a wide variety of skills and abilities.

The actual community organization work in the Regent Hill project was ably carried out by Mrs. Juliet Brudney, Mrs. Kathleen Barber, Mr. Warren Blanchard, and Mr. Morris Kritzman. In addition, Mrs. Rosemary Lippitt, Mrs. Joseph Factor, and Mrs. Ruth Clapp helped to set up and run the cooperative nursery school in the project. Miss Julia Scannan took a major share in running the school-age recreation program. Mrs. Willa Freeman Grunes and Dr. Alex Bavelas were helpful in the adult recreation activities which were undertaken.

The collection and analysis of data were also shared by a number of persons. Mrs. Kathleen Barber, Mrs. Gloria Leavitt, Mrs. Annette Kaysen, and Dr. Emily Willerman worked on construction of interviews, schedules, training and supervising interviewers, and training and supervising coders. Dr. Kurt Back and Dr. Stanley Schachter assisted in selecting the samples to be interviewed. Mrs. Josephine Gottsdanker, Mrs. Hannah Papanek, and Mr. Toshio Yatsushiro contributed to the analysis of qualitative records. Mr. John Gyr and Mr. Victor Schneider helped on the statistical analysis of the data.

A major contribution to the study was made by the persons who freely gave their time at various points in the research to advise, consult, and help solve the problems which arose continually. Dr. Dorwin Cartwright, Dr. Ronald Lippitt, Dr. John R. P. French, Jr., Dr. Gordon Hearn, and Dr. Marian Radke improved the quality of the study in this way.

The authors wish to express their deep thanks and appreciation to all of these persons without whose help we could not have done the study. We are also grateful to the Boston Regional Office of the Federal Public Housing Authority for their cooperation in facilitating the progress of the study.

<div align="right">Leon Festinger</div>

<div align="right">Harold H. Kelley</div>

Contents

Chapter I

The Basis For Status-Related Attitudes

Members of one group who develop hostility toward members of some other group may be expected to cut off communication with that group. If the group against which the hostility is directed perceives it, they will probably not initiate contacts with the hostile group. Once possibilities for communication between them are removed, the hostile perceptions will be insulated against change. This hypothesis, advanced by T. M. Newcomb,[1] suggests that a reduction in hostility between two groups can be brought about by reopening and stimulating contacts between them. If this is true, it is obviously of great practical significance to determine just how to produce effectively these necessary contacts. The subsequent question, one of considerable theoretical importance, revolves around the kinds of contacts that are required to produce changes in hostile attitudes. What must take place during social contact in order that pressure to change be exerted?

The experimental research program described in this book was designed as an attempt to provide some answers to these questions. An initial survey of the residents of Regent Hill, a government housing project, revealed that they felt themselves to be members of a low-status group. They looked down on their project neighbors as low class and felt that outsiders also looked down on project residents. The persistence of these attitudes in the face of evidence to the contrary seemed to be explained by the scarcity of social contacts occurring within the project and between the project and the surrounding community. The project residents' social relations appeared to have been affected by their perception of their own group as one of low status.

An experimental program of stimulating intraproject contacts was carried out over a period of nine months. Data collected by means of repeated sample surveys were analyzed to determine the extent to which increased contacts resulted in altered intraproject attitudes and relations. We were also able to determine the extent to which these internal changes led to changes in social relations with the larger external community. Examination of the changes produced under different conditions of contact sheds some light on questions about the nature of contacts effective in creating attitude change.

The status-related hostile attitudes involved in this study are important in relations among many kinds of groups in our society. Status differences between groups, regardless of the nature of the status distinction, tend to result in considerable amounts of both intergroup and intragroup hostility. The practical problem of alleviating these hostilities, particularly the intergroup tensions, is receiving much attention in present-day applied social science. To develop a perspective of the place of the present study in the general area of intergroup relations, we shall first

---

1. Human Relations, 1947, 1, 69-86.

state some of the characteristic attitudes and behaviors of low-status group members. We shall then briefly examine those theories about changing attitudes that are most relevant to understanding the changes produced by our experimental program.

The Social Attitudes and Behavior

of the Low-Status Group Member

Status differences between groups occur along numerous dimensions. Most discussed have been the high and low socio-economic groups. The many ethnic groups differ in status and are all considered to have lower status than the dominant majority "American" group. Religion, occupation, sex, and age have been used by one social scientist or another in describing privileged and underprivileged groups. We wish here to outline those psychological properties of the low-status group which form the common thread running through the numerous high-low distinctions in the literature. This analysis of the psychological meaning of low-status group membership will be followed by an examination of its implications for the feelings, attitudes, and social behavior of the low-status group member.

1. The psychological situation

of the low-status group member:

a. Through contacts with the high-status group, the low-status person becomes aware of the limitations involved in his present group membership. Membership in any group means that certain things are available to the person – there are certain activities, privileges, duties, powers, etc. which are his by virtue of his membership. A given pattern of permissible behavior does not in and of itself convey to a person the feeling of relative status. It is only by comparing this pattern with that available to members of other groups that a person develops a feeling of being privileged or underprivileged. Consider the case of a child who is a member of an underprivileged sociological group. As long as he is sheltered from contact with the discriminations of the external group and does not learn of the possible areas of behavior that are ruled out of bounds for him, he is not psychologically a low-status person. It is when he participates in common situations with members of the dominant group and as he broadens his knowledge of what is possible that he becomes aware of his lowly position. Allison Davis[2] reports with regard to a study sponsored by the American Youth Commission that social status is not an important factor in the personality development of southern Negro children for the first decades of their lives. In contrast, their parents show deep frustration and considerable status sensitivity because they have left the shelter of the primary groups and have met the limitations placed upon their lives. In contrast, their parents show deep frustration and considerable status sensitivity because they have left the shelter of the primary groups and have met the limitations placed upon their social and economic behavior by virtue of their race.

2. Davis, Allison. Racial status and personality development. Sci. Mon., 1943, 57, 354-362.

b. Members of the low-status group desire to attain membership in the high-status group. When a group is said to have high status, it means that members of that group are permitted to engage in specific modes of need satisfaction that are not allowed to members of lower groups. Thus, by definition, high-status membership is more desirable than low. This fact is documented by studies of second generation ethnic groups in America. These groups generally are discriminated against and restricted in their activities. The immigrant group, because of their language difficulties and insulation in highly organized ethnic districts, usually are but little aware of a status differential. Their children, however, learn the dominant group language, have intergroup contacts in the public schools, and really begin to explore the limits placed upon their ethnic group. Thus, the second generation becomes keenly aware of their low status. These persons, it has been found, have strong desires to attain membership in the higher group. For example, Johnson and Masuoka, in discussing second generation Japanese, conclude that their "locus of aspiration lies in the community of the dominant group."[3] Irving Child[4], in his study of second generation Italians, finds among his rebel group an explicit desire to belong to the "American" group. Among persons expressing other reactions to their minority group membership (the in-group and the apathetic reaction) Child finds evidence of attraction to the dominant group but the conflict between this group and the attractions of the parental group has been handled in such a manner as to rule out overt expression of this desire. Studies measuring social distance[5] and sociometric distance[6] between status levels provide further corroboration. These demonstrate a tendency to feel closer to, and name more often as friends, those persons at higher educational and socio-economic levels than those at one's own position or lower levels. These data indicate a stronger desire to associate with persons at higher status levels than at lower levels which, in turn, probably reflects the desire to move upward in the status hierarchy.

c. There are restraints upon the member of the low-status group against leaving his group and entering the dominant group. The low-status person cannot satisfy his desires to belong to the high group simply by moving into it. One general source of restraints against such upward mobility lies in the attractions of the lower group and his loyalty to it. Although such forces are probably not universally present for the low-status person, they have been frequently encountered by investigators, particularly in the case of ethnic groups (e.g. I. L. Child[7]). A much more general source of restraint is the rejection by the high-status group of attempts by outsiders to enter it. There is little doubt that blunt rejections are early experiences in the lives of members of low-status groups and that they soon learn to anticipate rejection with the result that they give up any and all attempts to change their social position. A study by

3. Johnson, C. S. and Masuoka, J. Orientals and their cultural adjustment. Fisk Univ. Soc. Sci. Source Documents, 1946, No. 4, Pp. 135.
4. Child, I. L. Italian or American. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1943.
5. Dodd, S. C. A social distance test in the Near East. Amer. J. Sociol., 1935, 41, 194-204.
6. Lundberg, G. A. Social attraction patterns in a rural village; a preliminary report. Sociometry, 1937, 1, 77-80.
7. Op. cit.

Beckham[8] indicates the nature of these rejections in the case of Negroes. Virtually all of the Negro children and adults included in the sample remembered a humiliating experience where they personally were rejected. Sociometric studies[9] demonstrate that rejection of Negro children in school begins as early as kindergarten. The extent of this rejection leaves little doubt but that, as Beckham indicates, most Negro children will have met rejection in a personal form by the time they are 11 or 12 years old. The development of internal restraints to avoid rejection is attested to by Child. In the case of his rebel group, although there existed strong conscious desires to belong to the dominant group, there were rarely attempts to join the clubs to which they aspired or to meet non-Italian girls they admired.

To summarize, when a member of a low-status group becomes aware of the restrictions and discrimination that act upon him because of his membership, he typically develops a strong desire to leave his present group and to enter the more attractive high-status group. Sometimes this desire comes into conflict with his loyalties to the low-group and the satisfactions that he receives there. Thus, to some extent, awareness of his low status places an individual in a conflict situation. But more typical and more important are the restraints placed upon his upward movement by the high-status group. Let us examine the most important consequences of this barrier situation for the attitudes, behavior, and personality of the low-status person.

2. *Consequences of the low-status person's situation:*

a. The low-status person tends to take over many of the high-status group's values. It is not clear what conditions must prevail in order for the minority group to adopt the ideals and standards of the dominant group. Perhaps the essential factor is the desirability of majority group membership. At any rate, there is considerable agreement among investigators that low-status groups in America tend to share the majority group's standards for evaluating behavior, beauty, success, etc. Several quantitative studies[10] indicate clearly that Negroes tend to share the dominant group's views of other ethnic groups. Negro children and college students tend to attribute the same qualities to Japanese, Germans, Jews, etc. as do whites and they rank these groups as to preference or social distance in much the same way as do majority persons. There have also been consistent observations that within Negro urban communities, the color preferences of whites have been accepted and form part of the basis for social stratification among Negroes.[11] This phenonemon is closely related to our next point.

b. The low-status person tends to become hostile toward his group. The confirming evidence for this point again comes from studies of ethnic

8. Beckham, A. S. A study of race attitudes in Negro children of adolescent age. J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1934, 29, 18-29.
9. Moreno, J. L. Who Shall Survive? Washington: Nervous and Mental Disease Pub. Co., 1934; Criswell, J. H., A sociometric study of race cleavage in the class room. Arch. Psychol., 1939, No. 235, 16 pp.
10. Meltzer, H. Group differences in nationality and race preferences of children. Sociometry, 1939, 2, 86-105; Hartley, E. L. Problems in Prejudice. New York: King's Crown Press, 1946; Bayton, J. A. and Byoune, E. F. Racio-national stereotypes held by Negroes. J. Negro Educ., 1947, 16, 49-56.
11. For example, see the discussion in Myrdal, G. An American Dilemma. New York: Harper & Bros., 1944, p. 695 ff.

minority groups in the United States. Kenneth and Mamie Clark[12] found in a study of three to seven-year old Negro children that they typically expressed a definite preference for a white doll as compared with a brown one. They characterized the brown doll as "ugly" or said "It looks bad." Very similar responses to color comparisons were found by Charles S. Johnson in interviews with Negro youths.[13] Radke[14] asked Jewish children to match descriptions with pictures of Jews and non-Jews. With increasing age, she found an increasing tendency to associate negative traits with Jews. Bayton and Byoune[15] found that the stereotype of the Negro held by Negro high school and college students is very similar to that held by white students. The stereotype of the Negro common to both Negro and white students consisted of "musical," "very religious," "superstitious," "happy-go-lucky," and "loud." Irving Child found intragroup hostility to be openly expressed by the "rebels" among the second generation Italians. They openly rejected the parent Italian group, its leaders, and its symbols. Overt resentment toward parents and rejection of their cultural background is said to be characteristic of other bilingual groups.[16]

This rejection of one's own group can probably be traced to several sources. The first is the fact of having adopted the values of the dominant group. Lewin suggests this in his classic article on self-hatred among Jews.[17] There he says, "It is recognized in sociology that the members of the lower social strata tend to accept the fashions, values, and ideals of the higher strata. In the case of the underprivileged group, it means that their opinions about themselves are greatly influenced by the low esteem the majority has for them." The second basis lies in the frustrations that develop because of membership in the low-status group. The low-status person will often perceive the high-status group, which provides the restraints against upward mobility, as the source of frustration. (There is little doubt that, as a result of this, hostility does develop toward the majority group. The Bayton and Byoune data show that the stereotype of whites held by the Negro includes a number of hostile attributions, e.g. grasping, deceitful, cruel.) But he can also interpret his minority membership as the primary reason for his frustration and direct his aggression toward that group. The tendency to direct these hostilities against his own group is probably reinforced by his sharing the derogatory evaluations of his group made by the dominant group.

c. If it is possible for the low-status person to do so, he will move into the more privileged group. In so doing, he typically tries to avoid being identified with the low group and reduces further contacts with them. Moving upward on the social ladder may not depend only upon acquiring certain means (e.g. money, education, fancy clothes). In order to avoid

12. Clark, K. B. and Clark, M. P. Racial identification and preference in Negro children. pp. 169–178 in Newcomb, T. M. and Hartley, E. L., Readings in Social Psychology, New York, Holt, 1947.
13. Growing up in the Black Belt; Negro Youth in the Rural South. Washington D.C.: Amer. Council on Educ., 1941, p. 259 ff.
14. Radke, M. Unpublished study reported in Christian Sci. Monitor, July 17, 1946, p. 4.
15. Op. cit.
16. Spoerl, D. T. Bilinguality and emotional adjustment. J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1943, 38, 56–57; Bossard, J.H.S., The Sociology of Child Adjustment, New York: Harper and Bros. 1948, Chap. X.
17. Lewin, K. Self-hatred among Jews. Chap. 12 in Resolving Social Conflicts, New York: Harper and Bros., 1948, pp. 186–200.

the restraints against upward mobility maintained by the dominant high-status group, a person may also have to rid himself of physical features, speech pecularities, or other characteristics which mark him as a member of the low-status group. The person can also be labelled as belonging to the minority group on other bases than physical characteristics, for example, because of having personal relations with the minority group. So in cases of upward mobility we find the person doing two things, both intended to avoid identification of his original group membership: (1) the person carefully obliterates all physical or behavioral characteristics which would give him away, and (2) he avoids social contacts with the low-status group, especially under conditions where the interaction would be visible to the dominant group.

These actions have been adequately described in the literature. Child's "rebel" group among the second generation Italian men were careful to get themselves labelled as "Americans" in any relationship. In their social interactions, even though they did not express a preference for non-Italian friends they had more male companions, girl friends, and work associates among non-Italians. Bossard[18] describes the extent to which vestiges of the parental language are used to assign status to individuals. From a study of 17 persons raised in bilingual families, he finds that most of them developed protective devices to avoid being identified through their language peculiarities. These devices included restraint in their manner of speaking, behaving as inconspicuously as possible, and developing meticulous English. They also were careful to avoid bringing their outside friends into the parental homes and even avoided the homes themselves.

d. The low-status person may embark upon a program of improving his group in order to make his situation more tolerable. This line of behavior is probably entered upon more frequently the less possibility the low-status person has of undetected locomotion into the dominant group. Some evidence which may bear upon this assumption comes from Stonequist[19] who found that Negroes, as compared to second generation Europeans, more often and more strongly feel that their race has a mission to perform in the world.

A program for improving the low-status group can have two goals: (1) improving the subgroup so that the majority group drops the negative evaluation of it, and (2) mobilizing the subgroup to wrest expended privileges and greater equality of treatment from the dominant group. In either event, the success of the enterprise depends to a great extent upon the willingness of the dominant group to relinquish certain prerogatives and give up whatever satisfactions may be involved in the existence of the low-status group. Thus, the venture has little likelihood of success and dissatisfaction with the outcome is almost inevitable. There frequently results increased hostility toward the low-status group which takes the form of "These people just don't know what's good for them and they won't cooperate to improve themselves." For example, from a study of Negro college students' attitudes[20], 93% agreed to the opinion the "The trouble with Negro business is that Negroes have never learned to organize or work together." In her intensive study of middle class Negro girls,

18. Op. cit.
19. Stonequist, E. V. The Marginal Man. New York: Scribners, 1937, pp. 189-190.
20. Davis, T. E. Some racial attitudes of Negro College and grade school students. J. Negro Educ., 1937, 6, 157-165.

Brenman[21] found a high degree of intragroup hostility expressed by those girls who had seen the failure of self-improvement efforts. In contrast, girls who still saw the possibility of organizing the group to achieve greater benefits exhibited a high degree of in-group pride.

In summary, programs of group improvement seem generally doomed to failure in the case of low-status groups since their success is so highly dependent upon the reactions of the majority group. The failure of these efforts only serves to increase the volume of intragroup hostility and adds "uncooperativeness" to the low-status person's stereotype of his own group.

e. The frustration and conflict which envelop the low-status person result in important personality disturbances. There is general acceptance of the idea that cultural conflict results in mental conflict for the individuals involved. However, the demonstration of the resulting disturbances and personality symptoms leaves much to be desired. One of the better studies, that of Brenman, indicates that middle class Negro girls show greater insecurity when compared with a group of middle class white girls. This insecurity results from their uncertainty about when and where they will encounter prejudice but is also a function of the conflict between their levels of aspiration and the permitted outlets for self-expression. Spoerl[22] compared college freshmen from bilingual backgrounds with a roughly similar sample from families where only English was spoken. He found the former sample to have considerably poorer emotional adjustment which could be traced primarily to disharmony in the family caused by the cultural conflict.

No two minority or underprivileged groups are in exactly the same situation and any low-status group we might choose to examine would have unique circumstances which set it off from low-status groups in general. We would certainly find important variations in such properties as the basis for identifying group members, the areas of life in which discrimination makes itself felt, and the cultural and institutional patterns which have developed as an adjustment to the low-status situation. If we consider the total context of important factors, the problems of a Negro community in a small mid-West town are vastly different from those of a tenement district in a metropolitan center. However if the points we have elaborated above can be considered the common salient features of the underprivileged group, then these general problems can be studied in a wide variety of contexts.

Changing Hostile Social Attitudes

It is a well known fact in social psychology that the hostile attitudes involved in intergroup relations are highly stable and quite resistant to change. It is very apparent that strong forces are involved in maintaining such attitudes. An understanding of the nature of these forces and the mechanisms by which they preserve and protect the relevant attitudes is necessary to understanding the kinds of change methods that can be used.

Krech and Crutchfield suggest three categories of factors which

21. Brenman, M. The relationship between group membership and group identification in a group of urban middle class Negro girls. J. Soc. Psychol., 1940, 11, 171-197.
22. Op. cit.

serve to support social attitudes: (a) the internal motivational supports which consist of repressed, frustrated, and socially unacceptable need structures and (b) the supports in the external world which includes two sub-categories. "(1) observable objects, events, and relationships and (2) the beliefs and attitudes of other people."[23] Paralleling this analysis of the sources of support for attitudes, there are three major theories about producing attitude change. The first is the <u>motivational control</u> of attitudes through changing the need systems relevant to them. Second is the <u>perceptual control</u> of attitudes which requires changing the person's experience with relevant objects, events, attributes and relationships. Third is <u>social control</u> through changing the social attitudes and group norms with which the person comes into contact.

There is little doubt about the importance of personality and motivational factors in producing and sustaining hostile social attitudes. The California studies of prejudice are convincing on this point.[24] Although the methods of changing social attitudes through changing the pertinent personality factors have not been explored systematically, it seems reasonable to expect that the next few years will see documentation of the way in which existing psychotherapeutic methods are effective, within the limited populations to which they are applied, in changing intergroup attitudes. Undoubtedly these personality and motivational factors will prove to be very difficult to change. Because our present study cannot be assumed to have produced changes in personality factors, we shall not further discuss the therapeutic methods involved in the motivational control of social attitudes.

Both the other theories, that of perceptual control and that of social control, hinge upon the idea of exposing the person to simple contacts which differ from his present ones. Let us examine the nature of the contact necessary to produce change according to the two theories.

1. The perceptual control theory:

This theory starts with the assumption that what a person has found out through his samples of experience about another group of people exerts supporting forces on his attitudes toward them. In other words, his knowledge about the group is related to his attitude toward them. By changing his knowledge of the group, new and different pressures can be brought to bear upon his attitudes and, if this pressure is sufficient, it may result in attitudinal change.

The major evidence for this view is the correlation found between knowledge and attitudes, i.e., a tendency for persons to have knowledge which is congruent with their attitudes. However, as others have pointed out, the significance of this relationship is not subject to a single unequivocal interpretation.[25] The problem is: which was prior, the attitude or the knowledge? Were there forces on the person to accept the attitude because of his knowledge or did the attitude determine the acquisition and retention of the knowledge? There is no clear cut support for the first of these possibilities while there are a number of kinds of evidence for the latter.

23. Krech, D. and Crutchfield, R. S. Theory and Problems of Social Psychology, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948, pages 494-495.
24. Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J., and Sanford, R. N. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
25. Klineberg, O. Tensions Affecting International Understanding. New York: Social Science Research Council, Bulletin 62, 1950, page 142, 154 ff.

A variety of ways have been described in which attitudes determine the acquisition of new knowledge. Persons tend to expose themselves to experience which will support their attitudes and to retreat from experiences which would not be supportive. Such effects have been demonstrated in relation to propaganda[26] and in the laboratory where, investigating interpersonal relations, a relation was found between hostile first impressions and the volume of subsequent contacts.[27] The selectivity of both the perceptual and memorial processes has been experimentally demonstrated.[28] These devices of restricting and screening what is experienced and remembered seem to be particularly applicable to pieces of cognitive information about the world. Such selective processes seem to be completely adequate to the task of preventing the person, under normal conditions, from having to deal with conflicts between his attitude and knowledge systems.

Of course the problem of changing attitudes, operating under the perceptual control theory, is to bypass these devices – to force the person to experience facts contrary to his attitudes, to push him into situations he would normally avoid, and to assure the presentation of experiences of such structural coherence and figural properties that they will resist distortion. But are either of these steps adequate? The answer seems to be no. The person still has freedom to interpret and evaluate the experience as he wishes. Cooper and Jahoda have illustrated the kinds of misinterpretations that prejudiced persons can place upon cartoon material, interpretations which result in these persons completely missing the propaganda point.[29] Indeed, it seems doubtful theoretically whether information (as it is mediated) or knowledge (after it is internalized) ever has any necessary implications for a person's attitudes. We can perhaps best illustrate the independence of knowledges and attitudes by an example. Suppose a person has a strongly hostile attitude toward some low-status group, say Negroes. If he finds out that Negroes live in slums, this fits quite well into his attitudes since it demonstrates how inferior they are. If, on the other hand, he finds out that they live in respectable middle class communities this makes him even more hostile since now "these inferior beings are trying to live like white people." It is difficult to imagine a fact or knowledge that could be conveyed to this person which could not be conveniently assimilated to his pre-existing attitudes.

Because of these considerations, we believe the perceptual control techniques eventually will be shown to have little or no effectiveness in changing attitudes.

2. The social control theory:

The other major theory of attitude change through simple contact requires that the person be brought into social contact with evaluations or attitudes that differ from his own. In other words, it is not information about the world that counts but what other people think about it, how they evaluate it, interpret it, what attitudes they hold about it. To be most ef-

26. Cartwright, D. Some principles of mass persuasion. Human Rel., 1949, 2, 253-267.
27. Kelley, H. H. The warm-cold variable in first impressions of persons. J. Personality, 1950.
28. Levine, J. M. and Murphy, G. The learning and forgetting of controversial material. J. Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1943, 38, 507-517. For a theoretical discussion of these processes, see especially Haire, M. and Freeman, W., Perceptual defenses: processes protecting an organized perception of another personality. Human Rel., 1950.
29. Cooper, E. and Jahoda, M. The evasion of propaganda: how prejudiced people respond to antiprejudice propaganda. J. Psychology, 1947, 23, 15-25.

fective, this technique of producing change should include not only exposure to new social attitudes but also removal of already existing social supports. Thus, a complete program of change would involve curtailing communication with those persons and groups who were maintaining the present attitudes and developing increased contacts with persons and groups who will express the different attitudes.[30]

It may be argued that if a person's perceptions of events and facts can be distorted to fit his pre-existing attitudes, cannot his perception of other persons' attitudes be similarly distorted. Indeed it seems that this is possible. There are important reasons, however, why most persons cannot permit such distortion. In general, it would mean getting out of touch and out of step with the social world around them. In so far as they need to conform to group standards or as they depend upon social agreement as an anchorage for their attitudes, they cannot afford to be unreal about the social values of others or to have distorted views of the norms of the groups in which they expect to hold membership. Indeed, it would seem that the most powerful determinants of attitudes are the standards and norms of groups in which people have membership. These "reference" groups help determine the formation of attitudes and, once formed, provide an anchorage for them.

It is important to know what persons or groups will be a "reference group" for a given person. With whose evaluations will he be concerned? Some work has been done on the relation between the attractiveness of the group to the person and his dependence upon it for attitude anchorage.[31] Other variables such as prestige and expertness need to be explored before we can answer this question completely.

At the end of this book we shall evaluate the results of our change program in terms of this theory which contends that change can occur under circumstances of contact only when there is communication among people about differing attitudes which they hold.

---

30. It is instructive to consider the effects of contacts between high-and low-status groups upon attitudes of the high-status group members toward the low-status group. Studies of the effects of such contact have generally demonstrated little or no change. This is understandable if we remember that it is fairly typical of the low-status syndrome that members of low-status groups share the attitudes and evaluations of the high-status groups. In many instances, then, producing social contact between members of high-status and low-status groups is merely putting together people who, to some extent, share the same attitudes. According to our hypothesis, we would not expect attitude change to occur under such conditions.

31. Festinger, L., et al. Theory and experiment in social communication. Research Center for Group Dynamics, Report of Studies under ONR Contract, 1950.

Attitudes in Baytown
Toward the Regent Hill Project

Description of Baytown

"Baytown" is one of the oldest towns in the country. It has a population of around 30,000 and is spread over a large area. An industrial town in the past, Baytown was dominated a good deal in its life as a community by shoe manufacturing. Its present industry, except for the shipyards during the war, was relatively unimportant.

World War II saw a vast increase in the level of economic activity in Baytown. A large Naval installation brought many servicemen and civilian employees. Shipbuilding was the major war activity. The two yards located near the town brought an influx of outsiders into Baytown and provided jobs for many townspeople. It has been estimated that 60% of Baytown's wage-earners worked at the shipyards at some time during the war. Because of the layoffs in these yards at the close of the war, shipbuilding as an occupation was insignificant at the beginning of the present study.

Baytown has few of the characteristics of a typical centralized town of its size. There is no "center of town." with the usual concentration of banks, movies, large stores, and city hall. There appear to be five distinct neighborhoods in Baytown, these being separated primarily by geographical barriers such as hilly areas and railroad tracts. Each of these neighborhoods approximates an independent community, having its own shopping center, church, school facilities, etc. Although these neighborhoods differ in socio-economic level, property value, prestige, and relative proportions of "Yankees," newcomers, and ethnic groups, according to official spokesmen Baytown is a one-class community. It is generally accepted that there is no great wealth in the community and generally denied that there is any poverty. An additional fact generally taken as proof of the community's middle-class status is the fact that the homes in Baytown are typically single-family and owned by the occupants. Considering itself an "Old Yankee" town, the community attaches high value to all objects and persons tracing descent from the early settlement days. Several prided themselves upon living on the same street with two families who have lived in Baytown "for generations and generations." The fact that newcomers to Baytown find it difficult to become assimilated into the social organizations is readily admitted.

On national issues the town considers itself Republican. There is a strong bias against Federal or any other form of interference in issues which are considered to be Baytown's own concern. "We are wise, conservative, and forward looking, and we know better than any outsider could how to solve our own problems."

Description of the Regent Hill Project

The housing project known as Regent Hill was built near the northern tip of Baytown in the middle of one of its five sub-communities. There was no physical separation between the project and the town other than the customary street. It was built and operated under the auspices of the regional office of the Federal Housing Administration with governmental funds allocated for the development and operation of housing projects for war workers. Construction on the project was started in May of 1942 and the project was fully occupied by December of that same year.

The people who originally lived in the project were almost entirely shipyard workers and the project was appropriately located between two relatively large shipyards. The project continued to be almost exclusively occupied by workers from these two shipyards until the end of the war. However, by January of 1947 when this study began only about 40% of these early residents still lived there and only twelve percent of the residents still worked in the shipyards. As the shipyards started cutting down, some of the residents had moved away, while others, continuing to live at the project, had found employment elsewhere.

The Regent Hill Housing Project consists of one hundred permanent dwelling units built in an area of about four square city blocks. Seventy-two of the houses are semi-attached, the remaining twenty-eight are single houses.

The History of Town Opposition Toward the Project

The story of the reception by the town of the idea of the Regent Hill housing project may be traced through the newspaper stories at the time.

First newspaper accounts of the planned project and the opposition to it appeared in the April 22, 1941 issue of the daily newspaper of a neighboring town.* The article was placed prominently on the front page under the heading "Protests Over U.S. Housing." The article described a Baytown town meeting on the previous night at which time the government's plans were first made public.

> ...Angry protest arose here last evening from members of the town selectmen in the face of plans of the U.S. Housing Authority to construct a $630,000 defense housing development, and town officials voted to take every possible step to block the housing project on the site proposed.... Members of the selectmen contended almost unanimously that a federal housing project in their town was unnecessary – Selectman K declared he had already telegraphed Congressman W and asked 'if the President had declared an emergency in the U.S. that would allow the government to come into this town with a complete disregard for our building code and zoning laws.'... Referring to the proposed housing development in the most derogatory manner, Selectman B and Y declared that the structures to be built would be 'shacks' and that a 'slum clearance' project would be needed in the area in ten years if they are constructed.

---

* Baytown itself has two weekly newspapers.

A local weekly paper of April 25 revealed the following additional information:

> ... the board of selectmen were jolted out of their routine procedure by the news that the government was well on its way towards completing plans for the huge defense project.... No inklings of such intentions on the part of the federal government, which began two months ago, had reached the ears of the selectmen until last week, and all the members of the board, with the exception of Selectman F, expressed irritation over the intrusion of the federal government into the town without first contacting the selectmen and informing them of its plans.

This flurry of local opposition apparently brought about a postponement in the government's building plans, for there was little discussion of the project after May, 1941.

In an informal interview at the time of our investigation, Mr. L. who was chairman of the Board of Selectmen at the time the project was first proposed, gave more of the story:

> In the beginning, the government bought that tract of land there for $4600, and without a salutation to the local authorities, they made plans for a Federal development there. I called Judge N, our town counsel, and the town engineer, and the engineer said, 'Well the government is going to start the building of the project in six weeks.' I was a little indignant, because I thought they should have told us what they were going to do. I sent several telegrams to the representatives from this part of the state, and asked them how come they were moving in on us without the courtesy of a 'good morning.' We instituted a complaint against the building of housing in Baytown and we received a ruling that if Baytown did not want housing, they didn't have to have it. Then, a short time later, Pearl Harbor came, and of course that changed the picture materially.
>
> I was president of the Board of Selectmen, and I was asked if some of the Board would meet with members of the State Housing Board, and we agreed that because we were actually at war, we would approve a housing project. They presented the picture that they would like to build a project to accommodate 50 families. But when they finally finished the project, it was for 100 families, and it is the additional houses that some of us old-timers object to. The first houses were well located, but when they finished those, they built a border of those little ones that I said before look to me like a border of petunias.

Current Opinion About the Project from Community Leaders

To ascertain what might be called "official" attitudes toward the project and its residents at the time of our investigation, a series of informal interviews were conducted with a relatively wide range of community leaders. These attitudes tend to range from neutral and objective to marked hostility. The following series of quotes are fairly typical of the range obtained from twenty-eight "community leaders." From the Director of Guidance at the Baytown High School:

The children are O.K. kiddoes. You would never have known they were from the project, though: they're the same as all the other kiddoes. Among the children, there's absolutely no consciousness of the project. But I know that there is a feeling against the project in the town. But that's how Baytown people are ... that's the 'settlers'' attitude ... if your whole family wasn't born here, you've got to prove yourself.

From a lifelong resident of Baytown and member of a locally distinguished "settler" family:

I think that there was some opposition to the project when it was first proposed, but I would say that the people in the town have become quite accustomed to the situation. The inhabitants of the project, as far as I can see, are perfectly normal people. I think it's too soon to tell what contribution the project has made, if any, to the town life. Up to this time, it hasn't been very great; in fact, there have been problems because of the project. And now it's a matter for the future. A town of this size should have undertaken more on its own to develop the project. This particular project leaves too little for the town to say.... The houses are what you would expect from war-time construction. The thinking men of town hope that when the government is through with it, it will tear the whole project down. But it will more likely sell the houses off at auction, and a lot of people will get stuck with shells.

From a social worker in a local Welfare Society:

There is a lot of social life up there. There is a great deal of going out at night, and frequenting the taverns along Bridge Street on the part of women as well as men. There are families that were normal and decent, but there are a large percentage of the other kind, people who do a lot of running around. Most of the project people are not absorbed in the community life. Many of them were "transients and opportunists," the kind of people who were on relief during the depression. They aren't "too stable."

From a church minister who also writes a weekly column in a local newspaper:

A good many of these people have been getting higher salaries for the first time in their lives, and they want to be catered to. They have an exaggerated idea of their own importance. That may not be a just appraisal, but I think that it exists.

Current Opinion About the Project from Town Residents

The consensus about the project on the part of the general population of Baytown is considerably different from that of the "community leaders."* The most striking aspect was the relative lack of knowledge about the project and the neutrality of opinion about it on the part of the townspeople.

---

* The following data are based on interviews with a random sample of 200 residents in the near vicinity of the project. (See Appendix B).

Table 1 shows the percentages of people in those areas of Baytown closest to the project who showed evidence in an interview of knowing about the project. Only about half the people in the immediate vicinity and only one-quarter of those in nearby areas were sufficiently aware of the project to recall its existence. About half the people needed detailed description of the project before they showed signs of recognition. In the nearby areas about one-quarter of the people were entirely unaware of the existence of such a project.

Townspeople were asked a number of questions about the effects of the project on the town and what they thought of the project. Eighty per cent of the people had no opinions at all on the matter. The following tabulation shows a fairly equal balance of positive and negative attitudes among the 20% who did voice opinions (some people made more than one such response and so the percentages add to more than twenty):

Project helps the town	4%
Project helps business in town	3%
Project drags down town	10%
Town was opposed to construction of project .	6%

Table 1

Recognition of Project by People in Surrounding Areas of Town

Recognizes Project in Response to:	Immediately Adjoining Areas N = 100	Nearby Areas N = 100
General question	54%	25%
Directive Probe	40%	52%
No recognition	6%	23%

Much the same is true of the attitude of the people in the town toward the tenants of the Regent Hill project. In spite of several questions which asked specifically about attitudes toward residents of the project, 43% of the townspeople had nothing to say about the matter.

As the following tabulation shows, among those who did have opinions and attitudes about people in the Regent Hill project there was a fairly even division concerning favorable and unfavorable attitudes:

Low class people	7%
Temporary people	10%
Poor people	9%
Ordinary people	26%
Wonderful people	11%

There is, then, an official history of opposition to the project on the part of the town. This opposition is still reflected in the relatively high

proportion of hostile attitudes toward the project found among "community leaders." These "official" attitudes, however, tend to be in contrast with attitudes expressed by a random sample of townspeople. Among the latter neutral opinions tend to predominate.

Chapter III

The Social Isolation of Regent Hill

Comparison of Project Residents and Townspeople

Because one of our primary concerns in this investigation is with the social relationships between the project and the surrounding community we wish to know whether or not, on the basis of demographic variables,

Table 2

Sociological Comparison of Project and Town Residents

	Project	Town
Occupation of Head of Family		
Professional	5%	8%
Supervisory, Managerial	20	11
Clerical	10	7
Labor (Skilled and unskilled)	57	58
Servicemen, unemployed, etc.	8	16
Education of Respondent		
Above high school	21%	25%
High school	73	50
Grammar school	6	25
Age of Respondent		
Over 30	59%	76%
Under 30	41	24
Length of Residence		
More than 5 years	0%	81%
2 to 5 years	55	15
Less than 2 years	45	4
Number of Children Living With Family		
None	3%	42%
1 or 2	69	40
3 or more	28	18

we might expect the project people to fit into the community. Thus, it is important to determine how similar the project residents are to the towns-people.

Table 2 shows the distribution of project and town residents with respect to a number of demographic variables. It is apparent that occupationally the two groups are very similar, although the project residents have a slight edge in the supervisory and managerial classification. In terms of education, the two samples are also very similar. The slightly higher educational level among the project residents is probably due to the fact that they tend to be younger than the town residents.

There are large differences between the groups in length of residence in Baytown and number of children living with the family. The vast majority of Baytown residents have lived there for more than five years while no one in the project has lived there that long. The project residents also tend to have more children living at home. This is again probably a correlate of age.

Except for the difference in length of residence there seems to be reason to expect that the project people would readily merge with the rest of the Baytown community.

Regent Hill's Feelings of Acceptance by Baytown

In spite of the many similarities between Regent Hill residents and Baytown residents, and in spite of the predominantly neutral opinion about Regent Hill in Baytown, many project residents perceive the town as looking down on them and discriminating against them. These perceptions on the part of the project residents can be best illustrated by the following tabulations of answers to two questions in an interview:[*]

"Do you feel that living in this project makes it easier or harder to have friends in Baytown?"

Townspeople prejudiced against project	6%
Townspeople feel we are low class	19%

"Do you think the people from Baytown would like to come to activities at the Community Hall?"

No, they dislike the project or project people	18%

It is clear that a fair proportion of the project residents openly voice strong feelings of being rejected by the townspeople. Altogether, 45% mention such feelings somewhere in the course of the interview.

While these feelings in the project are at variance with the predominantly neutral attitudes found among a cross-section of townspeople, they do tend to agree with the opinions of the town leaders.

Friendship Contacts between Project and Town

In considering the data on contacts between residents of the project and the town, it should be remembered that the project was built in the middle of a residential community with no physical separation between the project and the surrounding neighborhood. At the time of this study the average length of residence of tenants in the project was about three years.

---

[*] This interview was administered to a random sample of 60 project women at the start of our study. The interview and sampling procedures are described in Appendix A.

In the light of this knowledge it seems surprising that, when asked "How many friends would you say you have living in Baytown?", only twenty-four per cent of the project residents gave any evidence of having specific friends; fifty-two per cent spoke vaguely of having acquaintances; while twenty-four per cent actually said they had no friends at all.

While it is difficult to make a precise evaluation of these figures in the absence of data for non-project people of comparable length of residence, it seems reasonable to suppose that this represents a very low level of friendship. This conclusion of relative isolation of the project residents from the town is supported when we look at other possible contact channels.

Organizational Contacts between Project and Town

In the course of our interviews with both the project residents and the townspeople we asked to what town organizations, clubs, or churches they belonged. In order to assess the degree of isolation of the project residents, it is desirable to compare them with townspeople of similar length of residence in Baytown. We consequently used for the comparison only data from townspeople with less than five years residence. Table 3 presents these data. There is a striking difference in organizational membership between these samples of project and town residents. While only eleven per cent of the townspeople belong neither to clubs nor churches, forty per cent of the project people have no membership. Even with respect to church membership alone, which is a relatively easy membership to establish, a sizeable difference exists between them.

We may conclude that the project residents have been kept, or have kept themselves, in greater isolation from the town's activities than persons of similar tenure not living in the project.

Social Relations Within Regent Hill

In our investigation thus far of the Regent Hill housing project, we have found that the project residents show a number of the symptoms of a minority or underprivileged group. Specifically, they feel that outsiders look down on them and they have relatively little social contact with outside groups. If the syndrome of the low-status group is consistent, we should find this status perception reflected in the internal social life of the project.

1. Attitudes of project residents toward each other:

There is a considerable amount of hostility toward each other among the project residents. While nowhere in the interview was any question ever asked concerning their attitudes or feelings toward their neighbors, this hostility nevertheless was spontaneously expressed. Sixty-two per cent of those interviewed voiced the opinion that the other people living in the project were low class and undesirable.* Even in the absence of any comparative data on non-project residents, one can be certain that this represents an unusually high degree of hostility.

This hostility even extends to attitudes about the children in the project. The following tabulation shows the hostile responses (not mu-

---

* It should be pointed out that this opinion was usually a generalized one with no specific persons being mentioned. Where particular residents were described as "low class," there was little agreement as to their identity.

tually exclusive) to the question: "What problems are there in bringing up a child while living here?"

Too many or bad children	33%
Children get bad habits from others	23%
Neighbors are low class	23%

Considering the extent of these hostile feelings, we may well expect to find considerable effect on the pattern of social life within the project.

Table 3

Comparison of Project and Town Residents in Terms of

Membership in Town Organizations

Town Memberships	Project N = 80	Town	
		Less than 5 years residence N - 36	Over 5 years residence N = 164
No membership	40%	11%	15%
Church membership only	28	44	38
Club membership	32	44	46

2. *Social contacts among project residents:*

There were not many active friendships existing among the residents of the project. This becomes fairly clear if we look at the responses to the question: "How many friends would you say you have living here in the project?" Only thirty-five per cent of the residents gave any evidence of having specific friends; forty-five per cent spoke vaguely of acquaint- ances, while twenty per cent said they had no friends at all. There is ad- ditional corroboration from responses to a question concerning whether or not they invite project people to their homes. Thirty-seven per cent of the residents said that they never extended such invitations.

It is also interesting to examine the rate at which the making of new friends proceeds in the project. In the interview they were asked "Have you met any people in the project in the past two or three months that you didn't know before?" Sixty per cent of the residents had not met any new people. If we couple this fact with the already existing low level of know- ing other people, we may conclude that the process of making new friends is proceeding very slowly.

In the next chapter we will attempt to give an explanation of the de- velopment of (1) hostility among the project residents, (2) little contact and little social life within the housing project, (3) relative isolation from the larger surrounding community, and (4) perceptions of rejection by the townspeople. This explanation will form the basis for our experimental change program which will be described later.

Chapter IV

A Psychological Analysis
of the Low Status Syndrome in Regent Hill

The pattern of social interaction we have found to exist within the project and between the project and town must be understood in terms of the conditions under which people entered the project and the factors affecting them during their residence there. We are thus concerned with explaining the sequence of a developmental process culminating in the state of affairs we found to exist at the time of our study. We, ourselves, obtained a great deal of insight into this process from a careful reading of a number of interviews. For this reason, we shall use quotations from some of the more illuminating interviews to illustrate our hypotheses about this process. We shall also attempt to support our explanation by quantitative data.

1. Relation of desire to live in the project

and anticipations about neighbors:

Typically the people who lived in the Regent Hill project had not had a positive desire to live there. They saw themselves mainly as having been forced into living there because of unusual circumstances in their lives or because of the operation of factors outside their own control. These are some of the statements made by project residents:

> My husband transferred from the F. shipyard to the H. shipyard which meant that he had to travel over sixty miles a day from the north shore down here so we felt that it was necessary to move closer to his work.

> We couldn't find anyplace else and we were being evicted from C. They wouldn't accept us anyplace else because we have three children and they are all under five.

> I have a home in ND, my son went into the service. We had to have some place to live in. We applied here and moved in before the electricity was on. Even then it was hard to find places with the shipyard going you know.

These people mostly felt that they had been forced by environmental circumstances to move into this project. They consequently felt that the other people they would find living in the project, unlike themselves, would be typical "project people" and they were prepared to look down on them. Here are some of the more explicit statements in response to the question: "Before you moved here what things did you think you would find unpleasant about living in one of these houses?"

> The people, the environment, you don't get a selected group of people in any housing project. If you live in a residential area you get a "same" group but not in a housing project.

> It was a desperate situation. I was ill so I couldn't house hunt so my husband put in an application here. We didn't think about the future at all. We were just happy to get it. My children are at an age where it wouldn't hurt them to be associated with children who turned out to have undesirable traits - and so far as I am concerned they aren't undesirable anyway. Because of that we had no compunction in coming here.

> I really didn't think much about it. My husband got it and I flew up here right away, just having any home together was so wonderful that I didn't care. My husband was just out of the service you see. We were dubious of the type of people that live in projects and we don't care much for them. You know this was built for war workers.

Quantitative evidence about the relationship between lack of desire to live in the project and hostile anticipations about neighbors may be obtained by comparing those respondents who indicated any kind of initial positive attraction to the project with those who did not. If our interpretation is correct, there should have been greater expectation of other project residents being undesirable in the latter group.

There were twenty-five people interviewed who could be classed as indicating some positive attraction to the project. (Twenty-two out of these twenty-five merely said that it was convenient to their job, or represented a financial saving.) Thirty-five of those interviewed came for what might be called negative reasons; perhaps they were evicted or lived too far away or were not able to find anyplace else to live. The following tabulation presents these two groups' anticipations about their neighbors.

	Only negative reasons for coming to project.	Some positive reasons for coming to project.
Anticipated good neighbors	0	2
Anticipated undesirable neighbors	10	3
Expressed no anticipation	25	20

There is a slight relationship between these two variables. The two cases in the sample who said they anticipated liking their neighbors were both among those who had come to the project for some positive reason. Thirteen people voiced expectations that the other people in the project would be undesirable. Ten of these thirteen are among those who came to the project for "negative" reasons. No very high level of statistical significance can be attributed to this relationship but on the whole it tends to corroborate our explanation.

2. *Relation of anticipation about neighbors*

and ensuing social contacts:

This expectation that the project would be tenanted by undesirable or

low class people led to the intention to refrain from "general" or wide-spread contact with others in the project and to restrict their contacts to a selected few. This they were able to do. Several quotes from interviews illustrate the voluntary evidence of general contact with the other residents of the project.

> The other children's parents are such a low grade, they just don't teach their children any manners at all. The children have foul mouths but the parents do too; that's it, they get it at home. You just can't send your children out to play; others teach them bad language and bad habits. If they would fence things in and you could have a fence around a house then you could keep a child within boundaries and you could tell the other children to go home. It's harder to make friends here because of the type of people who live here. We never in the world would want them for friends. Usually your neighbors are your friends but not these neighbors, not if we can help it.

> I have never become very intimate with people here and as a consequence we have never had any trouble. I think you will see what I mean. You have a heterogeneous group of people from all walks of life and from all over the country. In this type of place you know absolutely nothing about people's background.

In order to determine quantitatively the relation of anticipation about neighbors and social contacts with them we may compare those thirteen respondents who verbalized an expectation that other project residents would be undesirable with the forty-seven who did not state any such expectation. The data tend to show that the people who verbalized their negative expectations actually have a somewhat more active social life. When asked whether or not they invite other people from the project to their homes, eighteen of the forty-seven residents who did not verbalize negative expectations said they never invited project people to their homes. None of the thirteen people who did verbalize negative expectations said this. This difference is significant at the one per cent level of confidence. We must then conclude that having negative expectations about undersirable and low class people in the project did not mean a restriction in the volume of social life. The plausible explanation here seems to be that those people who verbalized their negative expectations are those who, having a stronger need for social contact, were more concerned about this problem.

We might, however, expect to find that those people who expressed their negative expectations would be more selective concerning their friendships and contacts with others in the project. They would not expose themselves to "general" or widespread contacts but would confine their social activities to a highly selected few people. We may assume that people who did not want to expose themselves to general contact with others in the community would be more discontent with the privacy that was afforded them in the project, while those who were not so concerned about contact with the community would feel more satisfied with the amount of privacy they had. We may then examine the responses to the question "How do you and your husband feel about the amount of privacy you have?" to see if the data support the relationship between negative expectations and selectivity of contact. Only thirty-one per cent of those who had negative expectations feel that they have sufficient privacy in the

project, while sixty-two per cent of those who did not verbalize negative expectations feel that they have sufficient privacy. This difference is significant at the ten per cent level of confidence. Those who feel that they do not have sufficient privacy make statements such as "undesirable neighbors intrude," "there is no privacy outside the project," "neighbors can hear one's conversation," etc. The data thus support our explanation.

3. Relation of lack of contact

with the persistence of hostile attitudes:

As a result of effectively staying out of contact and out of communication with all but a selected few of the other residents, the initially hostile attitude toward the people living in the project did not change with the passing of time. Consequently, these hostile attitudes were still in effect at the time of our investigation. Following are some examples of the way these attitudes express themselves:

> I would clean out the project to begin with. There is plenty of chance to do it. A few of these undesirables should be put entirely out into slum clearance projects and then you could start something and it would go through. Those people just wouldn't try to help themselves, they never should have children, that's what. I never could go into the slum settlement work, that's one sure thing.

> You can't leave any toys out in the yard, the neighbors take them in, paint it and give it to their own kids. You can't leave milk out for fear it will be stolen or broken. My neighbor and I have an agreement to take in each other's milk if the other isn't home.

> The environment here is the worst thing. There is a very low class of people here, the language is something like you probably never heard and it's very bad for the kids. The main problem is one of association. There are just so many unintelligent people here.

We have now reached a partial explanation of why we found so many residents who felt that others in the project were low class and undesirable people. Our reasoning has been that because they came to the project expecting others to be undesirable they withheld themselves from "general" contact with others in the community, and consequently these attitudes did not change. We might then expect to find an empirical relationship between the extent to which they stayed out of general communication with other people in the project and the feeling that neighbors were low class and undesirable.

Using the concern with privacy as the measure of whether or not residents restricted their contact in the project community, we find the expected relationship with expression of hostile attitudes toward neighbors. Forty-seven per cent of those who feel they have sufficient privacy express in the course of the interview the feeling that neighbors in the project are low class. The comparable figure for those who do not feel they have sufficient privacy is 77%. This difference is significant at the two per cent level of confidence.

4. *Relation of own attitudes*

with perceptions of outsiders' attitudes:

Our analysis of the "low status syndrome" in Chapter I would lead us to expect to find, in the Regent Hill project, the typical conjunction of "internal" and "external" attitudes. Specifically we would expect the persons having hostile attitudes towards other project residents to feel somewhat ashamed of living in the project. It is plausible to suppose that by projection of their own attitudes they would feel that the outside community also looked down on project residents. There follow some of the more articulate statements about this from the interviews:

> There are always those who leave the community hall in deplorable condition. I have gone down and cleaned it myself before the dancing class was coming in because I would be ashamed to have the women from outside see it. You know the kind of thing they would say: 'you can imagine what their homes must be like,' and I want to avoid that sort of feeling.

> The people in the town made it harder for us to have friends. I don't know whether they thought we were Oakies or what - maybe they thought we were people who couldn't find work or jobs and just traveled around the country looking for work. But in the stores down in the square, they refuse to take care of what they call "project people" and they wouldn't wait on you, that kind of thing. They classed us that way.

> You don't have any way of knowing - it seems all the people in the town look down on you as if you were a bunch of foreigners or something, there is no getting around it. The people in the town do look down on us.

Unfortunately, the first interview in the project contained no questions which gave much opportunity for the respondent to talk about the attitudes which townspeople had toward project residents. Altogether only six people spontaneously volunteered the opinion that outsiders were prejudiced against the project. Those six people were all among the thirty-eight who also expressed the feeling that their project neighbors were low class. None of the twenty-two persons who did not mention low class neighbors volunteered such an opinion. This difference is significant at the six per cent level of confidence.

There are more data available from the second project interview since appropriate questions were asked. Fifty-three per cent of those who looked down on their neighbors indicated that they felt townspeople looked down on the project, while only twenty-five per cent of those who did not look down on their neighbors mentioned this. This difference is significant at the three per cent level of confidence.

5. *Relation of perception of town attitudes*

to contacts with townspeople:

To the extent that project residents felt ashamed of living in the project and perceived that townspeople looked down upon them, one would expect project people to attempt to dissociate themselves from the project in their contacts with the townspeople. Thus contacts which project peo-

ple made with the town would tend <u>not</u> to be made <u>through</u> other project people but rather on their own in a way which does not identify them with the project. Lacking such convenient introductions with townspeople, project people would have a more difficult time making contacts with the town. There follow some quotes that illustrate how this operates:

> I definitely do not think project people have as much to do with Baytown activities as most people. For one reason I don't think they have been invited to participate by the townspeople. If they are in activities it is because they pushed themselves and did it all on their own. I may be wrong but my own conclusion is that if you want to get into community activities you have to know one or two people that don't live in the project and get them to take you to club meetings or whatever you are interested in and then maybe you will get into things. One of my friends in Baytown got me interested in this Bluebird work. I never could have gotten started otherwise.

> It was a problem entertaining the church club I belonged to. There are about sixty women in it so I worked it out. We took the bus way down to the beach where my house is at NB and we had a picnic down there. That's the way I have to do my entertaining.

It will be recalled from Chapter III that project residents do have less contact with the town than would be expected from their length of residence and similarity to the townspeople. There is, however, no difference between those who do and those who do not have the opinion that townspeople look down on project people in the amount of contact they have with the town. While channels of contact with the town may be more restricted for the former group, this may well be balanced by a greater desire to have such town contacts.

To explain the generally low degree of contact between the project and the town we must look to how these contacts are made and the scarcity of channels for making contacts. Unfortunately, there are few data available with respect to this. Worthy of note, however, is the absence of certain categories of response from our data. In response to the question of how they got to know friends in Baytown, not one of the respondents reported having established these contacts through other project residents. Again in answer to the question, "Have you met any people in Baytown in the last two or three months that you didn't know before? How?" Only two out of all the people interviewed mentioned that they had met such people through project neighbors. The glaring absence of this channel of contact for project residents is certainly consistent with the interpretation that, since other project residents were not effective channels for making contact with the town, there would be a generally low level of such contact.

Implications for a Program of Change

According to the foregoing analysis the basic point in the sequence producing the "hostile-isolation" syndrome was the fact that much information communication and contact among the project residents was cut off because of their <u>a priori</u> unfavorable expectations concerning their neighbors. If this is correct, an action program which stimulated contacts among project residents under favorable conditions would act to break down their hostile attitudes toward each other. If such an action

program were successfully carried out, there should be further ramifications of its effects. If increased contacts within the project would break down the feelings that neighbors were undesirable people this should also result in feeling less shame about living in the project. There would then be less reluctance about being identified with the project. This would also mean a greater readiness to use available channels for contact with townspeople, channels which had previously not been used because they meant identification of the resident as coming from the project.

From our psychological analysis, then, it is conceivable that an action program which threw project residents into contact with each other under favorable conditions would change the total syndrome which we found to exist. Hostile attitudes toward neighbors might be reduced and relationships between the project and the surrounding town might be increased. Such an action program was undertaken and is described in the following chapter.

Chapter V

A Program to Change Social Attitudes
in Regent Hill

The experimental action program set up in Regent Hill followed from the analysis of the state of affairs in the project. Measurement of the effects of the action program would, then, throw light on the validity of the analysis.

Skilled community workers were given the task of working with the tenants of the housing project to help them organize a program of community activities. The major purpose to be accomplished by the community worker was to bring the project residents into contact with one another so as to establish communication among them. The community workers were never to stimulate contacts between the residents of the project and the people of the surrounding town. This, although it placed a severe restriction upon the community workers and was not natural for them, seemed necessary in order to examine our hypotheses that project-town relations were conditioned by social relations within the project.

The skilled community workers served also as data collectors. Each of them kept detailed daily accounts which served a two-fold purpose:

1. They provided a detailed description of the day-by-day developments of the action program. This is a statement of what we, as experimenters, did in this investigation.

2. They provided data on contacts, friendships, and attitudes among the project residents derived from the behavior of the residents or conversations between residents and the community workers.

A more formal program of measurement was also carried out to determine the amount and kind of change accompanying the action program:

1. Before the action program started an open-ended interview was administered to a random sample of the project residents. This interview attempted to ascertain such things as attitudes toward the project, attitudes toward other residents, attitudes toward community activities, data about the social life within the project and relations with the town. At intervals of two to three months this interview was repeated with random samples of the project residents. Four surveys in all were taken. (See Appendix A)

2. Simultaneously with the interviews within the project a random sample of town residents were interviewed to determine their attitudes toward, knowledge about, and contacts with the project and its residents. (See Appendix B)

After describing the action program in the remainder of this chapter, we shall proceed to examine its effects on the life of the community.

The History of Community Activities in Regent Hill

During the four and one-half year period of the project's existence there had been no successful program of community activities. The formal organization responsible for such activities was a tenant committee appointed by the manager of the project. This committee had organized occasional parties for children on special holidays and a series of Saturday night dances. A strong feeling developed against the tenants committee because it was "always the same people who ran things." The Saturday evening affairs finally ended because of jealousies and resentment.

There had also been a few informal efforts at community activities by individual tenants. These included an attempt to organize a series of boxing lessons for boys, an attempt to organize a number of men in the project to lay out a softball field, an art class for children, a gardening group, and sewing classes. In each case either the attempt failed before it got started or interest in the activity quickly died down and the members soon stopped attending.

This history of failure resulted in a pessimistic attitude among the project people about future possibilities for successful activities. The following tabulations of data gathered in the first interview with a sample of sixty project women clearly reflects this pessimism. Question: "What activities would you like to see in the project?"

"Shouldn't be any;" "There are enough now"	28%
"There are difficulties in starting such activities"	18%

Question: "What things about a project like this makes it easier or harder to have community activities?"

"Lack of cooperation;" "Gossip among tenants"	33%
"The other residents are low class"	12%

Approximately half of the women in the project foresaw sizeable difficulties in starting successful project activities. A large number of these women attribute these difficulties to the noncooperativeness and lack of congeniality of their neighbors. Most of the women who were not unfavorable were indifferent and had few ideas.

To succeed, a community program would have to combat the pessimistic attitudes toward activities and encourage the development of a broader, more widely accepted leadership than presently existed.

The First Period of the Action Program[*]
—January 29 to April 15

The community worker was introduced by a regional Federal Public Housing Authority representative at a meeting of a group of project women which he arranged. The community worker interested these women in the possibilities of a project nursery school, a recreation program for school-age children, and adult education and recreation activities. To explore these possibilities a community-wide meeting was planned and committees were set up to do preliminary planning. The community worker and

---

[*] The action program is divided into periods of from two to two and one-half months duration, corresponding to the intervals between the successive interviewings in the project.

29

several committee members canvassed the project residents to publicize the large meeting. Of the 200 odd adults in the project approximately 35 people (mostly women) turned out for it.

At the large meeting, the research program provided experts who led small planning groups in each of the three possible activity areas. In these groups definite plans were made for next steps. Within the week following there were separate meetings of the groups interested in the nursery school, the school-age recreation program, and adult recreation. The nursery school group made the greatest progress. Members of this group planned a budget and decided on the fees they were to charge for attending the school. They began investigating the possibility of obtaining a teacher and equipment. They also planned to canvass the entire project in order to enlist the attendance of children and to interest as many women as possible to help at the school sessions.

The adult education and recreation group scheduled a fund-raising event to be held within the next two weeks in order to provide financial support for the nursery school.

At the meeting of the women interested in school-age children's recreation, definite plans were made for an afternoon of supervised recreation the following week. Several women volunteered to mimeograph publicity bulletins.

Thus, about a month after the research program began, fairly widespread support for a program of community activities was present. A growing number of women had become involved. The activity leadership was broadening because new women were assuming responsibilities and the program was getting too large for all the work to be done by the same few people.

During this period of preliminary work, resistances toward the action program began to make themselves known.[1] These resistances showed themselves in three ways: first, a lasting pessimism with regard to the possibility of establishing a successful program of community activities; second, pronounced criticism of the general meeting; and third, opposition to specific features of the activities.

The chairman of the tenants' committee frequently voiced pessimism concerning the future of the activities based on her conception of the other tenants and her experience in the past. This pessimism was communicated to her associates and made them critical and defeatist. When she, for example, publicly reported on the school age committee, she said that no plans or ideas had come out of this committee. Her attitude towards the work of the nursery school committee was also defeatist. Although this committee had developed specific plans for a nursery school to be started in the near future, she remarked that raising funds for the nursery school would take time and that "maybe they wouldn't be ready to start anything before September (seven months later)."

The effect of this pessimism on others can be seen from comments made by various women to the community worker. One complained, for example, that the women wanted to talk about nothing but bridge games and that "people here are scared of anything serious." When asked to make plans for the general meeting one woman said, "women who have lived here twice as long as I don't think there's much use." Refusing to canvass, another asserted, "sooner or later I always have an unpleasant

---

1. Festinger, L., Cartwright, D., et al, A study of a rumor: its origin and spread. Human Relations, 1948, 1, 464-486.

experience in contacting people in the project." Many of the women who refused to participate in the new program referred to trouble they had had in the past.

Criticism of the general meeting also became a symptom of the growing resistance. Although the general meeting served a function in enlisting the interest of a fairly large group of women in community activities, it also had a negative effect in that it became a target of criticism. While the goal of the experts who had led the meeting had been to stimulate interest and initiative on the part of the tenants, many who attended complained that the experts had not taken enough initiative and did not seem to be of much help. Many said that they wished the discussion leaders had told them more definitely what to do.

Another effect of the general meeting was to crystalize suspicion about "who all these experts were and why they were taking such an interest in the project." While it was clear to those attending the meeting that the experts were all from the same educational institution, they did not understand the reasons behind this concerted effort.

The movie which was shown also came in for criticism. While many seemed to have enjoyed the film the assertion was frequently made that it didn't really apply to their situation.

The resistance which arose in connection with specific features of the activities centered largely around the nursery school program which had made most progress. Symptomatic of the suspicion with which people were viewing the nursery school program were reasons given for refusing to enroll their children. For example, some people stated that their children did not need a nursery school and some stated that they didn't think this nursery school would be a good one. In one case the feeling was so strong that the door was slammed in the face of Mrs. C., who at that time was very active in the nursery school committee.

Most disruptive was the resistance shown by the secretary of the tenants' committee. Her resistance was strong enough to take the form of deliberate blocking of the activities. For example, following the general meeting she called off two meetings of the nursery school steering committee of which she was chairman and consistently opposed other suggestions of the community worker. When it was suggested that it might be possible to provide the nursery school temporarily with a teacher to help it get started, the secretary of the tenants' committee opposed the idea. She said that she did not think people should be given anything for nothing and that she had found a woman on her own initiative who could do the job very adequately.

An informal meeting between Mrs. C., the secretary of the tenants' committee, and the community worker at this time revealed growing disagreement over the activities between Mrs. C. and the secretary who for some time had been on friendly terms.

At this point the people in the project were closer than they had ever been to a constructive program of community activities and at the same time overt resistance against these community activities was also at its peak. The increased number of people who were participating threatened the status position of the old leaders. If these activities were to proceed, new leaders would almost certainly become dominant. The successful progress of the various committees also contradicted the widespread conviction that such activities were impossible in this community. This unexpected progress focused the attention of those who resisted on the out-

siders whose motives for working with them they did not understand. In the absence of satisfactory information supplied by the outsiders, an explanation was found which appeared plausible to some and which justified the resistance which had arisen.

One morning late in February, 1947, when the community worker arrived at the project to attend a meeting of the school age recreation committee, she happened to meet a member of this committee on the street. The community worker was told that this meeting and all other meetings were cancelled and that she could get more detailed information from the other women or from the local manager of the project. The woman seemed embarrassed and unwilling to talk about the reasons for this development. The community worker proceeded to talk with the local project manager to find out what had happened. The following reconstruction of events is based upon information obtained from the local project manager, from regional management, and from subsequent conversations with project tenants.

One of the three men who attended the general meeting was Mr. M., a resident of the project who was a leader of boys' activities in a local church. He was known to have close contact with a law-enforcement agency and to be particularly interested in combatting communist influences.

Following the general meeting the secretary of the tenant's committee went to see Mr. M., and between them they arrived at certain conclusions which the secretary told to a number of the more active tenants as demonstrated facts. First, it was declared that Mrs. C., who had been very active in organizing the nursery school, was an "avowed communist." Secondly, it was asserted that three of the experts who spoke at the general meeting were also known to be communists.

The obvious conclusion to be reached was that the tenants should have nothing further to do with these community activities.

Armed with these "proven facts," the secretary of the tenants' committee spent considerable time talking with two other women about her discovery. Among them they decided to call a meeting of the more active leaders to decide what steps should be taken. The decision of the six women who attended this meeting was to state the case to the local project manager and to ask his advice as to what to do.

In the subsequent meeting of eight women with the local project manager (two women just happened to be in the manager's office at the time) there was some disagreement between those who wanted to drop the program altogether and those who favored a more moderate course. The secretary of the tenants' committee and a close friend of hers were most insistent on having the activities stopped immediately. The local project manager, when asked for his advice, stated that he was in a "bad position" because he himself did not fully understand who the community worker was nor why the research was being conducted. He reported the matter to the regional management office while advising the women that, now that they knew there was danger, they might continue with the activities, since there was "some good coming out of it," but that they should watch carefully to see that nothing wrong was done. By the end of the meeting even the more moderate among the women agreed to drop the activities because the situation had become disagreeable.

During this meeting the behavior of the local project manager was a crucial determinant of the course of events. Had he been fully acquainted

32

with the sponsorship of the research program and had he fully understood its purpose, he could have provided the necessary information to allay the suspicions of the women. Such positive action on his part would probably have prevented further attempts to stop the program. He did not possess this information and understanding because his initial hostility toward community activities had led the community worker to bypass him in her efforts to establish a community program.

The immediate effect of this series of events was the complete cessation of activities. It was almost two weeks before the community worker could do anything to dispel the rumor, since regional management, wanting to assist in counteracting the rumor, requested a delay in action. During this period she did not appear at the housing project and the already postponed meeting of the nursery school steering committee did not take place. The canvassing for the fund-raising event and the planned school age recreation afternoon were cancelled. During these two weeks the rumor spread through the project. By the time the community worker resumed her activities, it had become greatly elaborated.

Once the basic premise of communism had been accepted, a cognitive reorganization took place bringing new meaning to many events which had not previously seemed at all significant. Small incidents at committee meetings, minor details of procedure at the general meeting, a chance remark in a conversation, a speaker's manner of address - all became integrated and added up to support the premise of communism. Some examples of this process may be cited.

The sudden interest that Mrs. C. (the avowed communist) had shown in nursery school activities, her repeated praise of the community worker, and the fact that the community worker had accepted an invitation to dinner at her home became the basis for the assertion that the community worker and Mrs. C. had been friends in the past.

The offer made by the community worker to provide temporarily a nursery school teacher gave rise to questions concerning the source of the money and the reason for the outsider's wanting her own teacher in the school. The communist answer seemed plausible.

The movie, shown at the general meeting, which contrasted crowded city living conditions with conditions in a planned rural community was later interpreted as being communist propaganda. This interpretation was strengthened by the belief that the music in the movie (written by Aaron Copland) "sounded Russian."

Several things happening at the general meeting were later thought to be examples of communist tactics. The movie, which was scheduled to be shown at the beginning of the meeting, was shown at the end due to mechanical difficulties with the projector. This change was seen as a maneuver to prevent discussion of the film. The suggestion made by one of the experts that the adult education group might discuss the topic of the atomic bomb and international affairs was said to have been proposed to provide an opportunity for communist propaganda. The fact that the experts, rather than proposing a set plan for community activities, tried to stimulate discussion was taken as evidence that they were not really experts. All these were readily accepted as the sort of things communists would do.

In attempting to understand the reasons for the inception and growth of the rumor, three broad questions call for consideration. (1) What functions did the rumor serve? (2) What roles did people play in its

origin and spread? (3) What determined the nature of its content?

The functions of the rumor become clear if one relates the content and effects of the rumor to the situation from which it sprang. These functions may be analyzed in terms of the rumor's relation to areas of cognitive unclarity, personal motivations, and problems of interpersonal relations.

As indicated in discussing the events leading up to the rumor, there were many areas of cognitive unclarity for the project residents concerning the new efforts to organize community activities. The statement made by the community worker that she was employed by a research organization and was interested in community activities left many questions unanswered. It left unclear just who the sponsors really were and just why they were willing to spend so much time and effort in working at this particular housing project. It was especially difficult to understand how the community worker was able to spend all her time working at the project and how the sponsors were able to provide a nursery school teacher free of charge. This was a situation which they had never encountered before and which they could not explain or understand in terms of their past experience. The premise of communist sponsorship tied these previously incomprehensible facts together into a coherent explanation. They now "understood" what was happening and why it was taking place. With communist sponsorship as an accepted reference point they proceeded to substantiate it further, as noted in the preceding section, by reinterpreting even events which had not been puzzling.

In describing the situation leading up to the rumor it was pointed out that the old leaders were beginning to feel their leadership position threatened. New leaders were emerging and assuming importance in the direction of new activities. The effect of the rumor was to put an end to these activities, to dissolve the new committees, and thus to preserve the old leadership structure. It would be incorrect to assert that the rumor was deliberately designed to create these effects, but neither would it be correct to assume that it was a neat coincidence. The loss of leadership status produced negative attitudes toward the new activities and a readiness to support any movement to stop their further development. It was thus easy to create an explanation that was hostile to these activities. The communist content of the rumor served to prevent those favorable to the activities from openly supporting them out of fear that they, themselves, might become suspect.

Partially responsible for the temporarily successful stopping of the activities was the widespread belief that such activities in this housing project were doomed to failure because of the "low type" of people living there. The cessation of activities consequently met with no surprise, but merely confirmed these pessimistic expectations.

In analyzing the beginnings of the rumor three roles may be distinguished, namely, the scapegoat, the active instigator, and the passive supporter.

Probably the effectiveness of any hostile rumor is partially dependent upon the presence of a suitable scapegoat. It is interesting to note that in this situation it was not the community worker against whom the hostility was mainly directed. She had quickly become accepted as a friend by many of the women, and the content of the rumor did not fit what they knew about her. Rather, the hostility was directed against Mrs. C. who for various reasons was clearly suited for the role of scapegoat. Prior

to her involvement in these activities she had kept aloof from the rest of the tenants and had not formed any close friendships. Her only friend was her next-door neighbour, the secretary of the tenants' committee. The secretary was thus able to use her knowledge about Mrs. C. to support the rumor. The secretary was able to tell others that Mrs. C. read a communist newspaper and had radical opinions. Others in the project, not knowing Mrs. C. except as a very active worker for the new nursery school, were inclined to accept these statements. Contributing to the readiness of some to use her as a scapegoat was the fact that Mrs. C. · was Jewish. This resulted in some confusion of the content of the rumor as it was transmitted. As one of the tenants remarked some time later, "The whole thing was vicious slander and a lot of it was anti-Jewish feeling." Finally, the fact that she was one of the most prominent of the new leaders focused the resentment of the old leaders against her. During the period of the rumor she was almost completely ostracized and could not even discover what had happened.

It is interesting to note that the rumor could develop to the proportions it attained with only one really active instigator. The secretary of the tenants' committee was the only one who assumed real initiative in developing the rumor. She went to Mr. M. to discuss the possibility of communist sponsorship; she personally conveyed these conclusions to a number of the other women; and she persuaded them to stop the community activities.

The rumor would not have had the impact that it did had there not been a number of women who gave it their passive support. Various reasons led people to assume this role. The situation was such that those women who would have liked the community activities stopped were able to achieve this by passively supporting the secretary. All the women who were active in the new community activities were in the position of having either to oppose the rumor openly or to go along with it. Since open opposition might direct hostility against them and since they were uncertain about the facts, they became passive supporters. The appeal of an exciting plot also led some to keep in close touch with the development and lend it their passive support. As one woman told the community worker after activities had been resumed. "There hasn't been so much excit ment around here for months. I got so fascinated by the whole thing that I wrote my family a long letter all about it."

There is no evidence that anyone either in the development of the rumor or in its transmission took a positive stand against it.

Action taken to combat the rumor consisted of:

a. Detailed information about the sponsorship and purposes of the research program was given to the project residents both in groups and individually. An attempt was made to leave no unexplained areas.

b. Deliberate efforts were made to integrate some of the old leaders into the new activities and to assure them status positions. This removed many causes of resistance with the result that some of these old leaders became staunch supporters of the new program.

c. Working both through regional management and directly with the local project manager, the latter's support was won for the new program of activities. At a meeting with some of the project women the local manager stated that the rumor had been demonstrated to be unfounded.

d. When it became clear that the active instigator of the rumor, the secretary of the tenants' committee, was still intent on continuing her opposition, efforts were directed toward minimizing the effect she could have. Very soon the activities were again progressing without her participation.

Even after the rumor was cleared up, it was impossible to resume the activities on the same basis as before. The rumor episode had served to reaffirm the tenants' pessimism about successful community activities. The prevailing attitude was that this was just one more example of what always happened. People would do a lot of planning and hard work and then, somehow, it always came to naught because of gossip, slander, and maliciousness on the part of other project residents.

The community worker decided to resume the program with a series of nursery school and school-age recreation demonstrations which the tenants were invited to observe. It was hoped that their interest would be renewed and they would gain confidence in the success of such a program, eventually assuming responsibility for it. The program was resumed approximately two weeks after the rumor came to the surface.

a. The nursery school demonstration program: During the first period of the research program, four morning demonstration sessions were held. These were led by a professional nursery school teacher provided by the research program. The mothers themselves were invited to observe the demonstration program in order that they might learn the purposes and techniques of nursery school activities.

Two other meetings with the mothers were devoted to planning and training. At these meetings the teacher discussed with the mothers the purposes of the methods she was using and interpreted the children's behavior. The mothers also started planning such details of the program as the number of children who could be handled in one session, needed equipment, fees to be charged, etc. At the last two demonstration sessions, several mothers were given responsibilities for helping the nursery school teacher.

b. The school-age demonstration program: Three demonstration programs were led by outside professional recreation leaders provided by the research program. The community worker canvassed the mothers of school-age children before the sessions and also sent out circulars inviting them to observe the activities. Then, because of the difficulties of procuring good professional leaders regularly, the community worker, with the awareness that this might be somewhat premature, decided to turn the program over to the mothers. An effort to train the mothers for this purpose proved to be unsuccessful because they were not willing to invest the time and effort needed. At the last demonstration session several mothers directed the craft work but it was clear that they were not well enough trained for the task.

In spite of these difficulties the children enjoyed the sessions throughout this period and, according to their mothers, looked forward to them.

c. The teen-age program: After the research program was resumed, the teen-agers wanted to be included in the recreation activities. The community worker provided the needed guidance and the teen-agers readily became involved in carrying on their program. The community worker hoped eventually to introduce adult involvement wherever possible, thus furthering the general goal of increased communication among the project adults.

During this period, the teen-agers held three planning meetings, two parties, and two educational tours. At the planning sessions, the teen-agers were very responsive to the suggestions of the community worker. They made specific plans and took responsibility for publicizing their activities. Their parties were successful. On their own initiative, they invited children from outside the project with the result that up to half of those attending were nonproject children.

Although no adults became involved in the teen-age affair the teen-agers promoted the overall goals of the research program in other ways. They produced a mimeographed newspaper and distributed it throughout the project. In this newspaper, they reported on their own events, several other phases of the activity program, and interviews with various project residents. Another result of the teen-agers' program was the favorable attitude which it fostered in adults toward the entire action program. Quite frequently project residents told the community worker how much their children enjoyed the activities.

d. The adult activities: In the course of personally publicizing the demonstration activities to the project residents, the community workers attempted to revive the interest in adult educational and recreational activities which had existed prior to the rumor episode. Special efforts were made to contact men in the project in order to draw them into the activities.

The community workers' suggestions about adult activities met with apathy and open resistance. By the end of this period, nothing in this direction had been accomplished. Involvement of the men in the program was considered to be especially necessary since they had been left out of all activities up to that time.

e. The advisory committee: Following the rumor incident, it was decided to involve the tenants more directly in the research program by giving them more voice in planning general policies and by giving them more information about the research. The plan called for setting up an advisory committee consisting of tenants and members of the research group. Open nominations were to be held for the posts on the committee. The tenant members of the advisory committee would include representatives from each of the activity programs along with a representative from the already existing tenants' committee. The manager of the project consented to act as consultant to the advisory committee.

f. Accomplishments of first action period: By the end of the first period of community organization the following state of affairs existed:

1. Interest in a nursery school and in school-age recreation activities had been stimulated by a series of demonstration programs.

2. Women were assuming regular roles in helping in the operation of the nursery school.

3. A club of teen-agers, started at their own request, was operating under the supervision of the community worker. This club performed community-wide services in addition to sponsoring its own activities.

4. Efforts were under way to stimulate adult activities, but no definite results had been achieved.

5. Plans had been made and publicized for the election of a project-wide advisory committee.

The Second Period of the Action Program
—April 16 to June 29

a. Nursery school activities: In the second period of the program the nursery school shifted from a demonstration program to a program controlled by the mothers. During this period there were ten nursery school sessions weekly. The attendance was generally good and the children enjoyed the school. Many mothers were showing progress in learning the techniques of nursery school guidance. Because of the large number of pre-school children, the project was divided into two geographical areas with the children from one area attending in the morning and those from the other streets attending in the afternoon. Mothers from the corresponding sections were assigned responsibilities for helping at each session and frequently other mothers came to observe. This often led to friendly social contacts among the mothers.

During this second action period the mothers held four planning sessions. As in the first period, the mothers of all pre-school children in the project were personally urged by the community worker to attend these planning sessions. At the first meeting the eight women who attended formed themselves into a committee to guide the nursery school program. They energetically set about planning events to raise funds to support the nursery school. At the second meeting of this committee they made decisions about the details of a fund raising dance, fees of the nursery school and the replacement of the present nursery school teacher.

The actual work of running the fund raising dance fell largely on the shoulders of the community workers. A personal canvas was conducted to publicize the dance but the response was anything but enthusiastic. Scattered dislike of dances combined with residual distrust of the activities resulted in only twenty-five tenants appearing at the dance. The research program provided a professional group leader for the evening and it proved to be extremely successful. Husbands who had been resistant to coming had a good time and afterwards talked enthusiastically about the dance.

A second fund raising event was held during this period, and again although only a small number of people attended those who did come had a good time. In later discussions this small attendance was often held up as an example of how people really didn't cooperate and how difficult it was to get things done in the project.

b. The school-age program: During the period between the second and third interviews, the community workers' efforts to turn the control of the program over to the mothers continued with only occasional success. As in the previous period the mothers did not appreciate the need for extensive planning of the activities nor for training themselves to run the afternoon recreation sessions. A school-age activity committee was established and a chairman elected but this committee assumed very little responsibility. The community worker typically did most of the agenda planning for their meetings and carried a large part of the leadership.

The recreation afternoons led by the mothers were sometimes successful and sometimes particularly disorganized. As a result of these difficulties, a professional teacher was reintroduced into the program and four sessions were held under her guidance. The mothers were included in the program by being assigned helping positions.

Toward the end of this period, the older children had become interested in making puppets and one of the tenants agreed to direct their activities after the professional teacher left. Additional summer plans for supervised beach trips were made by the community worker and received favorably by the mothers. The work again fell mainly upon the community workers and the one beach trip that was made during this period was a huge success with the children. The mothers were extremely pleased with it since "it was so little trouble."

c. The teen-age program: During the first part of this period the teen-age program continued essentially as before. Their activities included two swimming parties, two meetings to plan for a tour of a metropolitan newspaper, the tour itself, and a dance. They continued to publish their newspaper which was read with interest in the project. The teen-age newspaper gradually developed into a cooperative enterprise. Events which the teen-agers did not cover were written up by representatives of other activities. Although they resisted the idea of inviting adults to supervise their activities, they were willing to cooperate with adult activities and, for example, agreed to act as baby-sitters so that parents could attend community meetings.

As summer approached the enthusiasm of the group began to lag. At the end of this period it was becoming increasingly clear that the distraction of summer jobs and recreation was leading to a gradual disintegration of the teen-age group.

d. Adult recreational activities - men's softball: Early in the second period steps were taken to establish a program of interest to the men. A male community worker held initial discussions with a small number of men who expressed considerable interest in playing softball and began to make immediate plans. Two of the men canvassed a large section of the project and obtained twenty-five promises to play. Another man took responsibility for locating a baseball diamond.

A second planning session was well attended. They set themselves up as a committee, elected a chairman and a secretary and also chose captains for two teams to be formed on the basis of a geographical division within the project. A number of highly successful practice games followed. Some of the wives of the players and a large number of youngsters came to watch the games. At a planning session following the last of the practice games the men agreed to play a regularly scheduled series of games.

During the following month a series of seven games was completed. However, the high morale with which the series began was not maintained. At one game when only a few men showed up, this was taken as a sign that they would have to give up having softball games at all. Friction arose over such things as umpires' decisions, assignment to certain positions by their captain, and razzing from some of the onlookers. As a result some men dropped out of the softball activities altogether.

In spite of these disruptions the softball group continued to play and they also staged a successful party. In planning the party the men seemed sensitive to the impression the party would create on outsiders. They agreed to keep theirs well regulated so that no one on the outside would be critical of "project people."

There was only one attempt to get interaction between the softball group and other activities in the program and this proved to be unsuccessful. The action worker suggested to the men that they share the work and profits of a party with the women of the nursery school. The men were

vigorous in rejecting this idea. They stated their desire to "keep the women out of our things" and felt "they would soon be having us do all the work if we once get dragged into their things."

e. The advisory committee and other general community functions: Although the initial circulation of ballots for the nomination of members to serve on the advisory committee had begun in the first period, it took almost two months to complete the nominations and subsequent elections. A large amount of time was spent collecting a small number of nominations. These finally had to be augmented by obtaining additional nominations at a meeting of the softball group. Difficulties also arose in handling the mechanics of the election. Those who were given the responsibility of conducting the balloting did nothing to implement the election for a considerable time.

The election finally completed, a meeting of this committee was held at which the results of the interviewing in the project were reviewed and their aid was enlisted in smoothing out the progress of further interviewing. Plans were also made for coordinating the various programs of activities and one person was appointed to edit and publish a newsletter to report, on each Monday, the various events scheduled for that week.

The advisory committee also decided to sponsor an open house. The tenants described successful unplanned evenings in the past where facilities were available and people came and did whatever they wanted. The committee sponsored one such open house which was not well attended.

In general the advisory committee seemed interested in taking initiative in enterprises for the general welfare of the project. The action workers encouraged this by attempting to build up the prestige of the committee by mentioning it often and favorably during their many contacts in the project.

One general community meeting was held during the second action period at which reports on the activities were given and at which movies of various aspects of the community program were shown. The purpose of this meeting was twofold: (1) to give the tenants a clear understanding of the research project so as to increase their acceptance of the research interviewing and (2) to increase their involvement in the activities program by showing them how much they had accomplished.

f. Accomplishments of the second action period: By the end of the second period of community organization, the following state of affairs existed:

1. The nursery school was operating a regular morning and afternoon session each week under the supervision of a skilled teacher who the mothers themselves had selected. A nursery school committee of the mothers assumed almost complete responsibility for setting policy and directing the affairs of the school. The collection of regular tuition fees had been augmented by two project-wide fund raising parties, putting the nursery school on a secure financial basis.

2. In the school age recreation program mothers had still not accepted the need for self-training nor had they accepted responsibility to any great extent. The beginning of summer vacations prompted the temporary termination of this program except for puppet building and weekly beach trips.

3. After a series of successful activities, the teen-age pro-

gram stopped because of the interference of summer jobs and vacations.

4. The men's softball group had weathered the crises of small attendance and conflicts between individuals and were continuing to play a series of regularly scheduled games. They had also sponsored a successful social evening.

5. The election of a project-wide advisory committee was finally carried through. At its first meeting the committee gave promise of taking responsibility and initiative for the welfare of the project and the coordination of community activities.

The Third Period of the Activity Program
—June 30 to September 21

During this final period of the activity program, a considerable portion of the effort of the community workers was expended in preparing the people for the termination of the research program. This preparation proceeded along the following lines:

1. Informing the people of the termination of the research program and the reasons for it.

2. Developing a realistic appreciation for the extra effort which project people would have to supply as a result of the withdrawal of the community workers.

3. Transferring gradually to the project people the responsibilities for the activities in order to make the effects of the termination less abrupt.

4. Training the project people in those skills of community organization which they lacked.

a. The nursery school activities: During this last period more people were becoming involved in the nursery school program. Three or four mothers appeared at the school voluntarily to offer their help. Several children whose parents had been reluctant to send them to the school appeared at some of the sessions. By the end of this period the chairman of the nursery school committee was assuming complete responsibility for scheduling mother assistants at the nursery school sessions. The financial and publicity functions of the nursery school were handled fairly adequately by tenant women with little help from the community workers.

Meanwhile the nursery school teacher had been talking to individual mothers about the possibility of sending their children to a full time nursery school. Since there appeared to be enough interest to warrant it the community worker had several discussions with the nursery school teacher to help her work out the details of the organization. A plan was evolved to have, in addition to the one day a week session, a four day a week nursery school. The nursery school teacher met with a large group of the mothers to settle specific details of the full time school.

In two subsequent meetings this full time school was definitely sanctioned. The community worker reported that she took less part in these meetings than at any that had previously been held. Enough children were enrolled in the school to insure its financial success. There was no expression of resentment against admitting outside children to the nursery school with the result that one-third of the eventual enrollment consisted of outsiders.

b. The school age program: The plans which had been made in June for the nine to twelve year olds to produce a puppet show were left completely in the hands of the community worker. After five sessions of the puppet group, the show was ready. It was presented for adults and children on one day, and again later for the nursery school children. Both the audience and the participators enjoyed the performances. Several people attended who never before had come to the community hall.

The weekly beach trips during the summer months proved to be enjoyable for both children and mothers. Seven trips were organized which were all well attended. Mothers participated as helpers but the major tasks of organizing the trips, obtaining helpers, and leading the trips were left to the community workers. The childrens' enthusisn for the program carried over to their mothers who commented upon the wonderful time their children had at the beach.

Concluding the children's summer activities a highly successful doll carriage and bicycle parade was organized by the tenants. The idea for the parade was presented by one of the women at a meeting of the school-age mothers where some preliminary planning was done. This group invited the participation of other tenant groups and initiated contacts with people outside the project in the course of planning and publicizing the parade. The community workers' main function during the preparation for the parade was to implement the women's ideas by helping them plan concrete details and by helping to publicize the parade within the project.

The event was given some publicity by the local newspapers and the committee planning the parade had been able to obtain donations from town merchants for prizes. The parade itself was highly successful with twenty-four children participating and a large number of spectators present including many townspeople.

Toward the end of the period the community workers expended considerable effort in helping the tenants complete plans for a fall program of activities for the school-age children. Lack of interest on the part of the tenants however, made it doubtful whether or not the fall program would develop.

c. The teen-age program: The teen-agers activities were reestablished under the supervision of an interested project woman. The teen-agers immediately planned a dance which was reported to be a great success with their new sponsor providing capable and acceptable supervision. At the end of this period the teen-agers accepted responsibility for mimeographing the project bulletin, undertaking this job with characteristic vigor. The teen-agers appeared to be off to a good start for their fall program.

d. Adult activities - men's softball: During the summer months the program of softball games for the men continued as a regular and popular program which received relatively little direction from the community worker. Games were played on Tuesday and Thursday evenings. Morale and attendance at the games were generally good. Minor disruptive incidents still occasionally occurred. A fist fight over an umpire's decision led to a meeting to decide upon rules of behavior to prevent further frictions. In the games that followed no further hostilities developed and the general spirit of the games was one of enjoyment.

However, the social affairs sponsored by the men were undertaken haphazardly. Publicity was left to word-of-mouth communication. The men were resentful when few people attended their parties. For those

who did attend the evenings provided pleasant socialization with dancing and singing.

Toward the end of the program the community worker talked to various men to try to determine an activity to supplant softball at the end of the season. Evening card games appeared to be the most feasible possibility and one scheduled evening of cards was moderately successful. The men decided to continue playing cards informally on Thursday evenings.

e. Adult activities - crafts: At the instigation of a number of project women, adult evening craft sessions were initiated under the leadership of the craft teacher who was still being provided by the research program. Although attempts were made to interest men in this program, the sessions were attended exclusively by women and teen-age girls. These sessions were valuable in contributing to informal and intimate socialization among the project women. In spite of the women's interest in the crafts sessions their continuation at the end of the research program was uncertain. There was some feeling among the women that the activities were bound to fold up after the research program ended. Final arrangements to have the sessions continue under the direction of a new craft leader were made by the community worker.

f. The advisory committee: Three meetings of the advisory committee were held during the final period of the research program. The discussions at these meetings centered primarily around the needs of the tenants in relation to their housing, problems arising from the various community activities, and discussions of the research plan and findings. In line with the general emphasis during this period the community workers tried to take a progressively less active part in these meetings.

By the end of the research program the work of the advisory committee was well established. Other activity programs began to look to it for help in dealing with problems which concerned the entire project. It provided an effective channel for presenting their requests to the manager, and the manager in turn effectively cooperated with them. The committee considered itself as a group with some prestige in the community and some responsibility for the affairs of the project.

The degree of realism with which the advisory committee assumed responsibility is shown in their initiation of a series of Saturday afternoon movie programs. The movies, for which admission was charged, were obtained for a small fee. The profit was set up as a general fund to be used at the discretion of the committee to assist various parts of the activities program. These movies proved to be a successful enterprise, appealing primarily to school-age children who attended in large numbers.

The course of the committee during this period was not free from interpersonal conflicts and hostilities. A new manager who was assigned to the project at this time saw the advisory committee mainly as something he could use to simplify his administrative problems. This initially caused a rather widespread resentment on the part of the tenants toward the new manager. Increasing familiarity of the manager with the community activities and direct contacts between tenants and manager improved the situation. At the end of this period the relations between the committee and the manager were fairly friendly, although he remained a dominating influence.

The conflict between the tenants and the manager also evoked some disruptive influences within the committee. One committee member, in

particular, tended to ally himself with the manager using this as a means of increasing his power in the group. With the help of the community workers the committee successfully resisted this attempt to dominate their affairs. By the end of the research program, however, it was not clear how well the committee would be able to continue to deal with this and other such disruptive forces.

g. Leadership training: Toward the end of the research program two sessions were held at which a number of tenants were given training in the skills of community organization. The community workers invited to these sessions the members of the advisory committee, leaders of the other activity groups, and others who had been active in the program.

In the course of inviting people to the sessions the community worker obtained a census of opinion concerning the major problems of conducting a community activity program. The two most common problems, namely, how to conduct a committee meeting and how to interest people in activities, formed the focus of discussion at these sessions. The training methods consisted of role-playing demonstrations of good and poor techniques. Subsequent discussions, served to clarify in general terms the things which made for good or poor effects.

While two such brief training sessions could not be expected to bring about real skill changes, the community workers felt they had been of value in bringing out problems of interpersonal relations and having frank discussions of them.

h. Accomplishments of the third action period:

1. The nursery school sessions were held regularly and for the most part attendance was good. The mothers assumed responsibility for the program and brought to completion plans for establishing a full time self-supported nursery school.

2. The school-age program of beach trips had been popular during the summer season with the mothers participating but assuming little responsibility for planning. The puppet activities had ceased after a successful show was put on. The future of the school-age program was very uncertain. There was in existence no organized group of mothers who felt responsible for continuing the program.

3. A doll carriage parade sponsored jointly by the nursery school and school-age committees was a marked success from the point of view of attendance and interest. It was completely planned by the tenants and stimulated a great deal of contact among them.

4. The teen-age group had organized one dance, and was undertaking to mimeograph the project bulletin. One interested and capable mother was supervising their social program and it seemed like that they would continue much as in the past.

5. The men's softball games, regularly played twice a week, continued to be the greatest attraction for large numbers of people. The softball group was less successful in the two social events they sponsored. Toward the end of the softball season a number of men started coming together for evenings of card playing. Although there was no real organization of this activity it seemed likely to continue in the future.

6. A number of women who had been attending the school-age craft sessions developed an interest in an adult craft program.

Weekly meetings of this group were held and were enjoyed by the project women. However, because they had not assumed responsibility for keeping the program going, at the end of the period it seemed unlikely that it would continue.

7. The advisory committee held several meetings during this last period and they demonstrated a mature feeling of responsibility for the welfare of the project.

8. In preparation for withdrawing the support of the research program from activities, several meetings were held for training tenant leaders in human relations skills.

Social Contacts
Stimulated By The Community Activities

The program of community activities we have just described was specifically intended to provide an increased number of contacts among project residents. In this chapter we will examine the data relevant to two questions: (1) Did the program of community activities increase the number of contacts among project residents? (2) Did these contacts take place under favorable circumstances?

Possibilities for Interpersonal Contact
in the Community Activities

The community program could stimulate contacts among project residents only to the extent that they participated in the activities. Table 4 gives the actual attendance records for women and men in each of the activity periods. During Period I, 39 per cent of the women and 2 per

Table 4

Per Cent of People Involved in Program

(For Those Who Attended at Least One Meeting During the Period)

| Period | Women | | Men | | Total | |
	No. in Project during Period	Per Cent Partici- pating	No. in Project during Period	Per Cent Partici- pating	No. in Project during Period	Per Cent Partici- pating
Period I	103	39	99	2	202	21
Period II	105	54	102	36	207	45
Period III	107	50	106	43	213	46
One or more periods	114	61	110	45	224	54

cent of the men participated in one or more of the community activities. The general level of participation increases from Period I to Period II, and stays high through Period III. Altogether during the course of the community activities about half of the project residents had participated at one time or another. Participation by women (61 per cent) was somewhat greater than for men (46 per cent).

The frequency of participation of those involved in the community activities would also be likely to affect interpersonal contacts. Table 5

presents data on the constancy of participation. Among the women 54 per cent of those who were present in the project for all three periods participated during two or during all three of the periods. Thirty-five per cent of the men participated in two or more periods.

Table 6 presents the average number of meetings attended by the participants during the three periods. The average number of meetings attended during any one period varies from 3.5 to 5.8. It should be noted, however, that the standard deviations are uniformly quite large relative to the average which indicates that there is great variability in the amount of attendance. Some people attended very few meetings while others attended very many.

Table 5

Per Cent of Those Present All Three Periods Who Participated

in Various Numbers of Periods

	Women	Men	Total
	N = 91	N = 88	N = 179
Participating in only 1 period	14	18	16
Participating in only 2 periods	22	34	28
Participating in all 3 periods	32	i	17

The data presented in these three tables may be summarized as follows:

1. The community activities attracted about half of the project adults. Any increases in interpersonal contacts which occurred may consequently be looked for among this half of the community.

2. There was great variability in constancy of participation among those who were involved in the activities. We may very likely expect to find a greater effect of the program on those who participated more frequently.

Table 6

Average Number of Meetings Attended
(For Those Who Attended at Least One Meeting During the Period)

	Women			Men		
Period	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number
I	3.5	3.2	39	*	*	*
II	5.1	4.3	57	4.3**	2.7	36
III	4.2	4.2	52	5.8	6.4	45

* Only 2 men participated at one meeting during this period.
** This figure is somewhat small since community workers' reports were not obtained for a number of men's softball games.

We may now examine the interpersonal contacts potentially available to those participating in the community activities. From the attendance records it was possible to calculate the number of different people copre-

sent at one or more meetings with each participant. These data, presented in Table 7, are based only on meetings at which there were fewer than 40 people since very large meetings provide little possibility for interpersonal contact. Actually 97 per cent of all the meetings had 20 or fewer people present. Seventy-nine per cent of all the meetings involved 10 or fewer persons. It seems clear that the great bulk of the meetings were small ones at which interpersonal contacts could readily occur.

Table 7

Average Number of Different People Co-present at One or More

Meetings with Each Participant

Period	Women		Men	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
I	13.8	6.8	*	*
II	21.2	14.3	26.8	12.3
III	38.4	20.3	34.3	23.4
All Periods	44.0	22.5	41.0	25.2

* Only 2 men participated at one meeting during this period.

Table 7 shows that for both men and women the number of contact possibilities provided by the activities program increased as the program progressed. Altogether the community activities provided an average of over 40 different contact possibilities per participant.

Actual Interpersonal Contacts Reported by Participants

Were the participants in the activities actually having social contacts with other residents as a result of their participation? Simply the co-presence of people is no guarantee of the occurrence of such contacts.

The first question to answer is whether having seen their neighbors in the course of participating in the activities was a salient feature of the project residents' lives. In the interviews they were asked "On what occasions and for what purposes do you see your neighbors." Table 8 presents the per cent answering "at the community hall." The data are presented separately for those who themselves participated, for those who had other members of their families participating (indirect participants), and for those who did not participate at all.

Table 8

Per Cent of Sample Responding "at community hall" to Question:

"On what occasions and for what purposes do you see your neighbors?"

Participation Group	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Direct Participation	12	35	31
Indirect Participation	3	19	10
No Participation	00	00	00

In the last two surveys the community hall is an important "meeting place" for about one-third of the participants. None of those who do not participate ever give this response.

It was possible in the last two surveys to divide the "direct participants. None of those who do not participate ever give this response.

It was possible in the last two surveys to divide the "direct participants" into those who had attended one to three meetings and those who had attended four meetings or more. In Survey 2, 50 per cent of the latter group report seeing neighbors at the community hall. This figure in Survey 3 is 56 per cent. The comparable figures for those who had attended only one to three meetings are 27 per cent and 17 per cent. As we would expect, the extent to which the activities fostered interpersonal contacts increased as the amount of participation increased.

We may next ask whether the participants made new acquaintances as a result of the community activities. Table 9 shows the percentages of the samples who report having made new acquaintances while attending these activities. The biggest effect occurs in Period II as reflected in Survey 2. Here 56 per cent of the "direct participants" report having met new people at the community hall. The "no participation" group is uniformly lowest in this response.

Table 9

Per Cent of Sample Responding "by attending new community activities"

to Question: "Have you met any people in the past 2 or 3 months you

didn't know before? How?

Participation Group	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Direct Participation	04	56	19
Indirect Participation	09	11	10
No Participation	00	07	00

If we again separate the "direct participants" into those who attended 4 or more meetings and those who attended 1 to 3 meetings, differences emerge in the expected direction. In Survey 2 this response is given by 61 per cent of those who attended 4 or more meetings and by 41 per cent of those who attended 1 to 3 meetings. Comparable figures for Survey 3 are 22 per cent and 17 per cent. We may conclude that the community activities did provide a means of meeting people.

The Attitudinal Climate in Which Contacts Were Made

The general context in which a social contact is made may be expected to affect the nature of the contact and, consequently, any resulting attitudinal changes. Since the present contacts were made in connection with an organized program of community activities, the attitudes of the participants toward the activities is a good indication of whether the broader attitudinal context in which contacts occurred was or was not favorable. Data on this are provided by the answers to the question: "On the whole do you think these activities have been a good or bad idea?" Table 10 presents the responses to this question. Opinion about the community

Table 10

Per Cent of Total Sample Making Various Responses to Question:

"On the whole, do you think these activities have been a good or bad idea?"

Response Category	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Unqualified Favorable Comments	66	74	69
Qualified Favorable Comments	19	19	20
Exclusively Unfavorable Comments	05	04	08
"Don't Know"	10	03	04

activities tends to be favorable. Only a negligible proportion in any of the 3 surveys make exclusively unfavorable comments. Well over 60 per cent of those interviewed give unqualified favorable comments.

As might be expected, attitudes toward the community activities are especially favorable among those participating in them. This result is shown in Table 11. Since, as we have seen, it is the participants who are making contacts, it is important that among them attitudes toward these activities are favorable.

Table 11

Per Cent of Various Participation Groups Who Make Unqualified or Qualified Favorable Comments in Response to the Question: "On the whole, do you think these activities have been a good or bad idea?"

Participation Group	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Direct Participation	88	97	94
Indirect Participation	94	96	95
No Participation	65	67	75

It is interesting to note that there begins to be an awareness among the project residents themselves that the community activities help in meeting people and making contacts. One of the responses to the question on opinion about the community activities was that they were good socially. In Table 12 it can be seen that the "direct" and "indirect" participators consistently make this response more frequently than those in the "no participation" category.

Table 12

Per Cent of Various Participation Groups Who Respond "good socially, helps people meet one another" to Question: "On the the whole, do you think these activities have been a good or bad idea?"

Participation Group	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Direct Participation	25	53	44
Indirect Participation	16	42	48
No Participation	10	00	31

Summary

The community activities, during the course of 8 months, involved approximately 60 per cent of the project residents. The community hall became a place for seeing neighbors and for meeting people that one had not known before. The greater the amount of participation in the community activities the greater was the effectiveness of these channels of contact.

The community activities were viewed favorably by the residents. Among those who participated in the activities and were consequently making new contacts with people, favorable attitudes were quite prevalent. The community activities were perceived by the project residents who were participating as a good place to make social contacts. We may, then, safely conclude that the contacts which were being stimulated by the program of community activities were in large part made under favorable conditions.

Changes in Attitudes and Behavior
Within the Project

We have previously come to the conclusion that the existing hostile attitudes among the project residents were maintained because of lack of communication among them. There was consequently little possibility of changing a priori opinions and attitudes. It was expected that stimulation of new and additional contacts among the project residents under favorable conditions would result in lessening of these hostile attitudes.

Of course, not everyone in the project was having increased contacts with their neighbors as a result of the community activities program. Of those who were making new contact (those who were participating in the program) not all were making them under favorable conditions. Some of the participants were more or less unfavorable to the community activities in spite of the fact they were participating. It is, therefore, most relevant for us separately to examine changes in attitudes toward other project residents for three groups of people: (1) those who were participating, directly or indirectly, and had unqualified favorable attitudes toward the activities (favorable contact group); (2) those who were participating, (directly or indirectly, but whose attitudes were, at least in part, unfavorable (unfavorable contact group); and (3) those who were not participating at all (no contact group). Table 13 presents the number of cases in Surveys 1, 2 and 3 for each of these 3 groups.

Table 13

Number of Cases in the Samples Separated According to
Participation In and Attitude Toward Activity Program [*]

Group	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable Contact	N = 42	N = 45	N = 26
Unfavorable Contact	N = 15	N = 15	N = 11
No Contact	N = 20	N = 9	N = 16

[*] This breakdown was not possible for Survey 0 since the activity program had not yet started. For the remaining surveys respondents were eliminated who had been in the project less than three months and who, therefore, had relatively little opportunity to become involved.

Why there were any persons who, although possessing unfavorable attitudes toward the activities, were nevertheless participating in them, is explained by an examination of the pressures to participate which were exerted in the project.

In interviews the project residents were asked, "How did you find out about the community activities?" One category of response which indicates the application of pressure is, "from the community worker who contacted me." Table 14 gives the data for this response. There is evi-

dence that increasingly more pressure is being applied on the "unfavorable contact" group by the community workers. The per cent of this group who mention this response increases steadily from 7 per cent in Survey 1 to 45 per cent in Survey 3. At the same time less pressure is being applied on the "favorable contact" group. These percentages fall steadily from 33 per cent in Survey 1 to only 8 per cent in Survey 3. It would seem that pressure perceived to come from the community workers rather than genuine attraction keeps the "unfavorable contact" group involved in the activities.

Table 14

Per Cent Responding "From the community worker who contacted
me" to the Question: "How did you find out about these activities?"

Group	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable contact	33	16	8
Unfavorable contact	7	13	45
No contact	10	0	6

Changes in Attitudes Toward Other Residents

We may now proceed to examine what changes in attitudes toward other residents in the project occurred as the experimental program of community activities progressed. We will examine this with respect to three categories of responses.

1. Feelings that neighbors are "Low Class":

Table 15a shows the percentages of people who mention "low class neighbors" in Surveys 1, 2 and 3.* There is not much indication of any change in this response as the community activities progressed. It is quite clear that the "favorable contact" group and the "no contact" group do not materially change from Survey 1 to Survey 3. The "unfavorable contact" group increases somewhat in the frequency with which they attribute "low classness" to their neighbors. The change is, however not significant. We must then conclude that attitudes of strong hostility such as this one were probably not changed as a result of the community activities. The slight indication of change which does exist is toward an increase

Table 15a

Per Cent Describing Their Project Neighbors as "Low Class"

Group	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable Contact	19	27	27
Unfavorable Contact	13	33	36
No Contact	60	11	37

*It is immediately apparent, of course, that these percentages are considerably lower than the 62 per cent found on Survey 0. The figures are however not strictly comparable. Survey 0 was a longer interview including many questions not included in Surveys 1, 2, and 3.

in hostility for those people who are having contacts under unfavorable circumstances.

2. *Feelings that others in the project are "Not Cooperative":*

Table 15b gives the percentages of people making this response in Surveys 1, 2 and 3. Those who participate in the community activities (both contact groups) are definitely higher than the non-participants in feeling that others do not cooperate. This difference probably exists because the cooperativeness of others becomes a salient point of concern for those who are involved in the program. It is hardly a salient characteristic for those not involved in the program and consequently they do not spontaneously mention it.

Between the two contact groupings there is a clear difference. Starting at almost identical levels in Survey 1 those having favorable contacts gradually decrease in the frequency of mentioning non-cooperativeness while those having unfavorable contacts increase markedly. In Survey 3 the difference between these groups is significant at the 1 per cent level. These results tend to substantiate the tendency found in the mention of "low class neighbors" for the "unfavorable contact" group to become more hostile as the program progressed. For the "favorable contact" group the milder attitude of "non-cooperation" shows some tendency to decrease.

Table 15b

Per Cent Describing Their Project Neighbors as "Not Cooperative"

Group	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable Contact	45	38	31
Unfavorable Contact	47	40	82
No Contact	00	11	19

3. *Feelings of having "Nice Neighbors":*

Table 15c, containing the percentages of people making this response, shows trends similar to those we have already found. Those who have unfavorable contacts as a result of the community activities steadily decrease in their mention of "nice neighbors." Those having favorable contacts mention this category quite frequently on Survey 3. In this last survey the difference between the two contact groups is significant at the one per cent level of confidence. There is no change from survey to survey for the "no contact" group.

Table 15c

Per Cent Describing Their Project Neighbors as "Nice Neighbors"

Group	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable Contact	45	27	65
Unfavorable Contact	27	20	09
No Contact	45	56	44

We may then summarize our results concerning changes in attitudes towards neighbors as follows:

1. For those people who do not have any increased contacts as a result of the community activities, there is no change from Survey 1 to Survey 3.

2. For those who have contacts under favorable conditions in the community activities there is a slight tendency for hostile attitudes to diminish and for favorable attitudes to increase.

3. For those having contact under unfavorable conditions in the community activities there is a marked increase in hostile attitudes.

Changes in attitudes towards neighbors would also probably affect attitudes toward living in the project. We may then look to such data for corroboration of the above conclusions. In the interviews the project residents were asked "How do you like your present home?" Table 16 shows the per cent who make only responses indicating satisfaction.

Table 16

Per Cent Who Express Only Satisfaction in Response to Question:

"How do you like your present home?"

Group	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable Contact	55	67	81
Unfavorable Contact	53	40	45
None	50	56	44

Those who had favorable contacts in the community activities show a steady increase from Survey 1 to Survey 3 in the per cent who give only satisfied responses.* The "unfavorable contact" and "no contact" groups show no change. In Survey 3 the "favorable contact" group makes significantly more such responses than the other two groups (three per cent level of confidence.) It would seem then that the slight decrease of hostility toward neighbors which we found to exist in the "favorable contact" group has also tended to affect their feelings about their homes.

Changes in Pattern of Social Life Within the Project

As a result of these changes in attitudes we might expect there to be changes in behavior toward other residents of the project. Data on number of friends in the project and on whether or not they invite others from the project to their homes show no changes from survey to survey and no consistent difference among the three comparison groups. Differences exist, however, for the number of different project people invited into their homes. Table 17 presents these data.

Those having favorable contacts in the community activities show a large and steady increase from Survey 1 to Survey 3. This increase is significant at the one per cent level of confidence. For this group, then, the changes in attitudes toward neighbors in the direction of diminishing hostility was accompanied by an increase in the number of different people invited in to their homes.

*This change is significant at the eight per cent level of confidence as tested by Chi square.

Table 17

Average Number of Different Project People Invited Into Home*

Group	Survey 1		Survey 2		Survey 3	
	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number
Favorable Contact	3.6	26	5.9	29	7.0	23
Unfavorable Contact	2.0	5	5.6	10	5.8	8
No Contact	5.0	10	5.2	8	5.6	10

* These data are based only on those cases for whom it was possible to ascertain number of people invited. They do not include all people who do any inviting.

The data for the "unfavorable contact" group is equivocal. There is clearly no change from Survey 2 to Survey 3. The small average (2.0) for Survey 1 is based on a very small number of cases and the differences among the three surveys are not significant. There seems to be no change for the "unfavorable contact" group in number of different people they invite to their homes. For the "no contact" group there is clearly no change. The averages for the three surveys are uniformly close together.

In summary, the subsiding of hostility among those who had favorable contacts results in changes toward liking their home better and inviting more people into their home. The increase in hostility among those who had unfavorable contacts produces no change in these respects. For those who had no additional contacts as a result of the community activities there is, of course, no change in these other attitudes and behavior patterns.

Changes In Relations with Townspeople

In this chapter we shall examine the extent to which the changes with-in the project contributed to changes in attitudes of project residents toward townspeople and to changes in contacts with the surrounding community.

Project Residents' Perceptions of Town Attitudes

It will be recalled that, at the beginning of the study, a considerable number of project people felt that townspeople looked down on residents of the project. There was some support in the data from Survey 0 for the interpretation that such perceptions were closely linked to their own attitudes toward the project residents. It seemed plausible to assume that the belief that one's neighbors were low class tended to promote the conviction that townspeople also felt this way. To the extent that the community activities program decreased the amount of hostility within the project, we would expect it also to lessen the perception that outsiders looked down on the project.

We have found that there was a decrease in hostile attitudes among those people having favorable contacts in connection with the community activities. It is among these people, then, that we would expect to find a decrease in the perception of hostility on the part of outsiders. Table 18 compares this group with the others on the comment, "Townspeople look down on us as being low class." In Survey 1 both the "favorable contact" group and the others were about equal in the percentage making this comment. By Survey 3 only four per cent of the "favorable contact" group say this while nineteen per cent of the others do. The change for the "favorable contact" group is significant at the five per cent level.

Table 18

Percentage Responding "Townspeople look down on us as being low class"

to Question: "Do you feel that living in this project makes it easier or harder

to have friends in Baytown?"

Group	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable Contact	19	9	4
Unfavorable Contact And No Contact	17	8	19

Attitudes Toward Participation in Town Activities

In line with changes in feelings about discrimination on the part of townspeople we should expect accompanying changes in the degree to which project residents are interested in town activities. Each of the interviews with the project residents was examined from the point of view of whether there was or was not any evidence of such interest on the part of the respondent. Table 19 presents the percentages showing some interest in town activities. The "favorable contact" group, who in Survey 1 are at about the same level as the others, increase rapidly in showing interest from Survey 1 to Survey 3. The others maintain essentially the same level throughout. In Survey 3, 78 per cent of the others show evidence of interest in town activities while all of the "favorable contact" group appear in this category.

Table 19

Percentage of Contact Groups Indicating Some Interest in Town Activities

Group	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable Contact	74	96	100
Unfavorable Contact And No Contact	71	83	78

It would be consistent to expect changes in opinions about participation in town activities. Table 20a shows the percentages who felt that project residents should take part in town activities. Table 20b shows the percentages who say that project residents do take an active part. Both sets of data show a marked tendency on the part of the "favorable contact" group to increase in the percentage who feel that project residents should or do take an active part in town affairs. In Table 20b this increase for the "favorable contact" group is statistically significant. The other group stays at a constant level with regard to attitude toward participation but decreases markedly from Survey 1 to Survey 3 in whether they feel project people do participate. This change is significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence.

Table 20a

Percentage of Groups Responding "Project residents should take some part in town activities" to Question: "What part do you think the people here ought to take in these activities?"

Group	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable Contact	48	58	69
Unfavorable Contact And No Contact	40	46	48

Table 20b

Percentage Responding "Project people take part in town civic matters," to
Question: "What part do you think the people here take in the activities and
organizations in Baytown?"

Group	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable Contact	0	9	27
Unfavorable Contact And No Contact	34	8	4

We may then conclude that those who had favorable contacts in the project as a result of the community activities did see less discrimination on the part of the townspeople, did have more interest in town activities, and felt more that project residents should participate in town activities.

Social Contacts Between Project and Town

The final step in our analysis of the data from the project is to examine whether, as a derivative of the activities in the project, contacts between project residents and townspeople did increase. Let us first see what contacts between the project and the town were directly stimulated by the program of community activities as determined from the reports of the community workers. It should be recalled that the community workers had been cautioned not themselves to initiate or to stimulate any contacts between project residents and townspeople. This was adhered to except for a few isolated instances.

During the first period of community activities, namely the time between Survey 0 and Survey 1, there were relatively few town contacts initiated by the project residents. One mother from the town was invited to participate in the nursery school program and her child attended the nursery school. One outside child attended several meetings of the school-age program and one town organization held a meeting in the community hall. The only significant contact with outsiders was initiated by the teen-agers whose club consisted of as many nonproject as project members.

During the second period of community activities, that is, the period between Surveys 1 and 2, the amount of tenant-initiated contact with the town increased somewhat. Two nonproject mothers participated in the nursery school program. Several nonproject children attended the school-age activities and the membership of the teen-age club continued to be made up in large part of nonproject members. The men's softball activities also involved contacts with nonproject people. Outsiders attended the project softball games as spectators and also, from time to time, nonproject men played in the games.

During this second period, five residents of the project started a movement aimed at persuading the town to establish a public kindergarten. They contacted a school superintendent to obtain advice, instigated a newspaper article concerning the need for a kindergarten, and organized a townwide meeting at the project community hall. Thirteen nonproject residents attended this meeting to plan a campaign for a public kindergarten. This public kindergarten movement, initiated spontaneously by project women, was perhaps the most significant development with respect to outside contacts.

During the third period of community activities, that is, the period between Surveys 2 and 3, the number of contacts between project people and townspeople continued steadily to increase. The participation of outsiders in the nursery school and school-age activities continued. The softball teams organized a special project team which played a few games with outside teams. Outsiders attended several of the large project functions during this period. A puppet show and several movies were each attended by two or three nonproject residents. A large doll carriage parade was attended by about 20 adults and 50 children from the surrounding community.

The movement for obtaining a public kindergarten continued. Another townwide meeting of the kindergarten group, held at the community hall, was attended by about 20 nonproject residents. Project residents also did canvassing in the neighboring area to get petitions signed to submit to the town council. It was then decided to have future meetings of the kindergarten group in some town hall which was more conveniently located. One of the project residents continued to play a leading role in the kindergarten movement.

We may now turn to an examination of evidence obtained from the interviews concerning contacts of project residents with townspeople. From the reports of the community workers it seems that there was an increase in "organizational" contact between the project and the surrounding community. We also know that among those who were having contacts with other project residents under favorable conditions there were changes in attitudes toward and interest in town activities.

It takes more, however, than simply wanting to have contact with someone to produce such contact. It will be recalled that our explanation of the original low level of contact with the town rested mainly on the assumption that other project residents did not serve as channels for making such contact. The changes in attitude which occurred within the project during the course of this study might be expected to open these contact channels. We should then look for increased contacts with the town among those persons whose attitudes changed in a favorable direction and for whom the opportunity to make contacts could reasonably be provided.

There were in this housing project two major sources of restraint against making contact with outsiders.

1. Those residents who had young children would be seriously restricted in the amount of free time available to participate in town affairs.

2. Making contacts with new people does not tend to be a simple affair of going up to a person and getting to know him or walking into a meeting of an organization and joining. It tends more to be a process of knowing someone who knows someone and being introduced. Consequently, those people who knew very few others in the project would have serious hindrances in the way of making new contacts in the town.

For this analysis we consequently removed from the "favorable contact" group those people who had children between the ages of one and five and those people who reported having no friends in the project. Since those in the "favorable contact" group were the ones who increased in their desire to make contacts with the town and decreased in feeling that townspeople looked down on them, this group, removing the sources of restraint against contacts, is the one in which we would expect to see increase in contact with townspeople.

Table 21 gives the per cent in the two groups who belong to some organizations in the town. It can be seen that the group which we expected to increase in town membership goes from 69 per cent in Survey 1, to 84 per cent in Survey 3. The other group decreases from 61 per cent in Survey 1 to 38 per cent in Survey 3. The difference between the two groups in Survey 3 is significant at the one per cent level.

Table 21

Percentage Having Membership in Town Organizations

Group	Survey 1		Survey 2		Survey 3	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Favorable Contact -						
No Restraint	9	69	9	75	11	84
All Others	39	61	39	68	15	38

Table 22 gives the percentages of those interviewed who belong to town organizations other than churches. It was felt of value to examine these data separately because church membership is perhaps the easiest kind to acquire. We find in Table 22 that the trends are even more marked. The "favorable contact-no restraint" group increases in such membership from 24 per cent to 62 per cent while the others decrease in such membership from 41 per cent to 12 per cent. These changes are significant at the 5 per cent level for each of the groups.

Table 22

Percentage Having Membership in Town Organizations and Clubs

Exclusive of Church Membership

Group	Survey 1		Survey 2		Survey 3	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Favorable Contact -						
No Restraint	3	24	3	25	8	62
All Others	26	41	24	42	5	12

Summary

Changes within the project produced by the program of community activities led to changes in the relations of the project people with the surrounding community. This cumulative consequence of the activity program came about even though the community workers refrained from directly stimulating such contact. It is important, however, that these changes toward more favorable perception of the town and increased contacts with the town took place only for a highly selected few of the project residents. Those few who had no restraints against making contacts and had changed favorably as a result of the community program, increased their contacts with the town. The great bulk of the project residents, however, tended to show a decrease in membership in town organizations.

Indirect Effects of Project Activities
Among the Townspeople

Before the community program opened within the Regent Hill Housing Project a survey was conducted in the surrounding town. Townspeople were questioned about their knowledge of the project, their attitudes toward the residents, and their contacts with them. Thereafter, similar town surveys were conducted simultaneously with the project surveys. Data exist consequently from four surveys in the town; one before the activities program started and three others at intervals of two to three months.

The town sample was drawn from the three precincts closest to the project. In each survey a random sample of one hundred people was drawn from the precinct in which the project was located and a sample of one hundred was drawn from two adjacent precincts. No one was ever interviewed more than once.

Knowledge of the Existence of the Project

A series of questions was asked to discover whether or not the respondent knew of the existence of the Regent Hill Project. In Table 23 these data are presented separately for the immediate precinct and the adjacent precincts. A great majority of the people interviewed did know of the existence of the project. This proportion is consistently larger for the precinct surrounding the project than for those somewhat removed geographically.

Table 23

Per Cent of Town Respondents Knowing about Existence of Regent
Hill Housing Project

Area	Survey 0	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Immediate Precinct	94	92	95	94
Adjacent Precincts	77	71	86	85

Changes in Contacts with Project Residents

Table 24 shows the percentages in the two precinct groups who have "direct contact" (i. e., who know at least one project resident); "indirect contact" (i. e., who have contact with some town resident who has direct contact with someone from the project); and those who have no contact with project residents. The residents of the immediate precinct have

considerably more direct contact with project residents than those in the
adjacent precincts.

Table 24

Per Cent of Town Respondents Having Various Degrees of Contact
With Project Residents, All Surveys Combined

Area	Direct Contact	Indirect Contact	No Contact
Immediate Precinct	46	16	38
Adjacent Precincts	14	20	66

Table 25 presents the data on contacts with project residents for the
total town sample in each of the four surveys. During the course of the
activities within the project there is a steady increase in the per cent of
people who have direct contact with project residents. The change in dir-
ect contact is significant at the eight per cent level of confidence. In the
rest of this chapter we will present further analysis of data from the town
interviews to substantiate the interpretation that these changes resulted
indirectly from the community activities program in the project.

Table 25

Per Cent of Town Respondents on Each Survey Having Various
Degrees of Contact With Project Residents

Degree of Contact	Survey 0	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Direct Contact	23	31	32	34
Indirect Contact	23	16	16	17
No Contact	54	52	52	48

To examine further the nature of these contacts between town and pro-
ject people it is important to have some specification of the atmosphere in
which these contacts take place. In examining the effect on the project
people of the community activities program quite different effects were
found between those who had contacts under generally favorable conditions
and those whose contacts were made under generally unfavorable condi-
tions. We might expect the same kind of distinction to hold true for con-
tacts between townspeople and project residents. There is no single situ-
ation in which most contacts between project residents and townspeople
occurred. It is, consequently, not possible to separate contacts made in
favorable or unfavorable situations. One can, however, separate those
who have favorable predispositions from those with unfavorable predis-
positions toward contact with project residents as reflected by their at-
titude toward the whole idea of government housing projects. For this pur-
pose the town samples were separated into those who had unfavorable at-
titudes toward government housing projects (unfavorable predisposition),
and those who had favorable attitudes toward government housing projects
(favorable predisposition). The former group includes those people who
mentioned objections to government ownership of projects, inefficient
management of government projects, political favoritism in such projects,
and the like. Table 26 presents the number of persons in the various
categories.

Table 26

Number of Respondents From Town Surveys in the Favorable and

Unfavorable Predisposition Groups

Predisposition	Survey 0	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable	126	109	113	95
Unfavorable	74	91	87	104

Table 27 presents the per cent of people in these two groups who had direct contacts with residents of the project. The unfavorably predisposed group is consistently higher in all four surveys. This is consistent with the project residents' own attitude toward the project. Since the project residents tended to look at the project in a negative light it is plausible that their contacts might be made more often with townspeople who objected to projects in general.

Table 27

Per Cent of Town Respondents Having Direct Contacts With

Project Residents

Predisposition	Survey 0	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable	20	26	28	27
Unfavorable	28	37	38	40

I. Recent contacts with project residents:

In each of the last three surveys the respondents were asked whether they had met any project residents in the last month or two whom they had not known before. Table 28 presents the percentages of those having direct contacts who respond affirmatively.* The per cent of the "favorably predisposed" group who have recent contacts increases steadily from Survey 1 to Survey 3. This increase is significant at the 5 per cent level of confidence. The "unfavorably predisposed" group does not increase. We may then conclude that to the extent that these recent contacts represent the initiative of the project residents, they now tend to seek out those townspeople with favorable predispositions toward projects. This trend

Table 28

Per Cent of Town Respondents Reporting Having Met Some Project Residents for

the First Time in the Month or Two Before the Interview

(For Those Having Direct Contacts Only)

Predisposition	Survey 0	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable	--**	21	41	54
Unfavorable	--**	32	45	36

** Question not asked in Survey 0.

---

* Obviously the data are uniformly zero for the no contact and the indirect contact group.

opposes the previous tendency for those who were unfavorably predisposed to have more contact with the project. Also this result is in line with the evidence within the project that those whose attitudes had changed in a favorable direction were increasing their contacts with townspeople.

2. Kinds of contacts between town and project residents:

In the interview the townspeople were asked in what kinds of situations they had had contact with project residents. Table 29 presents the percentages who mentioned social contacts. In Surveys 0 and 1 the unfavorably predisposed townspeople had a markedly higher percentage of social contacts with the project residents. As the study progresses, however, there is a marked decrease in social contacts by the unfavorably predisposed group. The percentage falls from 62 per cent in the initial survey to 19 per cent in the last survey. In the last two surveys the favorably predisposed group is higher than the unfavorably predisposed group. It would seem that as a result of the community activities and changes in attitudes among the project residents, they tend to withdraw from social contact with those townspeople who are unfavorably predisposed toward projects in general. It is interesting to note that since there is no increase in social contacts with the favorably predisposed group there is a decrease in the total amount of social contact with townspeople. This may be a result of the increased social activity within the project itself.

Table 29

Per Cent of Town Respondents Reporting Social Contacts With
Project Residents (For Those Having Direct Contacts Only)

Predisposition	Survey 0	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable	28	18	34	27
Unfavorable	62	41	27	19

During the course of the interview some of the respondents mentioned having been in a project home or the project community hall. Table 30 presents the per cent of people (again only for the direct contact group) who mention this. These data support our previous conclusions. Again, at the beginning of the study the unfavorably predisposed group more frequently mention having been in a project home or the community hall. There is a steady decrease for this group as the study continues. Once more the favorably predisposed group shows little or no change and by the last survey they mention it more frequently than the unfavorably predisposed group. Again we have evidence for withdrawal on the part of project residents from those who are unfavorably predisposed toward projects.

Table 30

Per Cent of Town Respondents Reporting Social Contacts with Project Residents

or Project Community Hall (For Those Having Direct Contacts Only)

Predisposition	Survey 0	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable	32	29	22	35
Unfavorable	48	29	21	19

In the last three surveys the townspeople were asked whether project residents belonged to their church or any of their clubs. Table 31 shows the same tendency for a decrease in project residents' membership in churches and clubs to which the unfavorably predisposed townspeople belong. There is an increase in the frequency with which those who are favorably predisposed report project residents as members of their organizations.

Table 31

Per Cent of Town Respondents Reporting that Project Residents

Belong to Their Church or Club (For Those Having Direct Contacts Only)

Predisposition	Survey 0	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Favorable	--*	50	50	77
Unfavorable	--*	56	45	38

* Question not asked in Survey 0.

We may summarize these data as follows: At the beginning of the study (and by inference, before the study started) townspeople who had unfavorable predispositions towards projects in general had more social contacts with project residents than those who had favorable predispositions. As the community activities progressed and changes occurred among the project residents, they tended to withdraw from contacts with unfavorably predisposed townspeople. Social contacts with favorably predisposed townspeople maintain the same level throughout the study.

Changes in Attitudes Toward Project Residents

Changes in attitudes toward project residents on the part of townspeople would not necessarily be a consequence of the changes in contact which we found. Attitude changes which might take place would depend upon the amount and kind of communication occurring during contacts between project residents and townspeople.

If project residents communicated nothing about the community activities or about their relevant attitudes there would be no reason to expect attitude changes to occur among the townspeople. Let us then see if there is any evidence that project residents initiated communication about the community activities to townspeople. In the interview townspeople were asked, "Have you heard of any happenings at the project in the last month or two?" Table 32 presents the percentages who had heard about the community activities. As the community activities developed the townspeople tended more and more to hear about them. The communication about the community activities stemmed mainly from the project residents themselves since those townspeople with direct contacts heard about them sooner and more frequently. There is also a slight tendency for those of the "direct contact" group with favorable predispositions to hear about the community activities more often than those with unfavorable predispositions.

There is evidence, then, that facts about the project community activities are being communicated to townspeople by the project residents.

Table 32

Per Cent of Town Respondents Having Heard of Project Activities

in the Month or Two Before the Interview

Contact Group	Predisposition	Survey 0	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Direct	Favorable	--*	7	9	23
	Unfavorable	--*	6	3	12
Indirect	Favorable	--*	0	0	13
	Unfavorable	--*	0	0	10
No Contact	Favorable	--*	0	0	0
	Unfavorable	--*	0	0	12

* Question not asked in Survey 0.

It is highly unlikely that such facts were communicated without being accompanied by evaluative and attitudinal statements. The following indirect evidence would tend to support the assumption that much of this communication was favorable to the project activities and the project residents:

1. The project residents who increased their contacts with the town were those favorable toward the program and active in it. These people also showed favorable changes in attitudes toward their neighbors.

2. The favorably predisposed townspeople maintained their contacts with the project while the unfavorably predisposed townspeople tended to reduce their contact.

3. The project residents tended to communicate about the community activities more to favorably predisposed than to unfavorably predisposed townspeople.

Assuming that favorable evaluations of the project and its activities were being communicated to the favorably predisposed townspeople, let us examine whether any consequent changes occur in their attitudes.

During the interview with the townspeople there were many opportunities for them to express attitudes towards the residents of the Regent Hill Housing Project. Table 33 presents the percentages who voiced ne-

Table 33

Per Cent of Town Respondents Expressing Negative Attitudes

Toward Residents of Regent Hill Housing Project

Contact Group	Predisposition	Survey 0	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Direct and Indirect (combined)*	Favorable	20	24	10	8
	Unfavorable	34	31	46	60
No Contact	Favorable	9	13	14	21
	Unfavorable	27	24	31	32

* The separate trends for the direct and indirect contact groups are very similar.

gative attitudes about the project residents, such as "low class," "temporary" or "poor" people. Throughout the four surveys the unfavorably predisposed townspeople express more unfavorable attitudes toward the project residents. This, of course, might be expected from their general predisposition. Relevant to our question, however, are the changes which occur in these groups during the period of the project activities program.

Those with contacts and favorable predisposition decrease markedly in expressing the opinion that project residents are undesirable. Those having contacts and unfavorable predispositions change in the opposite direction. The frequency of comments that project residents are undesirable increases from 34 per cent and 31 per cent in the first two surveys to 60 per cent in the last survey. Those who have no contact with the project, irrespective of their favorable or unfavorable predispositions, all tend to increase slightly in the frequency of negative comments about the residents of the Regent Hill Housing Project.

One may conclude from this that there was a general tendency to increase in negative attitude toward these project residents, perhaps because of newspaper stories or other sources. Having contact with project residents strongly accentuates this increase for those with unfavorable predispositions and reverses the trend for those with favorable predispositions.

It was also, of course, possible, during the course of the interview for the townspeople to mention favorable attitudes toward the project residents. Table 34 shows the percentages in the four surveys who make such comments. These data support the conclusions from the preceding analysis. Those having contact with the project residents and who are favorably predisposed increase in favorable comments from 55 per cent in the initial survey to 85 per cent in the final survey. The opposite trend tends to be revealed for those with unfavorable predispositions who have contact with project residents. Among those who have no contacts with project residents there are no changes either for those with favorable or with unfavorable predispositions.

Table 34

Per Cent of Town Respondents Expressing Positive Attitudes

Toward Residents of Regent Hill Housing Project

Contact Group	Predisposition	Survey 0	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Direct and Indirect (combined)*	Favorable	55	54	69	85
	Unfavorable	39	55	39	29
No Contact	Favorable	21	11	18	20
	Unfavorable	18	24	28	24

* The separate trends for the direct and indirect contact groups are very similar.

We may conclude that the changes in attitudes and in social life which occurred in the housing project as the result of the program of community activities were communicated to townspeople and created attitudinal changes which were consistent with their initial predispositions.

Chapter X

Practical and Theoretical Implications

Our experiment had two interrelated, yet different purposes:
1. To lessen the intragroup and intergroup hostility in Regent Hill by means of stimulating social contacts among the residents.
2. To discover the factors which determine whether or not social contacts will be effective in producing attitude change.

The first of these purposes may be viewed as a rather practical objective while the second is more theoretical in nature. The results of the experiment have bearing on each of them and we shall attempt to evaluate each separately.

The Practical Effects of the Change Program

At the beginning of our study the pattern of behavior and attitudes found among the project residents indicated that they felt themselves to be members of a low-status group. The low degree of social interaction within the project and of participation of project residents in the activities of the surrounding community was striking. Twenty per cent of the project residents had no friends within the project and almost forty per cent never invited project neighbors into their homes. Twenty-five per cent had no acquaintances in the surrounding community as compared with 11 per cent of the townspeople of comparable length of residence in Baytown.

Accompanying this relative social isolation were certain significant social attitudes. Most outstanding was the expression of hostility toward their project neighbors by sixty-two per cent of the residents. Comments like "the people here are low class" were quite prevalent. Another notable belief was that the townspeople looked down upon the project. Forty-five per cent of the project residents voiced the feeling of being rejected by the townspeople because of their membership in the project.

On the other hand, the project residents were not objectively of lower status than the people in the surrounding community nor were they perceived by the outsiders as having low status. Only about half of the townspeople had other than neutral attitudes toward the project people and only half of these (i.e. some 20 or 25 per cent) were at all hostile. It was possible from the data to explain this behavioral and attitudinal syndrome historically and to account for its maintenance in the face of contradictory external evidence.

Data from the first survey in the project indicated that residents had entered it with a negative stereotype of government projects and the kind of people who live in them. This hostile stereotype led to deliberate restrictions in contacts with their project neighbors which in turn operated to maintain the hostile attitudes.

Project persons who had hostile attitudes toward their own group desired membership in the outside community even more than those who

liked the project. Consequently, they tried to enter the activities of the surrounding community. Achieving this social membership was complicated, however, by the fact that in their attempts to move into the attractive outside group the project people behaved in a manner typical of low-status group members: (1) They tried to dissociate themselves from membership in the project. Accordingly, they did not introduce other project residents into town activities nor did they behave in any other manner which would imply that they belonged to the project. (2) They criticized the project to the townspeople and sought out townspeople who would share their hostile attitudes.

On the basis of these interpretations, a program of community activities was carried out with the purpose of lessening the social isolation and hostility by means of increasing social contacts among project residents. Interviews with successive samples of project and town residents were conducted to determine the effects of the program on attitudes and informal social life, both within the project and between the town and project.

The total effects of the community activity program were certainly not all in the desired direction. Those persons who were having contacts in the program and who were favorable toward it tended to change in the direction of less hostility and more active social relations; those who were in the program but unfavorable toward it tended to become even more hostile in their attitudes; the program consistently failed to produce changes in those persons not participating in it. Looking at the total project population in order to evaluate the overall practical accomplishments of the program, it would appear that in many instances matters became worse rather than better. For about half of the project population matters had a tendency to become better while for the other half they remained unchanged or became considerably worse. We will review some of these changes in detail and suggest some implications for a more successful program.

I. Attitudes toward project neighbors:

While the program of community activities had the objective of lessening the hostile attitudes within the project, it tended slightly to do so only for those who, while participating in the program, had favorable attitudes toward the community activities and hence may be said to have had new contacts under favorable conditions. For the project as a whole it perhaps made matters worse. The following tabulation shows the frequency of the hostile expression for the total samples in the last three surveys.[1]

	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
"Neighbors are Low Class"	21 per cent	22 per cent	32 per cent
"Neighbors not cooperative"	34 per cent	35 per cent	38 per cent

Although the increase in hostility is relatively slight it certainly indicates that merely stimulating contacts does not achieve the practical objective of lessening hostility. The overall amount of social contact within the project was increased by the program. The average numbers of different project persons they invite into their homes are 3.7, 5.5, and 6.4

1. Survey 0 is not used here because it was a longer and different interview giving more opportunity for the expression of hostility toward neighbors. Surveys 1, 2 and 3 are identical and can be compared.

for Surveys 1, 2, and 3 respectively. What impact these contacts have on attitudes, however, depends on the nature of the contact rather than its mere occurrence.

2. Relations with the surrounding community:

The program of community activities had as an indirect objective the improvement of relations between the project and the town. Again this objective was achieved only for those persons who had particular kinds of experiences as a result of the program. For the project as a whole the results are rather indecisive. Attitudes toward the town and townspeople seemed to improve slightly as shown in the following tabulation:

	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
"Townspeople look down on us as being low class"	18 per cent	9 per cent	11 per cent
Respondent shows interest in Baytown activities.	79 per cent	94 per cent	94 per cent

There is a slight lessening of the perception that townspeople regard the project as a low-status group and a slight increase in interest in town activities.

There tends, however, to be a reduction in the amount of contact between the project and the town. The percentage of project residents who report membership in town organizations and clubs decreases from 38 per cent in Survey 1 to 25 per cent in Survey 3.

It is clear, then, that the broad effects of the change program were, for practical purposes, insignificant. In some respects the net changes were for the better and in others, for the worse. In all cases, there were increasing differences between those persons favorable and those unfavorable toward the community activities, a phenomenon which may have been symptomatic of increasing schisms within the project. If this program had continued longer it might actually have led to the formation of subgroups and open conflict.

The relation between the direction of attitude change and general favorableness toward the program indicates one of the major weaknesses in our attempt to produce attitude change. The activities were devised so as to increase contacts among project residents but no effort was made to control the nature of the contact or with whom they were made. Once a project resident succumbed to the pressures to participate in the program, he was free to chose his associates from among those already engaged in the activities. Among the participants he was able to find representatives of the entire spectrum of attitudes within the project. We shall explore the theoretical implications of this situation in the next section. We wish here to point out the fact that a program such as this cannot be expected to involve only those persons with favorable or even neutral attitudes. It will also attract hostile persons and their presence must be taken into account in planning the program and predicting its effects.

Theoretical Evaluation of Change Program

In the first chapter, we proposed the thoery that a person's attitudes will change under circumstances of social contact only if attitudes or social norms, different from his own, are communicated to him. According

to this, if the community activities could bring people of diverse attitudes together under conditions where those possessing favorable attitudes would communicate them to persons whose attitudes were unfavorable, we would have brought about the circumstances under which favorable attitude change might occur. Of course, in the absence of control over the content of the communication which takes place during such contacts, there is no certainty that the changes would occur in the direction of making attitudes more favorable. Indeed, the attitudes might become less favorable. In the foregoing evaluation of the practical success of the community activities program, we have examined the net effect of these various changes. In terms of evaluating our thesis concerning the conditions for attitude change, however, it is important that we keep separate the various subgroups within our samples. In doing so we will be able to examine the following three conditions of contact:

1. People for whom the course of events provided no new contacts and consequently, no change in the nature of attitudinal communication from that which had existed for them in the past.

2. People whose contacts with others changed so that we have reason to believe that favorable attitudes were being communicated to them.

3. People whose contacts with others changed so that we have reason to believe that unfavorable attitudes were communicated to them.

We shall proceed to assemble our evidence about these three groups of persons to see what light can be thrown on the validity of our thesis concerning the conditions for attitude change.

1. The condition of unchanged contact:

The autistic hostility hypothesis (cf. Chapter I) states that persons with hostile attitudes toward some particular group will tend to refrain from contact with that group and, as a consequence, will maintain their hostile attitudes. This notion was the basis for our explanation of the hostile attitudes and the concurrent low level of contact among the project residents at the beginning of our study.

We now also advance the related hypothesis that persons with hostile (or favorable) attitudes toward a particular group will tend to establish and maintain contact with others who share their attitudes. Consequently, these attitudes will tend to be maintained and reinforced by their social contacts. There is evidence to support this from the data on contacts between project residents and townspeople. At the beginning of our study, when residents' attitudes toward the project were largely hostile, there was also a preponderance of unfavorable predispositions towards housing projects among these townspeople in direct contact with project residents. It would seem that the project people tended more often to establish contacts with townspeople who shared their hostile attitudes toward projects. As the study progressed there was some lessening of the hostility within the project among those who maintained contacts with townspeople. There was concurrently a tendency to withdraw from contact with townspeople whose predispositions were unfavorable.

Evidence on this point can also be obtained from other sources. Prior studies have shown that uniformities in attitudes are found among people belonging to the same group, that people tend to move into groups which share their attitudes and out of groups which do not share their attitudes. Groups also tend to reject members whose attitudes and opinions deviate

from those of the group. These findings all indicate that group member-ships and social contacts tend to be made so as to maintain the existing attitudes.[2]

This hypothesis about support-seeking group membership leads us to expect that among persons whose existing contacts were not affected by our experimental program there would be no change in attitudes. Whereas the autistic hostility hypothesis would predict this only for persons having little or no contact, our additional hypothesis predicts it even for those having considerable contact provided there is no change in their contacts as a result of the activities. This expectation is borne out. There were no appreciable changes in attitudes toward the project or its residents over the period of our study either among project residents who did not participate in the community activities and hence had no additional con-tacts from them, or among townspeople who had no contacts with project residents. These "no contact" groups uniformly show about the same proportions expressing various attitudes in all of the surveys.

Let us examine further the "no contact" group within the project. Our hypothesis is that the contacts they had already established were chosen so as to support their attitudes. Consequently, even though they were having social contacts in the project, their attitudes were never exposed to different ones and, hence, did not change. To support this hypothesis we may proceed to rule out other reasons which might account for absence of change. One such factor would be the general level of contact with other project residents. If this were very low or nonexistent the lack of change might be due to the absence of any communication whatsoever on relevant topics. Table 17 in Chapter VII, however, shows that the "no contact" group has as high a level of contact with other project residents as any of the other groups.

It is still possible that the absence of attitudinal change in the "no contact" group can be explained by the absence of facts and knowledge about the community activities program and what is was accomplishing. This, however, seems quite unlikely on the basis of our data. The weekly project newspaper which reported the activities was distributed to every home, and according to our interview results, was read by over 90 per cent of the residents. Table 10 in Chapter VI shows that only a small proportion of the residents had no opinions about the community activities and in Table 11 we see that attitudes toward the activities were predominantly favorable even among those who did not participate in them. It seems most plausible to conclude that the "no contact" group did hear about the activities and did form opinions about them. These opinions, however, were probably formed so as not to conflict with their existing attitudes about the project and its residents with the result that no attitude change occurred with regard to the latter topics.

The data then tend to confirm our thesis concerning attitude change. Without contact changes which would produce different attitudinal com-munications to the "no contact" people, no real forces were exerted on them to change their existing attitudes which were already strongly sup-ported.

2. Newcomb, T. M., Personality and Social Change, New York: Dryden Press, 1943. Festinger, L., Schachter, S. and Back, K., Social Pressures in Informal Groups, New York: Harpers, 1950.
   Schachter, S., Deviation, Rejection and Communication, J. Abnor. Soc. Psychol., 1951.

2. *The condition of new contacts and communication of favorable evaluations:*

Any change in attitude must necessarily overcome the reinforcing and supporting anchorages that the person has built up for his attitude in the past. Accordingly, when the social anchorages are the major sources of support for an attitude, the most effective method of change would consist of removing the person from his supporting social memberships and giving him membership in groups with different attitudes. In the present experimental program of community activities, the attempt was made to create new social contacts but nothing at all was done to do away with already existing contacts. Changes in attitudes would consequently be found only where the new forces which were brought to bear on the person were sufficiently strong to counteract the existing supportive structure. We may examine whether, by means of the new contacts which they developed in the community activities, sufficiently strong forces to change were brought to bear on participants. Of interest in this connection are the data from Table 17 in Chapter VII which show that those who participated in the community activities tended, at the start of our investigation, to have a lower level of social contact in the project than the non-participants. This may mean that there were fewer supporting social relationships and hence, that changes in attitudes could more easily occur.

Both the project residents and the townspeople who had new contacts under conditions which indicated some favorable attitudinal predisposition showed a lessening of hostility and an increase in favorable attitudes. Let us examine the meaning of these "favorable predispositions" from the point of view of what they probably indicate about the content of the communications taking place during the contacts.

Our data are consistent with the assumption that the possession of a favorable predisposition of some nature will ultimately lead to receiving predominantly favorable evaluative communication. The assumption is that persons with "favorable predisposition" attitudes make selective social contacts to gain support for these attitudes. In so doing, they render other attitudes vulnerable to change. The following kind of processes are probably operating:

1. Project residents who were favorably disposed toward and participating in the community activities would tend to make new contacts with others who were also favorably disposed toward the activities. Table 15 in Chapter VII shows that there is little or no relationship initially (Survey 1) between favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward the activities and the expression of hostile or friendly attitudes toward neighbors. Table 16 in the same chapter shows no relationship between attitudes toward the community activities and attitudes toward their project home. Thus, it is apparent that any group formation which occurred on the basis of similarity in attitudes toward the community activities would throw together persons with different attitudes toward the project and its residents. We might then expect some change in these latter attitudes since it is quite reasonable to expect them to be expressed during contacts.

2. Project residents who were favorably disposed toward the community activities would, other things being equal, more often be the recipients of favorably evaluative communications about the activities than of unfavorable communications. It is plausible to suppose that persons with favorable attitudes toward the activities would communicate these

favorable attitudes toward others. Once having expressed such attitudes it is more likely that someone else, wanting to communicate something favorable, would choose this person as the recipient. Likewise those desiring at any moment to communicate unfavorable evaluations would probably tend to select as recipients persons who had in the past expressed their own unfavorable attitudes. We would further assume that a large portion of favorable content about the program would also involve favorable evaluations of project residents and the project in general. The two kinds of content are closely interdependent making it difficult to praise the program without also praising some of the people working in it. From this it would follow that those residents who were favorably disposed toward the activities and who were, consequently, receiving favorable evaluations of it, also received favorable evaluations of other project residents. This would exert forces toward attitude change on those persons who, although favorable to the community activities, had possessed unfavorable attitudes toward the project residents.

3. Townspeople with favorable predispositions toward housing projects who had contact with residents from the Regent Hill project would be likely to be the recipients of favorably evaluative communications. This process had undoubtedly been going on for some time. Even at the beginning of our study those with unfavorable predispositions were more hostile toward project residents than were those with favorable predispositions. (Table 34 in Chapter IX). The changing attitudes within the project undoubtedly accelerated this process because there were new things to communicate. There would probably be a tendency for project residents to communicate favorable evaluations (both of projects in general and of this specific project) to those townspeople who in the past had expressed favorable evaluations of projects in general. Among those townspeople with favorable predispositions toward projects in general there was, at the beginning of the program, a considerable percentage with hostile attitudes towards this particular project and its residents. This percentage decreases to only 8 per cent in Survey 3 as a result of the processes described.

3. *The condition of new contacts*
and communication of unfavorable evaluations:

We would expect processes to operate here which are identical in nature to the processes described and discussed above. Project residents and townspeople having unfavorable predispositions and new contacts would receive unfavorable communications in line with their predispositions. At the same time they would receive negative evaluations of Regent Hill and its residents and, consequently, they could be expected to become even more hostile toward the project and its residents. This was indeed the case. The unfavorably predisposed persons who participated in the community activities consistently increased in the expression of hostile attitudes and decreased in the expression of friendly attitudes. Townspeople who were unfavorably predisposed toward projects in general markedly increased in hostility toward the residents of the Regent Hill project.

It is also relevant to the autistic hostility hypothesis that during the course of our study, as the attitudes of these townspeople toward the project residents became more and more hostile, there was a concurrent reduction in the amount of contact they had with the residents of the project.

It is important to note that the unfavorable general predisposition on the part of townspeople had led initially to greater contact with the Regent Hill residents who largely shared these attitudes. As this unfavorably predisposed group of townspeople also developed hostile attitudes toward this particular project and its residents, they withdrew from contact with it. It is also likely, of course, that the project people, as they became more favorable toward the project, withdrew from contact with those townspeople they knew to be hostile toward it.

4. Summary:

While the data from this study do not conclusively support our theory about the conditions for attitude change to the exclusion of other possible theories, they tend to lend strong support to it. In general we believe that the following communication theory of attitude change merits consideration:

I. Contacts are effective in producing attitude changes only if they entail the transmission of social attitudes, i. e. evaluative statements by other persons about the objects of the attitude. Such evaluations do not need to be communicated verbally or explicitly. They can be evidenced in the behavior of other persons toward the objects of the attitude.

II. The effectiveness of a communicated attitude in producing change is a function of various aspects of the relationship between the communicator and recipient, e. g. their interpersonal attractions, power relationships, etc. . . . Thus, for example, if a group of persons are held together by a common interest in community activities, and carry on communication about attitudes and opinions on which they differ, the conditions for attitude change are present.

III. Contacts will not be effective in producing attitude change if they merely contain information about the objects of the attitude. Such information may change the recipient's cognitive structure of the world, but will not change his evaluations of it or emotional feelings about it.

Sample Survey Method Used
in the Regent Hill Project

1. Method of sampling:

The samples of project persons to be interviewed were drawn from the project manager's lists of tenants. A random sample of sixty women was selected for the first survey with a stratification according to type of dwelling, i. e. whether one, two, or three bedroom house. For the last three surveys, equal numbers of men and women were randomly selected with further stratifications to include a certain number of persons who had been interviewed previously and a certain number of pairs of husbands and wives.

Replacements in the samples were made by random selection from the individuals remaining in the appropriate strata of the population. Three reasons existed for replacement: (1) refusal to be interviewed, (2) inability to contact the person originally selected, and (3) the respondent had moved away. In Survey 0 only three replacements were necessary. In Survey 1 thirteen members of the sample were replaced. In Survey 2 sixteen replacements were necessary but two were not replaced leaving the sample short two cases. In Survey 3 sixteen replacements were necessary but, because of the restriction that no person should be reinterviewed in a family in which three interviews had already been taken, it was only possible to make two replacements.

Table A1

Characteristics of the Four Project Samples

	Survey 0	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Women				
Previously Interviewed	0	23	21	21
Not previously interviewed	60	17	18	13
Men				
Previously interviewed	0	0	1	19
Not previously interviewed	0	40	38	13
Total	60	80	78	66
Number of families in which both husband and wife were interviewed	0	19	18	18

Table A1 summarized the characteristics of the four project samples. It should be noted that, except for the 23 women reinterviewed in Survey 1, no person was ever interviewed who had been a respondent on the immediately proceding survey.

2. *The Interview Method*:

The general method of interviewing consisted of a standardized open-ended schedule in which the interviewers used nondirective probes to encourage the respondent to elaborate his answers and to give reasons for his opinions. All of the interviewers were women, most of whom had some college training in psychology or the social sciences and many of whom had previous interviewing experience.

The period for training interviewers lasted three days. Additional time was given those interviewers who seemed to require it. The training included discussion of general problems of interviewing, techniques for establishing rapport, how to take verbatim notes during the interview, ways of encouraging the respondent to talk and enlarge upon his answers, and techniques for terminating the interview and writing up the content. A great deal of emphasis was placed upon the purposes of this particular interview. The trainees took part in a role playing session in which they acted out some interviews. Under supervision they also conducted some practice interviews in a nearby residential district. The interviewers were informed of the general sampling procedure and it was emphasized that they should make every effort to interview the persons assigned to them, even if this required making a number of return calls. It was also emphasized that they should write up the interview the same day it was taken.

Two interview forms were used in the course of the four surveys. The first form, used only in Survey 0, was much longer than the subsequent interview form, including many questions about the details of living in the project. The second form, used in Surveys 1, 2 and 3, is identical in part with the form used in Survey 0 except for a number of additional questions dealing with contacts between project residents and the town. Our analysis was limited to those questions used in all four or in the last three surveys. They are presented below:

(NOTE: Those questions marked with an asterisk (*) were not included in Survey 0).

    1a. How do you like your present home? Why?

    1b. How do these living quarters compare with other places in which you have lived?

    2.   How long do you expect to live here?

    3.   If you were going to move away now, how hard would it be for you to pull up roots?

    4a. What problems are there in bringing up a child while living here?

    4b. What advantages are there?

    4c. What could be done to make bringing up a child here easier?

* 5a. How many friends would you say you have living here in the project? How did you get to know them?

    5b. How easy or how hard is it to make friends with people living in the project?

    5c. On what occasions and for what purposes do you see your neighbors?

5d. Do you invite others from the project to your home? About how often? About how many have you invited to your home?

* 6a. How many friends would you say you have living in Baytown? How did you get to know them?

* 6b. Do you feel that living in this project makes it easier or harder to have friends in Baytown?

* 6c. Do you invite others from Baytown to your home? About how often? About how many?

6d. Is your home satisfactory for entertaining?

* 7a. What part do you think the people here take in the activities and organizations in the town of Baytown?

* 7b. What part do you think the people here ought to take in these activities?

7c. Have you joined any organizations, clubs, or church in Baytown? Which?

* 8a. What kinds of activities are there here at the project?

* 8b. How did you find out about these activities? (In the first place).

* 8c. Have you or your children taken part in any of the activities? Which ones?

* 8d. On the whole, do you think these activities have been a good or a bad idea? Why?

* 8e. Do you think the children have been getting anything out of them? If so, what?

9a. What activities would you like to see in the project?

9b. What things about the project make it easy or hard to have community activities?

* 9c. Do you think people from the town of Baytown would like to come to activities at the community hall?

*10a. Have you met any people in Baytown in the past 2 or 3 months that you didn't know before? How did you meet them?

*10b. Have you met any people in the project in the past 2 or 3 months that you didn't know before? How did you happen to meet them?

*11a. Do you ever talk about the project to people who don't live here? Who?

*11b. What sorts of things do you tell them about it?

12a. Do you like the appearance of the outside of your house?

12b. What improvements would you like to have in these houses? Anything at all?

13a. Does the spacing of houses seem all right to you?

13b. How do you and your husband (wife) feel about the amount of privacy you have here?

14. Would you move somewhere else if you have the opportunity?

15a. What was the last school you attended? (Is that a high school?)

15b. What is your husband's (your) occupation? ·

*15c. Do you get a newspaper regularly? Which one? Do you read either of the Baytown newspapers?

(Alternative questions for people in the project who have not been interviewed before - to be asked at the end of the interview.)
a. How long have you lived here?
b. Why did you come to live here?
c. Before you moved here, what did you think living in these houses would be like?
d. How does your experience actually living here compare with your expectations about good and bad things?
e. How many different houses or apartments have you lived in since being married?
f. What was the last place you lived in before coming here? (Part of country, size of town, type of living quarters)
g. Do you have any children? How old?

The following data were obtained from the Federal Public Housing Authority records: name, address, veteran status, length of residence, age, education, and occupation.

4. *Coding of the interviews:*

The content of the code was, for the most part, developed empirically, that is, categories emerged only for items which appeared fairly frequently in the interviews. However, in the case of items which were of particular interest to us as, for example, remarks about the project community activities, separate categories were included even though they occurred infrequently. Needless to say, the same code was used in the analysis of all four surveys.

. This general method of data analysis necessitates rather careful training and supervision of the content analysis. The training consisted of discussing the general purposes and procedures of the coding, the meaning of specific categories and the kinds of responses they would include. To insure a continuing high level of agreement between coders, periodic group discussions of specific problems in the code and constant supervision and check coding were instituted.

Appendix B

Sample Survey Method Used in Baytown

1. Method of sampling:

For each of the four town surveys random samples stratified by precinct, age, and sex were drawn. Stratification was done on the basis of a tabulation from the town directory which listed all adult residents, their addresses, occupations, and ages. For each survey the sample included one hundred townspeople drawn from Precinct 1 (the precinct in which the project lay), and one hundred drawn from Precincts 2 and 8 (the precincts immediately adjoining Precinct 1). The sampling was done by means of random numbers. Table B1 gives the characteristics of the four samples.

Table B1

Characteristics of the Four Town Samples

	Survey 0	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Precinct 1				
Male	48	48	49	47
Female	52	52	51	51
Precinct 2 and 8				
Male	49	49	49	50
Female	51	51	51	51
Total	200	200	200	199

Table B2

Replacements in Town Samples

	Survey 0	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3
Reason for Replacement				
Respondent moved	47	54	59	33
Unable to contact respondent	18	10	16	21
Respondent refused to be interviewed	13	8	24	20
Number of Interviews Affected	59	50	64	60

Unfortunately, because the town directory was one year out of date, it contained some names of people who had already moved away. Consequently many of the initially selected persons had to be replaced in each of the samples. Table B2 gives the distribution of replacements according to three major reasons, namely, respondent had moved away, interviewer was unable to contact the respondent after several calls back, or respondent refused to be interviewed. The last row in Table B2 indicates the number of interviews among the originally drawn two hundred which were affected by replacements.

2. *The Interview Procedure:*

The general interviewing method and the training of interviewers were identical with those for the project surveys and are already described in Appendix A. As in the case of the project surveys, a number of questions were added in Surveys 1, 2 and 3 which were not included in Survey 0. The questions used in the two schedules are given below.

3. *Questions asked in town surveys:*

(NOTE: Those questions marked with an asterisk (*) were not included in Survey 0).

1. How long have you lived in this house?
2. How long have you lived in Baytown?
3. Where did you live before you came to Baytown?
4. How do you like your present home?
* 4a. Do you own it?
5. How many are there in your family; how old are the children?
6. What do you think of this neighborhood and the other people living around here?
7. Have you heard of any housing projects in the town of Baytown? Where?
8. (If answer to 7 is "no") There is a housing project in North Baytown near Regent Hill. Have you heard about it? (If "no," ask only 23, 24, 30 and 32).
9. Do you know who owns that project?
10. Do you know how large that project is?
11. Do you know what the houses are like?
12. Do you know what kind of people live there?
13. Do you know any of the people living there? Who?
14. Have you had any other contacts with people living there? Explain.
15. In what kinds of situations have you had these contacts?
16. What sorts of things have you heard about that project and the people living in it?
*16a. From whom or where have you heard these things?
17. What have you heard about the children from there?
18. From whom or where have you heard these things?
19. Have you ever told others about the project or the people living there? Who?
20. What sorts of things have you told others about it?
21. What do you think of that project?
22. What do you think of the people who live there?

23. What do you think of the general idea of having housing projects?
24. What kinds of people would live in housing projects?
*25. What part do the people from the Regent Hill project take in the activities and organizations here in Baytown?
*26. What part do you think they ought to take in these activities?
*27. Have you met any of the people from the project in the last month or two? Where? How?
*28. Have you heard of any happenings at the project in the last month or two? Which? What?
*29. From whom or where have you heard of these things?
30. To what clubs, organizations, or church do you belong? (*Specific church)
*31. Do any of the people from the project go to your church or belong to your clubs?
32. What was the last school you attended?

Face sheet data: Name, age, sex, address, precinct, occupation, and occupation of head of family.

4. Coding procedure:

* The development of the code and the training and supervision of coders for categorizing the town interviews were identical to those procedures used for the project interviews and have already been described in Appendix A.

RESEARCH CENTER FOR GROUP DYNAMICS SERIES

PUBLICATION NO. 1

PUBLICATIONS OF THE

institute
for
social
research