

## CHAPTER VI

# THE MEASUREMENT OF IMPLICIT ANTIDEMOCRATIC TRENDS

*R. Nevitt Sanford, T. W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, and  
Daniel J. Levinson*

---

### A. INTRODUCTION

At a certain stage of the study, after considerable work with the A-S and E scales had been done, there gradually evolved a plan for constructing a scale that would measure prejudice without appearing to have this aim and without mentioning the name of any minority group. It appeared that such an instrument, if it correlated highly enough with the A-S and E scales, might prove to be a very useful substitute for them. It might be used to survey opinion in groups where "racial questions" were too "ticklish" a matter to permit the introduction of an A-S or E scale, e.g., a group which included many members of one or another ethnic minority. It might be used for measuring prejudice among minority group members themselves. Most important, by circumventing some of the defenses which people employ when asked to express themselves with respect to "race issues," it might provide a more valid measure of prejudice.

The PEC scale might have commended itself as an index of prejudice, but its correlations with the A-S and E scales did not approach being high enough. Moreover, the items of this scale were too explicitly ideological, that is, they might be too readily associated with prejudice in some logical or automatic way. What was needed was a collection of items each of which was correlated with A-S and E but which did not come from an area ordinarily covered in discussions of political, economic, and social matters. The natural place to turn was to the clinical material already collected, where, particularly in the subjects' discussions of such topics as the self, family, sex, interpersonal relations, moral and personal values, there had appeared numerous trends which, it appeared, might be connected with prejudice.

At this point the second—and major—purpose of the new scale began to

take shape. Might not such a scale yield a valid estimate of antidemocratic tendencies at the personality level? It was clear, at the time the new scale was being planned, that anti-Semitism and ethnocentrism were not merely matters of surface opinion, but general tendencies with sources, in part at least, deep within the structure of the person. Would it not be possible to construct a scale that would approach more directly these deeper, often unconscious forces? If so, and if the scale could be validated by means of later clinical studies, would we not have a better estimate of antidemocratic *potential* than could be obtained from the scales that were more openly ideological? The prospect was intriguing. And experience with clinical techniques and with the other scales gave considerable promise of success. In attempting to account for the generality of A-S and of E, to explain what it was that made the diverse items of these scales go together, we had been led to the formulation of enduring psychological dispositions in the person—stereotypy, conventionalism, concern with power, and so forth. Study of the ideological discussions of individuals, e.g., Mack and Larry, had had the same outcome: there appeared to be dispositions in each individual that were reflected in his discussion of each ideological area as well as in his discussion of matters not ordinarily regarded as ideological. And when clinical-genetic material was examined, it appeared that these dispositions could frequently be referred to deep-lying personality needs. The task then was to formulate scale items which, though they were statements of opinions and attitudes and had the same form as those appearing in ordinary opinion-attitude questionnaires, would actually serve as “giveaways” of underlying antidemocratic trends in the personality. This would make it possible to carry over into group studies the insights and hypotheses derived from clinical investigation; it would test whether we could study on a mass scale features ordinarily regarded as individualistic and qualitative.

This second purpose—the quantification of antidemocratic trends at the level of personality—did not supersede the first, that of measuring anti-Semitism and ethnocentrism without mentioning minority groups or current politico-economic issues. Rather, it seemed that the two might be realized together. The notion was that A-S and E would correlate with the new scale because the A-S and E responses were strongly influenced by the underlying trends which the new scale sought to get at by a different approach. Indeed, if such a correlation could be obtained it could be taken as evidence that anti-Semitism and ethnocentrism were not isolated or specific or entirely superficial attitudes but expressions of persistent tendencies in the person. This would depend, however, upon how successful was the attempt to exclude from the new scale items which might have been so frequently or so automatically associated with anti-Semitism or ethnocentrism that they might be regarded as aspects of the same political “line.” In any case, however, it seemed that the discovery of opinions and attitudes, in various areas

other than the usual politico-socioeconomic one, that were associated with anti-Semitism and ethnocentrism, would give a more comprehensive grasp of the prejudiced outlook on the world. The new instrument was termed the F scale, to signify its concern with implicit prefascist tendencies.

On theoretical grounds it was expected that the correlations of F with A-S and E would not approach unity. It was hoped that the F scale would catch some of the antidemocratic potential that might not be expressed when subjects responded to items which dealt directly with hostility toward minority groups. True, the items of the present A-S and E scales were, for the most part, so formulated as to allow the subject to express prejudice while maintaining the feeling that he was being democratic. Yet it was recognized that a subject might score relatively low on A-S or E and still, in the interview, where a confidential relationship was established and the interviewer was very permissive, reveal that he was prejudiced. More than this, it had to be admitted that a subject might refuse altogether to express hostility against minority groups and yet reveal features, e.g., a tendency to think of such groups in a stereotyped way or a tendency moralistically to reject social groups other than ethnic ones, which had to be taken as susceptibility to antidemocratic propaganda. If the F scale were to be regarded as a measure of antidemocratic potential—something which might or might not be expressed in open hostility against outgroups—then it could not be perfectly correlated with A-S or E. Rather, the demand to be made of it was that it single out individuals who in intensive clinical study revealed themselves to be receptive to antidemocratic propaganda. Although it was not possible within the scope of the study to use the F scale alone as the basis for selecting interviewees, it was possible to relate F scale score to various other indices of antidemocratic personality trends as brought to light by other techniques. Such trends, it seemed, could exist in the absence of high A-S or E scores.

However, the distinction between potential and manifest should not be overdrawn. Given emotionally determined antidemocratic trends in the person, we should expect that *in general* they would be evoked by the A-S and E items, which were designed for just this purpose, as well as by the F scale and other indirect methods. The person who was high on F but not on A-S or E would be the exception, whose inhibitions upon the expression of prejudice against minorities would require special explanation.

## B. CONSTRUCTION OF THE FASCISM (F) SCALE

### 1. THE UNDERLYING THEORY

The 38 items of the original F scale are shown in Table 1(VII), numbered in the order of their appearance on Form 78. If the reader considers that most of what has gone before in this volume was either known or

thought about before construction of the F scale began, it will be apparent that in devising the scale we did not proceed in a strictly empirical fashion. We did not consider starting with hundreds of items chosen more or less at random and then seeing by trial and error which ones might be associated with A-S and E. For every item there was a hypothesis, sometimes several hypotheses, stating what might be the nature of its connection with prejudice.

The major source of these hypotheses was the research already performed in the present study. Available for the purpose was the following material: results, such as those given in preceding chapters, from the A-S, E, and PEC scales; numerous correlates of E derived from questionnaire studies, that is, from responses to factual and short essay questions pertaining to such topics as religion, war, ideal society, and so forth; early results from projective questions; finally, and by far the most important, material from the interviews and the Thematic Apperception Tests. Another important source of items was research in fields allied to the present one in which the authors had previously had a part. Principal among these were several studies performed at the University of California on personality in relation to war morale and ideology (19, 20, 102, 107, 108, 109), and researches of the Institute of Social Research such as content analyses of speeches of anti-Semitic agitators and a study on anti-Semitic workers (2, 3, 56, 57, 57A, 57B). Finally, there was the general literature on anti-Semitism and fascism, embracing both empirical and theoretical studies.

It will have been recognized that the interpretation of the material of the present study was guided by a theoretical orientation that was present at the start. The same orientation played the most crucial role in the preparation of the F scale. Once a hypothesis had been formulated concerning the way in which some deep-lying trend in the personality might express itself in some opinion or attitude that was dynamically, though not logically, related to prejudice against outgroups, a preliminary sketch for an item was usually not far to seek: a phrase from the daily newspaper, an utterance by an interviewee, a fragment of ordinary conversation was usually ready at hand. (As will be seen, however, the actual formulation of an item was a technical proceeding to which considerable care had to be devoted.)

As to what kinds of central personality trends we might expect to be the most significant, the major guide, as has been said, was the research which had gone before; they were the trends which, as hypothetical constructs, seemed best to explain the consistency of response on the foregoing scales, and which emerged from the analysis of clinical material as the likely sources of the coherence found in individual cases. Most of these trends have been mentioned before, usually when it was necessary to do so in order to give meaning to obtained results. For example, when it was discovered that the anti-Semitic individual objects to Jews on the ground that they violate conventional moral values, one interpretation was that this individual had a

TABLE 1 (VII)  
THE F SCALE: FORM 78

2. Although many people may scoff, it may yet be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.
3. America is getting so far from the true American way of life that force may be necessary to restore it.
6. It is only natural and right that women be restricted in certain ways in which men have more freedom.
9. Too many people today are living in an unnatural, soft way; we should return to the fundamentals, to a more red-blooded, active way of life.
10. It is more than a remarkable coincidence that Japan had an earthquake on Pearl Harbor Day, December 7, 1944.
12. The modern church, with its many rules and hypocrisies, does not appeal to the deeply religious person; it appeals mainly to the childish, the insecure, and the uncritical.
14. After we finish off the Germans and Japs, we ought to concentrate on other enemies of the human race such as rats, snakes, and germs.
17. Familiarity breeds contempt.
19. One should avoid doing things in public which appear wrong to others, even though one knows that these things are really all right.
20. One of the main values of progressive education is that it gives the child great freedom in expressing those natural impulses and desires so often frowned upon by conventional middle-class society.
23. He is, indeed, contemptible who does not feel an undying love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.
24. Today everything is unstable; we should be prepared for a period of constant change, conflict, and upheaval.
28. Novels or stories that tell about what people think and feel are more interesting than those which contain mainly action, romance, and adventure.
30. Reports of atrocities in Europe have been greatly exaggerated for propaganda purposes.
31. Homosexuality is a particularly rotten form of delinquency and ought to be severely punished.
32. It is essential for learning or effective work that our teachers or bosses outline in detail what is to be done and exactly how to go about it.
35. There are some activities so flagrantly un-American that, when responsible officials won't take the proper steps, the wide-awake citizen should take the law into his own hands.
38. There is too much emphasis in college on intellectual and theoretical topics, not enough emphasis on practical matters and on the homely virtues of living.
39. Every person should have a deep faith in some supernatural force higher than himself to which he gives total allegiance and whose decisions he does not question.
42. No matter how they act on the surface, men are interested in women for only one reason.
43. Sciences like chemistry, physics, and medicine have carried men very far, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
46. The sexual orgies of the old Greeks and Romans are nursery school stuff compared to some of the goings-on in this country today, even in circles where people might least expect it.

47. No insult to our honor should ever go unpunished.
50. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
53. There are some things too intimate or personal to talk about even with one's closest friends.
55. Although leisure is a fine thing, it is good hard work that makes life interesting and worthwhile.
56. After the war, we may expect a crime wave; the control of gangsters and ruffians will become a major social problem.
58. *What* a man does is not so important so long as he does it well.
59. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.
60. Which of the following are the most important for a person to have or to be? *Mark X the three most important.*
- artistic and sensuous
  - popular, good personality
  - drive, determination, will power
  - broad, humanitarian social outlook
  - neatness and good manners
  - sensitivity and understanding
  - efficiency, practicality, thrift
  - intellectual and serious
  - emotional expressiveness, warmth, intimacy
  - kindness and charity
65. It is entirely possible that this series of wars and conflicts will be ended once and for all by a world-destroying earthquake, flood, or other catastrophe.
66. Books and movies ought not to deal so much with the sordid and seamy side of life; they ought to concentrate on themes that are entertaining or uplifting.
67. When you come right down to it, it's human nature never to do anything without an eye to one's own profit.
70. To a greater extent than most people realize, our lives are governed by plots hatched in secret by politicians.
73. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around so much and mix together so freely, a person has to be especially careful to protect himself against infection and disease.
74. What this country needs is fewer laws and agencies, and more courageous, tireless, devoted leaders whom the people can put their faith in.
75. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped.
77. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.

particularly strong and rigid adherence to conventional values, and that this general disposition in his personality provided some of the motivational basis for anti-Semitism, and at the same time expressed itself in other ways, e.g., in a general tendency to look down on and to punish those who were believed to be violating conventional values. This interpretation was supported by results from the E and PEC scales, where it was shown that items expressive of conventionalism were associated with more manifest forms of prejudice. Accordingly, therefore, *adherence to conventional values*

came to be thought of as a *variable* in the person—something which could be approached by means of scale items of the F type and shown to be related functionally to various manifestations of prejudice. Similarly, a consideration of E-scale results strongly suggested that underlying several of the prejudiced responses was a general disposition to glorify, to be subservient to and remain uncritical toward authoritative figures of the ingroup and to take an attitude of punishing outgroup figures in the name of some moral authority. Hence, *authoritarianism* assumed the proportions of a variable worthy to be investigated in its own right.

In the same way, a number of such variables were derived and defined, and they, taken together, made up the basic content of the F scale. Each was regarded as a more or less central trend in the person which, in accordance with some dynamic process, expressed itself on the surface in ethnocentrism as well as in diverse psychologically related opinions and attitudes. These variables are listed below, together with a brief definition of each.

- a. *Conventionalism*. Rigid adherence to conventional, middle-class values.
- b. *Authoritarian submission*. Submissive, uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the ingroup.
- c. *Authoritarian aggression*. Tendency to be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject, and punish people who violate conventional values.
- d. *Anti-intracception*. Opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tender-minded.
- e. *Superstition and stereotypy*. The belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate; the disposition to think in rigid categories.
- f. *Power and "toughness"*. Preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension; identification with power figures; overemphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego; exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness.
- g. *Destructiveness and cynicism*. Generalized hostility, vilification of the human.
- h. *Projectivity*. The disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outwards of unconscious emotional impulses.
- i. *Sex*. Exaggerated concern with sexual "goings-on."

These variables were thought of as going together to form a single syndrome, a more or less enduring structure in the person that renders him receptive to antidemocratic propaganda. One might say, therefore, that the F scale attempts to measure the potentially antidemocratic personality. This does not imply that *all* the features of this personality pattern are touched upon in the scale, but only that the scale embraces a fair sample of the ways in which this pattern characteristically expresses itself. Indeed, as the study went on, numerous additional features of the pattern, as well as variations within the over-all pattern, suggested themselves—and it was regretted that a second F scale could not have been constructed in order to carry these explorations further. It is to be emphasized that one can speak of personality

here only to the extent that the coherence of the scale items can be better explained on the ground of an inner structure than on the ground of external association.

The variables of the scale may be discussed in more detail, with emphasis on their organization and the nature of their relations to ethnocentrism. As each variable is introduced, the scale items deemed to be expressive of it are presented. It will be noted, as the variables are taken up in turn, that the same item sometimes appears under more than one heading. This follows from our approach to scale construction. In order efficiently to cover a wide area it was necessary to formulate items that were maximally rich, that is, pertinent to as much as possible of the underlying theory—hence a single item was sometimes used to represent two, and sometimes more, different ideas. It will be noted also that different variables are represented by different numbers of items. This is for the reason that the scale was designed with first attention to the whole pattern into which the variables fitted, some with more important roles than others.

a. *Conventionalism*

12. The modern church, with its many rules and hypocrisies, does not appeal to the deeply religious person; it appeals mainly to the childish, the insecure, and the uncritical.
19. One should avoid doing things in public which appear wrong to others, even though one knows that these things are really all right.
38. There is too much emphasis in colleges on intellectual and theoretical topics, not enough emphasis on practical matters and on the homely virtues of living.
55. Although leisure is a fine thing, it is good hard work that makes life interesting and worthwhile.
58. *What* a man does is not so important so long as he does it well.
60. Which of the following are the most important for a person to have or to be? *Mark X the three most important.*  
 artistic and sensuous  
 popular, good personality  
 drive, determination, will power  
 broad, humanitarian social outlook  
 neatness and good manners  
 sensitivity and understanding  
 efficiency, practicality, thrift  
 intellectual and serious  
 emotional expressiveness, warmth, intimacy  
 kindness and charity

It is a well-known hypothesis that susceptibility to fascism is most characteristically a middle-class phenomenon, that it is "in the culture" and, hence, that those who conform the most to this culture will be the most prejudiced.

Items referring to the holding of conventional values were included in order to gather data bearing on this hypothesis. Many of the early findings of the present study, however, gave evidence that the matter was not quite so simple. The correlation between conventional values and prejudice seemed to be positive but not very high; whereas unconventional people tended to be free of prejudice, it was clear that some conventional people were prejudiced while others were not. It seemed that, among the conventional group, what might make the difference was the deeper source of the conventionality, or rather the type of broader personality structure within which it had a functional role. If the adherence to conventional values was an expression of a fully established individual conscience, then we should expect no necessary connection between these values and antidemocratic potential. The same standards which render the individual easily offended by what he conceives to be the morally loose behavior of unassimilated minority group members or of "lower-class" people, would—if they are well internalized—cause him to resist the violence and delinquency which characterize the advanced stages of fascism. If, on the other hand, adherence to conventional values is determined by contemporary external social pressure, if it is based upon the individual's adherence to the standards of the collective powers with which he, for the time being, is identified, then we should expect a close association with antidemocratic receptivity. It is this latter state of affairs that we wish to call conventionalism—and to distinguish from mere acceptance of conventional values. The conventionalistic individual could in good conscience follow the dictates of the external agency wherever they might lead him and, moreover, he would be capable of totally exchanging one set of standards for another quite different one—as in a conversion from official Communism to Catholicism.

The scale items listed under *Conventionalism* afford the subject an opportunity to reveal whether or not his adherence to conventional values is of the rigid, absolutist character just described. For example, this would seem to be indicated by a mark of +3 on the item, "Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn." However, a sound decision on this matter would depend on the individual's responses to items in the other categories. For example, extreme conventionalism going with a strong inclination to punish those who violate conventional values is a different thing from conventional values associated with a philosophy of live and let live. In other words, the meaning of a high score on this variable, as on any of the others, is to be known from the broader context within which it occurs.

b. *Authoritarian Submission*

20. One of the main values of progressive education is that it gives the child great freedom in expressing those natural impulses and desires so often frowned upon by conventional middle-class society.

23. He is indeed contemptible who does not feel an undying love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.
32. It is essential for learning or effective work that our teachers or bosses outline in detail what is to be done and exactly how to go about it.
39. Every person should have a deep faith in some supernatural force higher than himself to which he gives total allegiance and whose decisions he does not question.
43. Sciences like chemistry, physics, and medicine have carried men very far, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
50. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
74. What this country needs is fewer laws and agencies, and more courageous, tireless, devoted leaders whom the people can put their faith in.
77. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.

Submission to authority, desire for a strong leader, subservience of the individual to the state, and so forth, have so frequently and, as it seems to us, correctly, been set forth as important aspects of the Nazi creed that a search for correlates of prejudice had naturally to take these attitudes into account.<sup>1</sup> These attitudes have indeed been so regularly mentioned in association with anti-Semitism that it was particularly difficult to formulate items that would express the underlying trend and still be sufficiently free of logical or direct relations to prejudice—and we cannot claim to have been entirely successful. Direct references to dictatorship and political figures were avoided for the most part, and the main emphasis was on obedience, respect, rebellion, and relations to authority in general. Authoritarian submission was conceived of as a very general attitude that would be evoked in relation to a variety of authority figures—parents, older people, leaders, supernatural power, and so forth.

The attempt was made to formulate the items in such a way that agreement with them would indicate not merely a realistic, balanced respect for valid authority but an exaggerated, all-out, emotional need to submit. This would be indicated, it seemed, by agreement that obedience and respect for authority were the *most important* virtues that children should learn, that a person should *obey without question* the decisions of a supernatural power, and so forth. It was considered that here, as in the case of conventionalism, the subservience to external agencies was probably due to some failure in

<sup>1</sup> E. Fromm (42), E. H. Erikson (25), A. Maslow (79), M. B. Chisholm (18), and W. Reich (96) are among the writers whose thinking about authoritarianism has influenced our own.

the development of an inner authority, i.e., conscience. Another hypothesis was that authoritarian submission was commonly a way of handling ambivalent feelings toward authority figures: underlying hostile and rebellious impulses, held in check by fear, lead the subject to overdo in the direction of respect, obedience, gratitude, and the like.

It seems clear that authoritarian submission by itself contributes largely to the antidemocratic potential by rendering the individual particularly receptive to manipulation by the strongest external powers. The immediate connection of this attitude with ethnocentrism has been suggested in earlier chapters: hostility against ingroup authorities, originally the parents, has had to be repressed; the "bad" aspects of these figures—that they are unfair, self-seeking, dominating—are then seen as existing in outgroups, who are charged with dictatorship, plutocracy, desire to control, and so forth. And this displacement of negative imagery is not the only way in which the repressed hostility is handled; it seems often to find expression in authoritarian aggression.

c. *Authoritarian Aggression*

6. It is only natural and right that women be restricted in certain ways in which men have more freedom.
23. He is indeed contemptible who does not feel an undying love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.
31. Homosexuality is a particularly rotten form of delinquency and ought to be severely punished.
47. No insult to our honor should ever go unpunished.
75. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped.

The individual who has been forced to give up basic pleasures and to live under a system of rigid restraints, and who therefore feels put upon, is likely not only to seek an object upon which he can "take it out" but also to be particularly annoyed at the idea that another person is "getting away with something." Thus, it may be said that the present variable represents the sadistic component of authoritarianism just as the immediately foregoing one represents its masochistic component. It is to be expected, therefore, that the conventionalist who cannot bring himself to utter any real criticism of accepted authority will have a desire to condemn, reject, and punish those who violate these values. As the emotional life which this person regards as proper and a part of himself is likely to be very limited, so the impulses, especially sexual and aggressive ones, which remain unconscious and ego-alien are likely to be strong and turbulent. Since in this circumstance a wide variety of stimuli can tempt the individual and so arouse his anxiety (fear of punishment), the list of traits, behavior patterns, individuals, and groups

that he must condemn grows very long indeed. It has been suggested before that this mechanism might lie behind the ethnocentric rejection of such groups as zootsuiters, foreigners, other nations; it is here hypothesized that this feature of ethnocentrism is but a part of a more general tendency to punish violators of conventional values: homosexuals, sex offenders, people with bad manners, etc. Once the individual has convinced himself that there are people who ought to be punished, he is provided with a channel through which his deepest aggressive impulses may be expressed, even while he thinks of himself as thoroughly moral. If his external authorities, or the crowd, lend their approval to this form of aggression, then it may take the most violent forms, and it may persist after the conventional values, in the name of which it was undertaken, have been lost from sight.

One might say that in authoritarian aggression, hostility that was originally aroused by and directed toward ingroup authorities is *displaced* onto outgroups. This mechanism is superficially similar to but essentially different from a process that has often been referred to as "scapegoating." According to the latter conception, the individual's aggression is aroused by frustration, usually of his economic needs; and then, being unable due to intellectual confusion to tell the real causes of his difficulty, he lashes out about him, as it were, venting his fury upon whatever object is available and not too likely to strike back. While it is granted that this process has a role in hostility against minority groups, it must be emphasized that according to the present theory of displacement, the authoritarian *must*, out of an inner necessity, turn his aggression against outgroups. He must do so because he is psychologically unable to attack ingroup authorities, rather than because of intellectual confusion regarding the source of his frustration. If this theory is correct, then authoritarian aggression and authoritarian submission should turn out to be highly correlated. Furthermore, this theory helps to explain why the aggression is so regularly justified in moralistic terms, why it can become so violent and lose all connection with the stimulus which originally set it off.

Readiness to condemn other people on moral grounds may have still another source: it is not only that the authoritarian must condemn the moral laxness that he sees in others, but he is actually driven to see immoral attributes in them whether this has a basis in fact or not. This is a further device for countering his own inhibited tendencies; he says to himself, as it were: "I am not bad and deserving of punishment, he is." In other words the individual's own unacceptable impulses are *projected* onto other individuals and groups who are then rejected. Projectivity as a variable is dealt with more fully below.

Conventionalism, authoritarian submission, and authoritarian aggression all have to do with the moral aspect of life—with standards of conduct, with the authorities who enforce these standards, with offenders against them

who deserve to be punished. We should expect that, in general, subjects who score high on one of these variables will score high on the others also, inasmuch as all three can be understood as expressions of a particular kind of structure within the personality. The most essential feature of this structure is a lack of integration between the moral agencies by which the subject lives and the rest of his personality. One might say that the conscience or superego is incompletely integrated with the self or ego, the ego here being conceived of as embracing the various self-controlling and self-expressing functions of the individual. It is the ego that governs the relations between self and outer world, and between self and deeper layers of the personality; the ego undertakes to regulate impulses in a way that will permit gratification without inviting too much punishment by the superego, and it seeks in general to carry out the activities of the individual in accordance with the demands of reality. It is a function of the ego to make peace with conscience, to create a larger synthesis within which conscience, emotional impulses, and self operate in relative harmony. When this synthesis is not achieved, the superego has somewhat the role of a foreign body within the personality, and it exhibits those rigid, automatic, and unstable aspects discussed above.

There is some reason to believe that a failure in superego internalization is due to weakness in the ego, to its inability to perform the necessary synthesis, i.e., to integrate the superego with itself. Whether or not this is so, ego weakness would seem to be a concomitant of conventionalism and authoritarianism. Weakness in the ego is expressed in the inability to build up a consistent and enduring set of moral values within the personality; and it is this state of affairs, apparently, that makes it necessary for the individual to seek some organizing and coordinating agency outside of himself. Where such outside agencies are depended upon for moral decisions one may say that the conscience is externalized.

Although conventionalism and authoritarianism might thus be regarded as signs of ego weakness, it seemed worthwhile to seek other, more direct, means for estimating this trend in personality, and to correlate this trend with the others. Ego weakness would, it seemed, be expressed fairly directly in such phenomena as opposition to introspection, in superstition and stereotypy, and in overemphasis upon the ego and its supposed strength. The following three variables deal with these phenomena.

d. *Anti-intracception*

28. Novels or stories that tell about what people think and feel are more interesting than those which contain mainly action, romance, and adventure.
38. There is too much emphasis in colleges on intellectual and theoretical topics, not enough emphasis on practical matters and on the homely virtues of living.

53. There are some things too intimate or personal to talk about even with one's closest friends.
55. Although leisure is a fine thing, it is good hard work that makes life interesting and worthwhile.
58. *What* a man does is not so important so long as he does it well.
66. Books and movies ought not to deal so much with the sordid and seamy side of life; they ought to concentrate on themes that are entertaining or uplifting.

Intracception is a term introduced by Murray (89) to stand for "the dominance of feelings, fantasies, speculations, aspirations—an imaginative, subjective human outlook." The opposite of intracception is extracception, "a term that describes the tendency to be determined by concrete, clearly observable, physical conditions (tangible, objective facts)." The relations of intracception/extracception to ego weakness and to prejudice are probably highly complex, and this is not the place to consider them in detail. It seems fairly clear, however, that *anti*-intracception, an attitude of impatience with and opposition to the subjective and tender-minded, might well be a mark of the weak ego. The extremely anti-intracceptive individual is afraid of thinking about human phenomena because he might, as it were, think the wrong thoughts; he is afraid of genuine feeling because his emotions might get out of control. Out of touch with large areas of his own inner life, he is afraid of what might be revealed if he, or others, should look closely at himself. He is therefore against "prying," against concern with what people think and feel, against unnecessary "talk"; instead he would keep busy, devote himself to practical pursuits, and instead of examining an inner conflict, turn his thoughts to something cheerful. An important feature of the Nazi program, it will be recalled, was the defamation of everything that tended to make the individual aware of himself and his problems; not only was "Jewish" psychoanalysis quickly eliminated but every kind of psychology except aptitude testing came under attack. This general attitude easily leads to a devaluation of the human and an overevaluation of the physical object; when it is most extreme, human beings are looked upon as if they were physical objects to be coldly manipulated—even while physical objects, now vested with emotional appeal, are treated with loving care.

e. *Superstition and Stereotypy*

2. Although many people may scoff, it may yet be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.
10. It is more than a remarkable coincidence that Japan had an earthquake on Pearl Harbor Day, December 7, 1944.
39. Every person should have a deep faith in some supernatural force higher than himself to which he gives total allegiance and whose decisions he does not question.

43. Sciences like chemistry, physics, and medicine have carried men very far, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
65. It is entirely possible that this series of wars and conflicts will be ended once and for all by a world-destroying earthquake, flood, or other catastrophe.

Superstitiousness, the belief in mystical or fantastic external determinants of the individual's fate, and stereotypy,<sup>2</sup> the disposition to think in rigid categories, have been mentioned so frequently in the foregoing chapters and are so obviously related to ethnocentrism that they need little discussion here. A question that must be raised concerns the relations of these trends to general intelligence—and the relations of intelligence to ethnocentrism. Probably superstition and stereotypy tend to go with low intelligence, but low intelligence appears to be correlated with ethnocentrism to only a slight degree (see Chapter VIII). It appears likely that superstition and stereotypy embrace, over and above the mere lack of intelligence in the ordinary sense, certain dispositions in thinking which are closely akin to prejudice, even though they might not hamper intelligent performance in the extraceptive sphere. These dispositions can be understood, in part at least, as expressions of ego weakness. Stereotypy is a form of obtuseness particularly in psychological and social matters. It might be hypothesized that one reason why people in modern society—even those who are otherwise “intelligent” or “informed”—resort to primitive, oversimplified explanations of human events is that so many of the ideas and observations needed for an adequate account are not allowed to enter into the calculations: because they are affect-laden and potentially anxiety-producing, the weak ego cannot include them within its scheme of things. More than this, those deeper forces within the personality which the ego cannot integrate with itself are likely to be projected onto the outer world; this is a source of bizarre ideas concerning other peoples' behavior and concerning the causation of events in nature.

Superstitiousness indicates a tendency to shift responsibility from within the individual onto outside forces beyond one's control; it indicates that the ego might already have “given up,” that is to say, renounced the idea that it might determine the individual's fate by overcoming external forces. It must, of course, be recognized that in modern industrial society the capacity of the individual to determine what happens to himself has *actually* decreased, so that items referring to external causation might easily be realistic and hence of no significance for personality. It seemed necessary, therefore, to select items that would express ego weakness in a nonrealistic way by making the individual's fate dependent on more or less fantastic factors.

<sup>2</sup> Although no items pertaining specifically to stereotypy appear in Form 78 of the F scale, several such items do find a place in the later forms; hence, it seems well to introduce this concept into the discussion at this point.

f. *Power and "Toughness"*

9. Too many people today are living in an unnatural, soft way; we should return to the fundamentals, to a more red-blooded, active way of life.
35. There are some activities so flagrantly un-American that, when responsible officials won't take the proper steps, the wide-awake citizen should take the law into his own hands.
47. No insult to our honor should ever go unpunished.
70. To a greater extent than most people realize, our lives are governed by plots hatched in secret by politicians.
74. What this country needs is fewer laws and agencies, and more courageous, tireless, devoted leaders whom the people can put their faith in.

This variable refers, in the first place, to overemphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego. The underlying hypothesis is that overdisplay of toughness may reflect not only the weakness of the ego but also the magnitude of the task it has to perform, that is to say, the strength of certain kinds of needs which are proscribed in the subject's culture. The relations of ego and impulse, then, are at least as close as the relations of ego and conscience. Nevertheless, they may be separated for purposes of analysis, and other variables of the F scale refer to the deeper strata of the individual's emotional life.

Closely related to the phenomenon of exaggerated toughness is something which might be described as a "power complex." Most apparent in its manifestations is overemphasis on the power motif in human relationships; there is a disposition to view all relations among people in terms of such categories as strong-weak, dominant-submissive, leader-follower, "hammer-anvil." And it is difficult to say with which of these roles the subject is the more fully identified. It appears that he wants to get power, to have it and not to lose it, and at the same time is afraid to seize and wield it. It appears that he also admires power in others and is inclined to submit to it—and at the same time is afraid of the weakness thus implied. The individual whom we expected to score high on this cluster readily identifies himself with the "little people," or "the average," but he does so, it seems, with little or no humility, and he seems actually to think of himself as strong or to believe that he can somehow become so. In short, the power complex contains elements that are essentially contradictory, and we should expect that sometimes one feature and sometimes another will predominate at the surface level. We should expect that both leaders and followers will score high on this variable, for the reason that the actual role of the individual seems to be less important than his concern that leader-follower relations shall obtain. One solution which such an individual often achieves is that of alignment with

power figures, an arrangement by which he is able to gratify both his need for power and his need to submit. He hopes that by submitting to power he can participate in it. For example, a man who reports that the most awe-inspiring experience for him would be "to shake hands with the President" probably finds his gratification not in submission alone but in the idea that some of the big man's power has, as it were, rubbed off onto him, so that he is a more important person for having "shook his hand" or "known him" or "been there." The same pattern of gratification can be obtained by acting in the role of "the lieutenant" or by functioning in a middle position in some clearly structured hierarchy where there is always somebody above and somebody below.

The power complex has immediate relations with certain aspects of ethnocentrism. An individual who thinks of most human relations in such terms as strong versus weak is likely to apply these categories in his thinking about ingroups and outgroups, e.g., to conceive of "superior" and "inferior races." And one of the psychologically least costly devices for attaining a sense of superiority is to claim it on the basis of membership in a particular "race."

g. *Destructiveness and Cynicism*

3. America is getting so far from the true American way of life that force may be necessary to restore it.
9. Too many people today are living in an unnatural, soft way; we should return to the fundamentals, to a more red-blooded, active way of life.
14. After we finish off the Germans and Japs, we ought to concentrate on other enemies of the human race such as rats, snakes, and germs.
17. Familiarity breeds contempt.
24. Today everything is unstable; we should be prepared for a period of constant change, conflict, and upheaval.
30. Reports of atrocities in Europe have been greatly exaggerated for propaganda purposes.
35. There are some activities so flagrantly un-American that, when responsible officials won't take the proper steps, the wide-awake citizen should take the law into his own hands.
42. No matter how they act on the surface, men are interested in women for only one reason.
56. After the war, we may expect a crime wave; the control of gangsters and ruffians will become a major social problem.
59. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.
67. When you come right down to it, it's human nature never to do anything without an eye to one's own profit.

According to the present theory, the antidemocratic individual, because he has had to accept numerous externally imposed restrictions upon the satisfaction of his needs, harbors strong underlying aggressive impulses. As we have seen, one outlet for this aggression is through displacement onto out-groups leading to moral indignation and authoritarian aggression. Undoubtedly this is a very serviceable device for the individual; yet, the strong underlying aggression seems at the same time to express itself in some other way—in a nonmoralized way. It was assumed, of course, that primitive aggressive impulses are rarely expressed with complete directness by adults, but must instead be sufficiently modified, or at least justified, so that they are acceptable to the ego.

The present variable, then, refers to rationalized, ego-accepted, nonmoralized aggression. The supposition was that a subject could express this tendency by agreeing with statements which though thoroughly aggressive were couched in such terms as to avoid his moral censorship. Thus, some items offered justifications for aggression, and were formulated in such a way that strong agreement would indicate that the subject needed only slight justification in order to be ready for all-out aggression. Other items dealt with contempt for mankind, the theory being that here the hostility is so generalized, so free of direction against any particular object, that the individual need not feel accountable for it. Still another guiding conception was that a person can most freely express aggression when he believes that everybody is doing it and, hence, if he wants to be aggressive, he is disposed to believe that everybody *is* doing it, e.g., that it is "human nature" to exploit and to make war upon one's neighbors. It goes without saying that such undifferentiated aggressiveness could easily, by means of propaganda, be directed against minority groups, or against any group the persecution of which was politically profitable.

h. *Projectivity*

46. The sexual orgies of the old Greeks and Romans are nursery school stuff compared to some of the goings-on in this country today, even in circles where people might least expect it.
56. After the war, we may expect a crime wave; the control of gangsters and ruffians will become a major social problem.
65. It is entirely possible that this series of wars and conflicts will be ended once and for all by a world-destroying earthquake, flood, or other catastrophe.
70. To a greater extent than most people realize, our lives are governed by plots hatched in secret by politicians.
73. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around so much and mix together so freely, a person has to be especially careful to protect himself against infection and disease.

The mechanism of projection was mentioned in connection with authoritarian aggression: the suppressed impulses of the authoritarian character tend to be projected onto other people who are then blamed out of hand. Projection is thus a device for keeping id drives ego-alien, and it may be taken as a sign of the ego's inadequacy in carrying out its function. Indeed, in one sense most of the items of the F scale are projective: they involve the assumption that judgments and interpretations of fact are distorted by psychological urges. The subject's tendency to project is utilized, in the present group of items, in an attempt to gain access to some of the deeper trends in his personality. If the antidemocratic individual is disposed to see in the outer world impulses which are suppressed in himself, and we wish to know what these impulses are, then something may be learned by noting what attributes he most readily, but unrealistically, ascribes to the world around him. If an individual insists that someone has hostile designs on him, and we can find no evidence that this is true, we have good reason to suspect that our subject himself has aggressive intentions and is seeking by means of projection to justify them. A notorious example is Father Coughlin's referring to anti-Semitism as a "defense mechanism," i.e., a protection of Gentiles against the supposed aggressive designs of the Jews. Similarly, it seemed that the greater a subject's preoccupation with "evil forces" in the world, as shown by his readiness to think about and to believe in the existence of such phenomena as wild erotic excesses, plots and conspiracies, and danger from natural catastrophes, the stronger would be his own unconscious urges of both sexuality and destructiveness.

i. *Sex*

31. Homosexuality is a particularly rotten form of delinquency and ought to be severely punished.
42. No matter how they act on the surface, men are interested in women for only one reason.
46. The sexual orgies of the old Greeks and Romans are nursery school stuff compared to some of the goings-on in this country today, even in circles where people might least expect it.
75. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped.

Concern with overt sexuality is represented in the F scale by four items, two of which have appeared in connection with authoritarian aggression and one other as an expression of projectivity. This is an example of the close interaction of all the present variables; since, taken together they constitute a totality, it follows that a single question may pertain to two or more aspects of the whole. For purposes of analysis, sex may be abstracted from the totality as well as any of the other variables. Which of these variables are most basic must be determined by clinical study. In any case, it seemed that

countercathexis (repression, reaction formation, projection) of sexual wishes was well qualified for special study.

The present variable is conceived of as ego-alien sexuality. A strong inclination to punish violators of sex mores (homosexuals, sex offenders) may be an expression of a general punitive attitude based on identification with ingroup authorities, but it also suggests that the subject's own sexual desires are suppressed and in danger of getting out of hand. A readiness to believe in "sex orgies" may be an indication of a general tendency to distort reality through projection, but sexual content would hardly be projected unless the subject had impulses of this same kind that were unconscious and strongly active. The three items pertaining to the punishment of homosexuals and of sex criminals and to the existence of sex orgies may, therefore, give some indication of the strength of the subject's unconscious sexual drives.

## 2. THE FORMULATION OF SCALE ITEMS

The considerations which guided the formulation of items in the scales described in previous chapters held as well for the F scale. There were several principles which, though a part of our general approach to scale construction, had particular significance for the present scale. In the first place, the item should have a maximum of *indirectness*, in the sense that it should not come close to the surface of overt prejudice and it should appear to be as far removed as possible from our actual interest. From this point of view, items such as 2 (Astrology) and 65 (Flood) were regarded as superior to items such as 74 (Tireless leaders) and 3 (Force to preserve). The latter two items, admittedly, could very well express certain aspects of an explicit fascist ideology, yet, as indicated above, statements touching upon the leader idea and the idea of force were definitely called for on theoretical grounds. More than this, there was a question of whether the aim of constructing a scale to correlate with E would be better served by the most indirect items or by the more direct ones, and in this first attempt it seemed the better part of wisdom to include some items of both kinds.

A second rule in item formulation was that each item should achieve a proper balance between irrationality and objective truth. If a statement was so "wild" that very few people would agree with it, or if it contained so large an element of truth that almost everyone would agree with it, then obviously it could not distinguish between prejudiced and unprejudiced subjects, and hence was of no value. Each item had to have some degree of rational appeal, but it had to be formulated in such a way that the rational aspect was not the major factor making for agreement or disagreement. This in many cases was a highly subtle matter; e.g., social historians might conceivably agree that Item 46 (Sex orgies) is probably quite true, yet it was here regarded as a possible index of projected sexuality, the argument being that most subjects would have no basis on which to judge its truth and would

respond in accordance with their feelings. Since each item contained an element of objective truth or rational justification, an individual's response to a particular item might conceivably be determined by this fact alone. Hence, no item taken by itself could be regarded as diagnostic of potential fascism. The item's worth to the scale would have to be judged mainly in terms of its discriminatory power, and the meaning of an individual's response to it would have to be inferred from his total pattern of response. If a man marks +3 on Item 46 (Sex orgies) but marks -3 or -2 on Items 31 (Homosexuality) and 75 (Sex Crimes), it might be concluded that he is a man of knowledge and sophistication; but a +3 on Item 46, accompanying agreement with Items 31 and 75 would seem to be a fairly good indication of concern with sexuality.

Finally, it was required of each item that it contribute to the structural unity of the scale as a whole. It had to do its part in covering the diverse personality trends that entered into the broad pattern which the scale purported to measure. While it was granted that different individuals might give the same response to a given item for different reasons—and this apart from the matter of objective truth—it was necessary that the item carry sufficient meaningfulness so that any response to it could, when responses on all items were known, be interpreted in the light of our over-all theory.

## C. RESULTS WITH SUCCESSIVE FORMS OF THE F SCALE

### 1. STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF THE PRELIMINARY SCALE (FORM 78)

The preliminary F scale, made up of the 38 items listed above, was administered as a part of questionnaire Form 78 to four groups of subjects in the spring of 1945. These groups were described in Chapter III, and they are listed in Table 11 (III).

The scoring of the scale followed the procedures used with the A-S, E, and PEC scales. Except in the case of negative items, a mark of +3 was scored 7, +2 was scored as 6, and so on. Items 12, 20, and 28 are negative (they state the unprejudiced position), and here, of course, a mark of +3 was scored 1, and so on. Table 2 (VII) gives the reliability coefficients, mean scores per item, and Standard Deviations for these four groups. The mean reliability of .74 is within the range ordinarily regarded as adequate for group comparisons, but well below what is required of a truly accurate instrument. It might be said that, considering the diversity of elements that went into the F scale, the degree of consistency indicated by the present figure is all that could be expected of this preliminary form of the scale. The question was whether by revision of the scale it might be possible to attain the degree of reliability that characterizes the E scale, or whether we might be dealing

here—as seemed to be the case in the PEC scale—with areas of response in which people are simply not very consistent.

It may be noted that the Professional Women show considerably more consistency than do the other groups of subjects, their reliability coefficient of .88 being in the neighborhood of that regularly obtained with the E scale. Since these women are considerably older, on the average, than our other subjects, it may be suggested that the higher reliability is due to their greater consistency of personality.

There appears to be no ready explanation for the low reliability found in the case of the Public Speaking Men. It may be noted that the Standard Deviation and the range for this group were also unusually small. Adequate explanation would require data from a larger sample of men and from an improved F scale.

Examination of Table 2 (VII) shows that there are no extremely high and no extremely low scores in any of the groups and that the obtained

**TABLE 2 (VII)**  
**RELIABILITY OF THE F SCALE (FORM 78)<sup>a</sup>**

Property	Group				Over-all <sup>b</sup>
	A	B	C	D	
Reliability	.78	.56	.72	.88	.74
Mean (total)	3.94	3.72	3.75	3.43	3.71
Mean (odd half)	3.80	3.59	3.60	3.22	3.55
Mean (even half)	4.08	3.87	3.91	3.64	3.88
S. D. (total)	.71	.57	.70	.86	.71
S. D. (odd half)	.87	.71	.85	.94	.84
S. D. (even half)	.69	.65	.76	.84	.74
N	140	52	40	63	295
Range	2.12-5.26	2.55-4.87	2.39-5.05	1.68-5.63	1.68-5.63

<sup>a</sup>The four groups on which these data are based are:

*Group A:* U. C. Public Speaking Class Women.

*Group B:* U. C. Public Speaking Class Men.

*Group C:* U. C. Extension Psychology Class Women.

*Group D:* Professional Women.

<sup>b</sup>In obtaining the over-all means, the individual group means were not weighted by N.

means are near the neutral point. The relatively narrow distribution of scores—narrow as compared with those obtained from the other scales—may be in part a result of lack of consistency within the scale: unless the items are actually expressive of the same general trend, we could hardly expect an individual to respond to the great majority of them with consistent agreement or consistent disagreement. On the other hand, it is possible that the

present sample does not contain subjects who are actually extreme with respect to the pattern which the F scale was designed to measure. This circumstance (lowered "range of talent") would tend to lower the reliability coefficients.

The F scale correlated .53 with A-S and .65 with E, in Form 78.

## 2. ITEM ANALYSIS AND REVISION OF THE PRELIMINARY SCALE

Data obtained from the initial four groups of subjects were used in attempting to improve the F scale—to increase its reliability and to shorten it somewhat, without loss in its breadth or meaningfulness. As with the other scales, the Discriminatory Power of an item provided the major statistical basis for judging its worth. Since it was intended that the F scale should not only have internal consistency but should also correlate highly with overt prejudice, attention was given both to the item's relation to the total F scale and to its ability to discriminate between high and low scorers on the A-S scale. An item's Discriminatory Power in terms of A-S ( $D. P_{A-S}$ ) is simply the difference between the mean score of the high A-S quartile on that item and the mean score of the low A-S quartile on the item. Table 3 (VII) gives for each item the mean score, the Discriminatory Power in terms of high vs. low scorers on F ( $D. P_{F}$ ), the  $D. P_{F}$ 's order of merit, the  $D. P_{A-S}$ , the latter's order of merit and, finally, the item's rank in a distribution of the sums of the  $D. P_{F}$  plus the  $D. P_{A-S}$ . This final rank order was a convenient index of the item's statistical "goodness" for our over-all purpose.

The average  $D. P_{F}$ , 1.80, is considerably below that found in the case of the A-S or E scales. Yet it indicates that, in general, the items yield statistically significant differences between the high and the low quartiles. Sixteen  $D. P.$ 's are above 2, 18 fall in the range 1–2, and only 4 are below 1. The means are, in general, fairly satisfactory; they average 3.71, which is near the neutral point of 4.0, and only 9 means are definitely too extreme, i.e., above 5.0 or below 3.0. As is to be expected, only 2 of the items with extreme means yield  $D. P.$ 's as great as 2.0.

The  $D. P.$ 's in terms of A-S are, of course, much lower; yet there are 17 items which appear to be significantly related to A-S, i.e., have a  $D. P_{A-S}$  greater than 1.0. Since it is the total F pattern that we expect to correlate with A-S and E, it is not necessary that each single F item by itself be significantly related to the latter. In general, items which are most discriminating in terms of F tend to discriminate best in terms of A-S, though there are some striking exceptions. In deciding whether to retain an item for use in a revised scale most weight was given to the  $D. P_{F}$  and to the general principles guiding our scale construction; these things being equal, the greater an item's  $D. P_{A-S}$ , the greater its chances of being included in the revised scale.

TABLE 3 (VII)

MEANS AND DISCRIMINATORY POWERS OF THE F-SCALE ITEMS (FORM 78)<sup>a</sup>

Item	Mean	D.P. <sub>F</sub> <sup>b</sup>	Rank D.P. <sub>F</sub>	D.P. <sub>AS</sub> <sup>c</sup>	Rank D.P. <sub>AS</sub>	Final Rank <sup>d</sup> (D.P. <sub>F</sub> +D.P. <sub>AS</sub> )
2. (Astrology)	2.60	1.74	(22)	1.24	(11)	(18)
3. (Force to preserve)	3.04	1.98	(18)	1.05	(17)	(15)
6. (Women restricted)	2.93	1.75	(21)	0.41	(32)	(26)
9. (Red-blooded life)	3.99	2.04	(15)	-0.08	(35)	(29)
10. (Pearl Harbor Day)	2.22	2.20	(9)	1.37	(6)	(8)
12. (Modern church)	4.67	0.19	(38)	-1.18	(38)	(38)
14. (Rats...germs)	4.44	1.60	(26.5)	0.85	(24)	(23.5)
17. (Familiarity)	3.33	1.86	(19)	1.56	(4)	(10)
19. (One should avoid)	3.63	0.76	(36)	0.70	(27)	(35)
20. (Progressive education)	3.28	1.07	(33)	-0.25	(37)	(37)
23. (Undying love)	3.62	2.61	(4)	1.17	(13)	(5)
24. (Things unstable)	5.01	0.79	(35)	0.88	(22)	(33)
28. (Novels or stories)	3.02	1.29	(30)	0.76	(26)	(27)
30. (Reports of atrocities)	4.20	0.43	(37)	0.66	(28)	(36)
31. (Homosexuals)	3.22	2.16	(10)	1.18	(12)	(13)
32. (Essential for learning)	3.31	1.67	(24)	1.10	(16)	(20)
35. (Law in own hands)	2.50	1.42	(29)	0.62	(29.5)	(28)
38. (Emphasis in college)	3.91	1.20	(31)	1.14	(15)	(25)
39. (Supernatural force)	3.97	2.54	(6)	1.26	(9.5)	(4)
42. (For one reason)	2.06	1.05	(34)	0.59	(31)	(34)
43. (Sciences like chemistry)	4.35	2.79	(3)	0.97	(18)	(6)
46. (Sex orgies)	3.64	2.11	(12.5)	0.93	(20)	(14)
47. (Honor)	3.00	2.09	(14)	1.65	(3)	(7)
50. (Obedience and respect)	3.72	3.09	(1)	1.55	(5)	(2)
53. (Things too intimate)	4.82	1.99	(17)	-0.23	(36)	(32)
55. (Leisure)	5.20	2.11	(12.5)	1.26	(9.5)	(11)
56. (Crime wave)	4.60	1.16	(32)	0.62	(29.5)	(31)
58. (What a man does)	3.48	1.70	(23)	0.87	(23)	(22)
59. (Always war)	4.26	2.59	(5)	1.91	(2)	(3)
60. (Important values)	4.17	1.60	(26.5)	0.31	(34)	(30)
65. (World catastrophe)	2.58	1.55	(28)	0.90	(21)	(23.5)
66. (Books and movies)	4.10	2.48	(7)	0.38	(33)	(19)
67. (Eye to profit)	3.71	2.21	(8)	0.78	(25)	(17)
70. (Plots by politicians)	3.27	1.85	(20)	1.15	(14)	(16)
73. (Infection and disease)	4.79	2.02	(16)	1.34	(8)	(12)
74. (Tireless leaders)	5.00	1.66	(25)	0.94	(19)	(21)
75. (Sex crimes)	3.26	2.81	(2)	2.07	(1)	(1)
77. (No sane person)	4.12	2.12	(11)	1.36	(7)	(9)
Mean/Person/Item	3.71	1.80		0.89		

<sup>a</sup>The four groups on which these data are based are: *Group A*: U.C. Public Speaking Class Women (N = 140); *Group B*: U.C. Public Speaking Class Men (N = 52); *Group C*: U.C. Extension Psychology Class Women (N = 40); *Group D*: Professional Women (N = 63). In obtaining the over-all means, the individual group means were not weighted by N.

<sup>b</sup>D.P.<sub>F</sub> is based on the difference between the high quartile and the low quartile on the F scale distribution.

<sup>c</sup>D.P.<sub>AS</sub> is based on the difference between the high quartile and the low quartile on the A-S scale distribution. E.g., the D.P.<sub>AS</sub> of 1.24 on Item 2 indicates that the mean of the low quartile on A-S was 1.24 points lower than the mean of the high quartile on A-S.

<sup>d</sup>For each item the sum of D.P.<sub>F</sub> + D.P.<sub>AS</sub> is obtained. The final rank of an item is the rank of this sum in the distribution of sums for the whole scale.

We may now inquire what it is that distinguishes the items which turned out well statistically from those that turned out poorly. Can any general statements be made about each of these two groups of items that can serve as guides in the formulation of new items? The first question concerns the nine groups of items chosen to represent the variables that entered into the conceptualization of F. Do most of the items with high D. P.'s pertain to a few of the variables? Are there some variables which simply do not belong to the pattern we are considering? Three of the clusters, Sex, Authoritarian Aggression, and Authoritarian Submission, had mean D. P.'s above 2.0, the remaining clusters having mean D. P.'s in the range 1.26-1.80. Projectivity (1.70), Destructiveness and Cynicism (1.56), and Conventionalism (1.26) were the least satisfactory. However, it is to be noted that every cluster has within it at least one item with a D. P. above 2.0. At this stage, therefore, it seemed best not to eliminate any of the variables but to give attention to improving or replacing the poorer items found in each cluster.

Turning to a consideration of items which proved to be outstandingly good in the statistical sense, we note that Item 75 (Sex crimes) leads all the rest, i.e., has the highest sum of D. P.<sub>F</sub> plus D. P.<sub>A-S</sub>. This item represents rather well the ideal to which we aspired in formulating items for the F scale. Not only is there a wide distribution of responses, with a mean fairly near the neutral point, but the item combines, apparently in a very effective way, several ideas which according to theory have crucial roles in prejudice: the underlying interest in the more primitive aspects of sex, the readiness for all-out physical aggressiveness, the justification of aggression by an appeal to moralistic values. More than this, the item seems to be sufficiently free of any logical or automatic connection with overt prejudice. That the next best item, 50 (Obedience and respect), should be outstandingly differentiating is not surprising since this kind of authoritarianism is a well-known aspect of the fascist outlook. The device of putting the authoritarianism in a context of child training seems to remove it from the surface of ethnocentrism; but whether or not this is true, the item pertains to an aspect of the fascist philosophy that could in no case be left out of account.

Third in the rank order of goodness is Item 59, "Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict." This item, from the Destructiveness and Cynicism cluster, expresses several ideas which are particularly important in the F syndrome. In addition to an element of overt antipacifist opinion, there is contempt for men and acceptance of the "survival of the fittest" idea as a rationalization for aggressiveness. The next item, 39 (Supernatural force), seems to express very well the tendency to shift responsibility to outside forces beyond one's own control. This is a manifestation of what has been termed ego weakness; the item has also been placed in the Authoritarian Submission cluster on the ground that faith in a supernatural force is related to faith in ingroup authorities. It was not expected that the presence

of religious feeling and belief would by itself be significant for prejudice; the aim in devising the present item was to compose a statement which was so extreme that not too many subjects would agree with it and which placed enough emphasis upon "total allegiance" and obedience "without question" so that the uncritically submissive person could distinguish himself. The mean of 3.97 and the D. P.<sub>F</sub> of 2.54 indicate that this aim was largely realized. Item 23 (Undying love), which ranked fifth in order of goodness, expresses extreme moral conventionality and ingroup feeling related to the family. It has a place in both the Authoritarian Submission and the Authoritarian Aggression clusters, because it includes both allegiance to the ingroup and a punishing attitude ("He is indeed contemptible") toward those who violate this value. The statement is so exaggerated, so expressive, as it seems, of the "protesting too much" attitude that we may wonder if strong agreement with it does not mask underlying but inhibited rebellious hostility against parents and parent figures.

Concerning all five of these items it may be said that they are highly diverse in their surface content, that they pertain to various aspects of the underlying theory—superego, ego, and id are expressed—and that with the possible exception of Item 50 (Obedience and respect) they are highly indirect in the present sense of the term. Indeed, as one examines further the ranking of the items in terms of their Discriminatory Powers—(Sciences like chemistry), (Honor), (Pearl Harbor Day), (No sane person), (Familiarity), (Leisure), (Infection and disease)—he may note that, in general, items which are best in the statistical sense are those which seem best in their formulation and in terms of our over-all theory and method of approach.

Items which turned out to be poor in the statistical sense are, in retrospect, easy to criticize. In some instances there was a failure in formulation: the statement was so unclear or ambiguous that many of the subjects, apparently, drew from it different implications from those intended. This would seem to have been true particularly of Items 12 (Modern church) and 20 (Progressive education). In other instances, e.g., Items 24 (Things unstable), 74 (Tireless leaders), and 58 (Crime wave), the statements contained too large an element of truth or rational justification and so appealed, as shown by the high mean scores, to both high and low scorers. Again, some of the items were too crude or openly aggressive, so that most of the high scorers as well as the low scorers tended to disagree. For example, Items 42 (For one reason) and 35 (Law in own hands) have both low means and low D. P.'s.

### 3. THE SECOND F SCALE: FORM 60

In preparing the new form of the questionnaire, the E and PEC scales were shortened so drastically that a comparatively long F scale (34 items) could still be used without allowing the total number of scale items to go above 60. Since we were still faced with the task of producing a reliable F scale, with-

TABLE 4 (VII)  
THE F SCALE: FORM 60

- a. *Conventionalism*: Rigid adherence to conventional, middle-class values.
  1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
  6. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to be liked and accepted by decent people.
  53. One main trouble today is that people talk too much and work too little.
  
- b. *Authoritarian Submission*: Submissive, uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the ingroup.
  1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
  7. Science has carried man very far, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
  11. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
  23. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
  29. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.
  32. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.
  44. In order for us to do good work, it is necessary that our bosses outline carefully what is to be done and exactly how to go about it.
  
- c. *Authoritarian Aggression*: Tendency to be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject, and punish people who violate conventional values.
  6. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to be liked and accepted by decent people.
  17. An insult to our honor should always be punished.
  19. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
  22. The trouble with letting everybody have a say in running the government is that so many people are just naturally stupid or full of wild ideas.
  34. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.
  39. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.
  49. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked, and feeble-minded people.
  53. One main trouble today is that people talk too much and work too little.
  58. Homosexuals are nothing but degenerates and ought to be severely punished.

- d. *Anti-intracception*: Opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tender-minded.
16. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.
  30. Some cases of feeble-mindedness are caused by overstudy.
  45. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
  53. One main trouble today is that people talk too much and work too little.
- e. *Superstition and Stereotypy*: The belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate; the disposition to think in rigid categories.
7. Science has carried man very far, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
  11. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
  18. It is more than just chance that Japan had an earthquake on Pearl Harbor Day, December 7, 1944.
  24. Some people are born with the urge to jump from high places.
  30. Some cases of feeble-mindedness are caused by overstudy.
  35. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.
  40. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.
  46. It is possible that wars and social troubles will be ended once and for all by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.
  50. It's a mistake to trust anybody who doesn't look you straight in the eye.
- f. *Power and "Toughness"*: Preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension; identification with power figures; overemphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego; exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness.
2. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.
  5. Any red-blooded American will fight to defend his property.
  17. An insult to our honor should always be punished.
  19. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
  32. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.
  35. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.
  57. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret by politicians.
- g. *Destructiveness and Cynicism*: Generalized hostility, vilification of the human.
10. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.

25. Familiarity breeds contempt.
41. The true American way of life is disappearing so fast that force may be necessary to preserve it.
- h. *Projectivity*: The disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outward of unconscious emotional impulses.
36. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around so much and mix together so freely, a person has to be especially careful to protect himself against infection and disease.
45. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
46. It is possible that wars and social troubles will be ended once and for all by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.
52. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.
57. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret by politicians.
- i. *Sex*: Exaggerated concern with sexual "goings-on."
34. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped or worse.
52. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.
58. Homosexuals are nothing but degenerates and ought to be severely punished.

out sacrificing breadth or meaningfulness, it seemed the better part of wisdom not to undertake much shortening of it at this stage.

The 19 items from the F scale (Form 78) that ranked highest in order of goodness were retained, in the same or slightly revised form, in the new scale. Thus, statistical differentiating power of the item was the main basis of selection. As stated above, however, the items which came out best statistically were, in general, those which seemed best from the point of view of theory, so that retaining them required no compromise with the original purpose of the scale. Of these items, 5 were changed in no way; revision of the others involved change in wording but not in essential meaning, the aim being to avoid too much uniformity of agreement or disagreement and, hence, to produce mean scores as close as possible to the neutral point.

Given 19 items of known dependability, the task was to formulate 15 additional ones which, singly, met the requirements of good items and which, taken together, covered the ground mapped out according to our theory. Here, criteria other than statistical ones played an important role. In attempting to achieve a maximum of *indirectness* we not only eliminated items which were too openly aggressive (they had low D. P.'s anyway) but retained, in

a slightly revised form, Item 65 (World catastrophe) despite its relatively low D. P. (R. O. 23.5), because it expressed a theoretically important idea and appeared on the surface to be almost completely removed from "race" prejudice and fascism. In the name of *breadth*, Item 67 (Eye to profit), whose D. P. was not low (R. O. 21), was eliminated because of its too great similarity to the highly discriminating Item 59 (Always war). To cover a great variety of ideas as efficiently as possible, two or more of them were combined in the same statement, e.g., "Any red-blooded American will fight to defend his *property*" or "... people *think* too much and *work* too little." With attention to these criteria, and to *meaningfulness*, *contribution to the structural unity of the scale*, and proper degree of *rational justification*, 4 items from the F scale (Form 78) whose D. P. rank orders were lower than 19, were revised and 11 new items were formulated to complete the new form. The 34 items, grouped according to the variables which they were supposed to represent, are shown in table 4 (VII).

Reliability of the scale, mean score per item, S. D., and the range of scores for each of the five groups to whom the F scale (Form 60) was given are shown in Table 5 (VII). The reliability of the scale is a considerable improvement over that obtained with Form 78 (.87 as compared with .74); it

TABLE 5 (VII)  
RELIABILITY OF THE F SCALE (FORM 60)<sup>a</sup>

Property	Group					Over-all <sup>b</sup>
	I	II	III	IV	V	
Reliability	.86	.91	.89	.87	.81	.87
Mean (total)	3.32	3.39	3.82	3.74	3.25	3.50
Mean (odd half)	3.41	3.42	4.09	3.78	3.19	3.58
Mean (even half)	3.24	3.36	3.56	3.73	3.28	3.43
S. D. (total)	.86	.96	.93	.81	.71	.85
S. D. (odd half)	.97	1.03	.99	.77	.83	.92
S. D. (even half)	.75	.96	.97	.93	.76	.87
N	47	54	57	68	60	286
Range	1.00-5.50	1.24-5.50	1.82-4.38	2.24-5.62	1.97-5.35	1.82-5.62

<sup>a</sup>The five groups on which these data are based are:

Group I: University of Oregon Student Women.

Group II: University of Oregon and University of California Student Women.

Group III: University of Oregon and University of California Student Men.

Group IV: Oregon Service Club Men.

Group V: Oregon Service Club Men (A Part only).

<sup>b</sup>In obtaining the over-all means, the individual group means were not weighted by N.

is as high as that of the shortened E scale (.87 as compared with .86) and much better than the reliability of .70 for the shortened PEC scale. The mean scores are not quite so close to the neutral point as was the case with Form 78 (over-all mean of 3.5 as compared with 3.7); the range and the variability, however, are somewhat greater.<sup>3</sup>

Inspection of the Discriminatory Powers of the items, as shown in Table 6 (VII), shows once again considerable improvement over Form 78. The mean D. P.<sub>F</sub> is now 2.15 as compared with 1.80 for Form 78. Three D. P.'s are above 3.0, 18 fall in the range 2.0-3.0, 12 are in the range 1.0-2.0, and only 1 is below 1.0. The mean D. P. in terms of E, 1.53, is notably greater than the mean D. P.<sub>A-S</sub>, .89, found with Form 78. There are 28 items with a mean D. P.<sub>E</sub> greater than 1.0; these F items are significantly related to ethnocentrism at the 5 per cent level of confidence or better. Each of the variables that entered into the F scale—Conventionalism, Superstition, etc.—is represented by items that are satisfactorily differentiating.

The correlation between the F scale (Form 60) and E is, on the average, .69. This is a considerable improvement over the results obtained with Form 78, where F correlated .53 with A-S and .65 with E, though it is still not quite as high as its intended functions require.

#### 4. THE THIRD F SCALE: FORMS 45 AND 40

Although the F scale (Form 60) might be described as a fairly adequate instrument, it still had some obvious shortcomings, and it was hoped that these might be removed before the scale was used with numerous groups of subjects. It still contained a number of items so poor statistically that they contributed almost nothing to the purpose of the scale. Also, there were two items (numbers 12 and 18) which, despite their ranking 1 and 9 in order of

<sup>3</sup> It may be reported here that in the case of the University of Oregon Student Women Form 60 of the questionnaire was administered in two parts: Part A contained the F scale and one half of the PEC scale and Part B, administered a day later, contained the E scale and the other half of the PEC scale. The purpose of this proceeding was to test whether responses to the items of one scale were affected by the presence within the same questionnaire of items from other scales. Apparently this variation in the manner of administration made little or no difference. When the results for the University of Oregon Student Women (Group 1) are compared with those for the University of Oregon and University of California Student Women (Group 2)—a fairly similar group—the differences in reliability, mean score, and S.D. appear to be insignificant. The same is true in the cases of the E and PEC scales, and reference to Table 14 (IV) and to Table 5 (V) will show. The mean for the other group of Oregon Service Club Men (Group V) who received only the A part of Form 60 does seem to be somewhat lower than that of the other group of Oregon Service Club Men. This difference cannot, however, be attributed to the difference in the form of the questionnaire. More important, probably, is the fact that Group V, in contrast to the other group, received the questionnaire *after* having listened to a talk on "What to do with Germany." There was at least an implicit connection between the content of the talk and the content of the F scale; as one of the subjects who sensed this connection said afterwards to our staff member, "You should have given the questionnaire before your talk."

TABLE 6 (VII)

MEANS AND DISCRIMINATORY POWERS OF THE F-SCALE ITEMS (FORM 60)<sup>a</sup>

Item	Mean	D. P. <sub>F</sub> <sup>b</sup>	Rank D. P. <sub>F</sub>	D. P. <sub>E</sub> <sup>c</sup>	Rank D. P. <sub>E</sub>	Final Rank <sup>d</sup> (D. P. <sub>F</sub> +D. P. <sub>E</sub> )
1. (Obedience & respect)	4.86	2.39	(14)	1.52	(17)	(13)
2. (Will power)	4.44	2.50	(11)	1.46	(19)	(12)
5. (Red blooded American)	5.49	1.46	(29.5)	1.18	(25.5)	(27)
6. (Bad manners)	5.30	1.80	(23)	1.56	(13.5)	(22)
7. (Science)	4.98	1.71	(24)	1.32	(23)	(25)
10. (War & conflict)	4.46	1.67	(26)	1.70	(10)	(21)
11. (Supernatural power)	3.60	2.91	(4)	1.38	(21)	(10)
12. (Germans & Japs)	3.71	3.16	(3)	2.83	(1)	(1)
16. (Cheerful things)	3.15	2.08	(20.5)	1.18	(25.5)	(23)
17. (Honor)	3.14	2.46	(12)	2.34	(4)	(7)
18. (Pearl Harbor Day)	2.19	2.51	(10)	1.83	(9)	(9)
19. (Discipline & determination)	3.68	3.17	(2)	2.28	(6.5)	(3)
22. (Not everybody in gov't.)	2.74	1.46	(29.5)	1.17	(27)	(28)
23. (Rebellious ideas)	4.30	2.70	(7)	2.29	(5)	(5)
24. (Born with urge)	2.87	2.60	(8)	2.28	(6.5)	(6)
25. (Familiarity)	3.30	2.08	(20.5)	1.33	(22)	(20)
29. (No sane person)	3.55	2.82	(6)	1.95	(8)	(8)
30. (Feebleminded)	1.84	1.43	(32.5)	0.91	(30)	(30)
32. (Devoted leaders)	4.49	2.42	(13)	1.43	(20)	(15)
34. (Sex crime)	3.43	2.83	(5)	2.52	(3)	(4)
35. (Two classes)	1.44	0.73	(34)	0.38	(34)	(34)
36. (Infection & disease)	4.80	1.68	(25)	1.03	(28)	(28)
39. (Love for parents)	3.16	3.28	(1)	2.56	(2)	(2)
40. (Astrology)	2.56	2.15	(17)	1.66	(11)	(16)
41. (Force to preserve)	2.48	2.31	(15)	1.56	(13.5)	(14)
44. (Bosses outline)	2.46	1.60	(27)	0.50	(33)	(33)
45. (Prying)	3.48	2.52	(9)	1.56	(13.5)	(11)
46. (Flood)	2.15	1.43	(32.5)	0.94	(29)	(29)
49. (Rid of immoral people)	2.74	2.12	(19)	1.56	(13.5)	(18)
50. (Mistake to trust)	2.12	1.45	(31)	0.84	(31)	(31)
52. (Sex life)	3.18	2.13	(18)	1.50	(18)	(19)
53. (Talk too much)	3.87	1.83	(22)	1.24	(24)	(24)
57. (Plots)	4.24	1.55	(28)	0.63	(32)	(32)
58. (Homosexuals)	2.29	2.20	(16)	1.54	(16)	(17)
Mean/Person/Item	3.42	2.15		1.53		

<sup>a</sup>The four groups on which these data are based are:

Group I: University of Oregon Student Women (N = 47)

Group II: University of Oregon and University of California Student Women (N=54)

Group III: University of Oregon and University of California Student Men (N = 57)

Group IV: Oregon Service Club Men (N = 68)

In obtaining the over-all means, the individual group means were not weighted according to N.

<sup>b</sup>D.P.<sub>F</sub> is based on the difference between the high quartile and the low quartile of the F scale distribution.

<sup>c</sup>D.P.<sub>E</sub> is based on the difference between the high quartile and the low quartile of the E scale distribution. e.g., the D.P.<sub>E</sub> of 1.52 on Item 1 indicates that the mean of the low quartile on E was 1.52 points lower than the mean of the high quartile on E.

<sup>d</sup>For each item the sum of D.P.<sub>F</sub>+D.P.<sub>E</sub> is obtained. The final rank of an item is the rank of this sum in the distribution of sums for the whole scale.

goodness, had to be dropped in the early fall of 1945 because they had lost their war-period timeliness. More than this, experience had shown that when it came to working with highly diverse groups outside the University, a questionnaire shorter than Form 60 was highly desirable. The other scales having already been reduced to an absolute minimum, the F scale had now to bear some of the pruning. Yet, such pruning had to be extremely judicious if the scale was not to lose in comprehensiveness and if, as was hoped, its reliability and its correlation with E were to be raised. Thirty was the number of items decided upon.

Revision consisted mainly in discarding seven items and adding three new ones. Two excellent items were discarded because, as mentioned above, they were no longer timely. Five items were taken out because they had relatively very low D. P.'s and because other items seemed to fulfill the same functions better: 44 (Bosses outline, R. O. 33), 50 (Mistake to trust, R. O. 31), 30 (Feeble-minded, R. O. 30), 22 (Not everybody in government, R. O. 28), and 5 (Red-blooded American, R. O. 27). Several items which ranked low in terms of D. P. were thoroughly revised and kept in the new scale: 35 (Two classes, R. O. 34), 57 (Plots, R. O. 32), and 46 (Flood, R. O. 29).

One of the three new items was the following: "The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor." This is a slightly revised version of an item which appeared in the earlier forms of the PEC scale, where it had proved to be discriminatory both in terms of PEC and in terms of E. Since this item expresses rather well both conventionalism and anti-intracception, it appeared to be a promising addition to the F scale.

A second new item was, "It is best to use some prewar authorities in Germany to keep order and prevent chaos." At the time this item was formulated—late summer 1945—General Patton had been accused of using German Nazis and extremely conservative bigwigs to help carry out certain phases of the occupation. His critics argued that this was a poor way to secure the cooperation of democratic elements in Germany; his defenders pointed to the necessity for promoting efficiency and preventing chaos. The issue was a lively one; and it appeared that an item bearing upon it might give the high scorer a chance to express his admiration for military authority, his means-centeredness, his preoccupation with order vs. chaos. (That the item did not work very well is probably due to inadequate wording: we had not dared to be sufficiently explicit about *which* prewar authorities were to be used, so that "prewar" could be taken to mean "pre-Nazi.")

"Nobody ever learned anything really important except through suffering," was the third of the new items. Here the temptation—constantly present during each revision of the F scale—to test a new hypothesis, or better, to obtain quantitative data bearing upon a phenomenon which in clinical study had appeared in relation to the general pattern of potential fascism, became

TABLE 7 (VII)  
F-SCALE CLUSTERS: FORMS 45 AND 40

- a. *Conventionalism*: Rigid adherence to conventional, middle-class values.
1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
  12. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.
  37. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.
  41. The business man and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.
- b. *Authoritarian Submission*: Submissive, uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the ingroup.
1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
  4. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
  8. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
  21. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
  23. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.
  42. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.
  44. Nobody ever learned anything really important except through suffering.
- c. *Authoritarian Aggression*: Tendency to be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject, and punish people who violate conventional values.
12. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.
  13. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
  19. An insult to our honor should always be punished.
  25. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.
  27. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.
  34. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked, and feebleminded people.
  37. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.
  39. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

- d. *Anti-intracception*: Opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tender-minded.
9. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.
  31. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
  - ✓ 37. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.
  41. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.
- e. *Superstition and Stereotypy*: The belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate; the disposition to think in rigid categories.
4. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
  8. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
  16. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.
  - ✓ 26. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.
  29. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.
  33. Wars and social troubles may someday be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.
- f. *Power and "Toughness"*: Preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension; identification with power figures; overemphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego; exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness.
2. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.
  13. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
  19. An insult to our honor should always be punished.
  22. It is best to use some prewar authorities in Germany to keep order and prevent chaos.
  23. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.
  26. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.
  - ✓ 38. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.
- g. *Destructiveness and Cynicism*: Generalized hostility, vilification of the human.
6. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.
  43. Familiarity breeds contempt.

- h. *Projectivity*: The disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outwards of unconscious emotional impulses.
18. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself especially carefully against catching an infection or disease from them.
  31. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
  33. Wars and social troubles may someday be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.
  35. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.
  38. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.
- i. *Sex*: Exaggerated concern with sexual "goings-on."
- ✓25. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.
  35. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.
  39. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

too strong. The item was taken from an editorial in a prominent picture magazine, where it had appeared in a context of political reaction. It seemed well adapted to bring out the sado-masochistic theme believed to be prominent in the personality of the high scorer: he believes that he *has* suffered and, therefore, knows the important things and that those who have not succeeded in raising their status, i.e., the underprivileged, should suffer more if they hope to improve their lot. The item did not work very well, its rank in order of goodness for men being 29. (Its D. P., 1.70, is still significant at the 5 per cent level, however.) It seems that this was partly because many subjects thought it unreasonable (the mean was 2.54), and partly because, where it was agreed with, it probably appealed to different subjects for different reasons: if it tapped the deep-lying sado-masochistic structures in some high scorers, it also appealed to the surface masochism, and perhaps to the intraceptiveness, of some low scorers.

The final F items, grouped according to the variables to which they pertain, are presented in Table 7 (VII).

Reliability of the scale, mean score per item, S. D., and range for each of the fourteen groups (total N = 1518) taking Form 40 and/or 45 are given in Table 8 (VII). The average of the reliability coefficients is .90, their range .81 to .97. Not only is there a slight improvement in reliability over Form 60 (av.  $r = .87$ ) and a very marked improvement over the original Form 78

TABLE 8 (VII)

RELIABILITY OF THE F SCALE (FORMS 40 AND 45)

<u>Group</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Reliability</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S. D.</u>	<u>Range</u>
<i>Form 40:</i>					
George Washington Univ. Women	132	.84	3.51	.90	1.2 - 5.4
California Service Club Men	63	.94	4.08	1.03	1.8 - 7.0
Middle-Class Men	69	.92	3.69	1.22	1.3 - 6.7
Middle-Class Women	154	.93	3.62	1.26	1.1 - 6.7
Working-Class Men	61	.88	4.19	1.18	1.8 - 6.9
Working-Class Women	53	.97	3.86	1.67	1.3 - 6.6
Los Angeles Men	117	.92	3.68	1.17	1.1 - 6.0
Los Angeles Women	130	.91	3.49	1.13	1.2 - 5.8
Mean <sup>a</sup>	779	.91	3.76	1.20	1.3 - 6.4
<i>Form 45:</i>					
Testing Class Women	59	.89	3.62	.99	1.3 - 5.9
San Quentin Men Prisoners	110	.87	4.73	.86	2.0 - 6.8
Psychiatric Clinic Women <sup>b</sup>	71	.94	3.69	1.30	1.0 - 6.3
Psychiatric Clinic Men <sup>b</sup>	50	.89	3.82	1.01	1.7 - 5.9
Mean	290	.90	3.96	1.04	1.5 - 6.2
<i>Form 40 and Form 45:</i>					
Employment Service Men Veterans	106	.89	3.74	1.04	1.2 - 5.8
Maritime School Men	343	.81	4.06	.77	1.6 - 6.1
Mean <sup>a</sup>	449	.85	3.90	.90	1.4 - 5.9
Over-all mean	1518	.90	3.84	1.10	1.4 - 6.3

<sup>a</sup>In obtaining the combined group means, the individual group means were not weighted by N.

<sup>b</sup>Due to a substitution of forms, the F scale for the Psychiatric Clinic subjects contained only 28 items.

(av.  $r = .74$ ), but the scale has now been developed to a point where it meets rigorous statistical requirements. A reliability of .90 may be interpreted to mean that the scale can place individuals along a dimension—in this case a broad and complex dimension—with a small margin of error. In other words, the score attained by an individual can be relied upon in the sense that chance errors of measurement have been minimized, so that in a repetition of the scale, at a time when political-socioeconomic conditions were generally the

same as before, his new score would either be the same as his first or fall within narrow limits above or below it. The degree of reliability attained here is within the range which characterizes acceptable intelligence tests.

The means, though they vary from one group to another (a matter to be discussed later), are fairly close, on the whole, to the neural point. As is to be expected from administration of the scale to a great variety of subjects, the range and the S. D. are greater than in previous forms. While no distribution curves have actually been made, the scatter diagrams indicate that they would be fairly normal in form (symmetrical but slightly platykurtic).

a. INTERNAL CONSISTENCY. The Discriminatory Powers of the scale items, as shown in Table 9 (VII), are considerably higher on the average (2.85) than in the case of Form 60 (2.15). All of the items differentiate significantly between the high and the low quartiles. It is to be noted that numerous items taken over without change from Form 60 work much better here than in that instance. This is probably due in part to the fact that the diverse groups given Form 45-40 included more extreme scorers and in part to improvement of the scale as a whole: a good item differentiates the more sharply between the upper and lower quartiles the more successfully the total scale distinguishes individuals who are actually extreme with respect to the trends being measured.

The fact that the D. P.'s are somewhat higher, on the average, for women than for men is deserving of some comment. This phenomenon would seem to be connected with the fact that there were three groups of men—Maritime School, San Quentin Inmates, and Working-Class Men—in whose cases the reliability of the scale was relatively low (.81-.88). Since these groups of men were less educated than most of our subjects, there is considerable likelihood that they failed to understand some of the scale items, a circumstance that would work against high D. P.'s as well as against reliability. Moreover, these are the three groups who, of all those studied, obtained the highest mean scores. It can be inferred from this that there was too much general agreement with some of the items, something which, as we have seen, tends to lower the D. P. This raises the question of whether we did not encounter in these groups not only more extreme manifestations of potential fascism than had been anticipated but also patterns of prefascist personality trends that the F scale did not adequately cover. Most of the work that went into the construction and revision of the scale was performed with groups of subjects in which the high scorers were, in the main, highly conventional. The procedure of retaining items which differentiated best within these groups was probably not the best one for constructing an instrument which would work with maximum efficiency in groups where tendencies to psychopathy and delinquency were much more pronounced. This is a matter to be discussed in more detail later.

Despite the absolute differences in the D. P.'s between men and women,

TABLE 9 (VII)

MEANS AND DISCRIMINATORY POWERS OF THE F-SCALE ITEMS (FORMS 40 AND 45)<sup>a</sup>

Item	Men's Groups			Women's Groups			Men and Women Combined			
	Mean	Rank	D. P.	Mean	Rank	D. P.	Mean	Rank	D. P.	
1. (Obedience & respect)	5.41	(1)	2.70	4.67	(4)	3.91	5.04	(2)	3.31	(6.5)
2. (Will power)	5.16	(4)	2.48	4.94	(1)	2.67	5.05	(1)	2.58	(22)
3. (Science)	4.20	(15)	2.55	4.32	(16)	2.89	4.26	(11)	2.72	(17)
4. (War and conflict)	4.69	(7)	2.32	4.26	(22.5)	2.98	4.48	(6)	2.65	(19)
6. (Supernatural power)	3.47	(22)	3.19	3.43	(18)	3.92	3.45	(20)	3.56	(4)
8. (Cheerful things)	3.80	(18)	2.52	3.71	(15)	3.14	3.76	(17)	2.83	(16)
9. (Bad manners)	5.22	(2)	1.77	4.80	(3)	2.60	5.01	(3.5)	2.19	(26.5)
12. (Discipline & determination)	4.59	(8)	3.60	4.03	(11)	4.03	4.31	(10)	3.82	(2)
13. (Born with urge)	3.75	(19)	2.54	3.25	(19)	2.47	3.50	(19)	2.51	(24)
16. (Infection and disease)	4.53	(10)	2.82	4.13	(10)	3.52	4.33	(9)	3.17	(8.5)
18. (Honor)	3.50	(21)	2.74	3.11	(25)	3.12	3.31	(22)	2.93	(14)
19. (Rebellious ideas)	4.71	(6)	3.04	4.14	(9)	3.72	4.43	(7)	3.38	(5)
21. (Germany)	4.26	(14)	1.98	3.74	(14)	2.40	4.00	(14.5)	2.19	(26.5)
22. (Devoted leaders)	5.18	(3)	2.32	4.84	(2)	2.87	5.01	(3.5)	2.60	(21)
25/24. (Sex crimes)	4.54	(9)	3.68	4.29	(7)	4.32	4.41	(8)	4.00	(1)
26/25. (Weak and strong)	3.05	(26)	2.94	3.21	(20)	3.39	2.77	(26)	3.17	(8.5)
27/26. (Undying love)	4.09	(16)	3.76	3.21	(20)	3.66	3.65	(18)	3.71	(3)
29/27. (Astrology)	3.31	(24)	2.79	3.16	(22.5)	3.33	3.24	(24)	3.06	(11)
30/28. (Force to preserve)	2.92	(27)	2.54	2.47	(27.5)	2.73	2.70	(27)	2.64	(20)
31/29. (Prying)	4.34	(12)	2.98	3.66	(16)	3.02	4.00	(14.5)	3.00	(12)
33/30. (Earthquake)	2.58	(28)	1.76	2.59	(26)	2.19	2.59	(28)	1.98	(29)
34/31. (Immoral people)	3.38	(23)	2.90	3.16	(22.5)	2.85	2.27	(23)	2.88	(15)
35/32. (Wild sex life)	4.04	(17)	2.48	3.60	(17)	2.93	3.27	(16)	2.71	(18)
37/33. (Talk less)	4.88	(5)	2.84	4.59	(5)	3.10	4.74	(5)	2.97	(13)
38/34. (Plots)	4.32	(13)	1.97	3.99	(12)	2.54	4.16	(12)	2.26	(25)
39/35. (Homosexuals)	3.10	(25)	3.25	2.67	(24)	3.36	2.89	(25)	3.31	(6.5)
41/36. (Artists-businessmen)	2.36	(30)	1.58	1.88	(30)	1.88	2.12	(30)	1.73	(30)
42/37. (No sane person)	4.42	(11)	3.13	3.85	(13)	3.18	4.14	(13)	3.16	(10)
43/38. (Familiarity)	3.56	(20)	2.20	3.20	(21)	2.90	3.38	(21)	2.55	(23)
44/39. (Suffering)	2.54	(29)	1.70	2.47	(27.5)	2.29	2.51	(29)	2.00	(28)
Mean/person/item	4.00		2.64	3.63		3.08	3.81		2.85	

<sup>a</sup>These data are based on all fourteen groups taking Forms 40 and 45 (see Table 8 (VII)).

items which work well for one sex tend, in general, to work well for the other. The correlation between the D. P. rank orders for the men and those for the women is .84. This is sufficient justification for averaging the D. P.'s of the two groups to obtain an over-all "order of goodness" for each item. Since the differences between men and women, in the present context, are probably as great as the differences between any two groups of the same sex in the present sample, it is highly probable that a correlation between the D. P. rankings of any two such groups would be in the neighborhood of .84. There appear to be no general or systematic differences between the items which work better for men and those which work better for women.

Mean scores for the men's groups are somewhat higher on the average than mean scores for the women's groups. This phenomenon would seem to be due primarily to the three male groups discussed above whose scores are particularly high. If men and women of the same socioeconomic class are compared, the means are not significantly different. Moreover, items which appeal most strongly to the men are much the same as those which appeal most strongly to the women, the rank-order correlation between the means for men and those for women being .95.

b. CORRELATIONAL ANALYSIS. As a part of an independent investigation, the E, PEC, and F scales (from Forms 40 and 45) were administered to 900 students in an Elementary Psychology Class at the University of California. It was decided not to include the data from this new college group among the general results of the present study because the total sample of subjects was already weighted too heavily on the side of young and relatively well-educated people. However, the 517 women from this psychology class constitute the only group in whose case the scales were subjected to an item-by-item correlational analysis.<sup>4</sup> The results of this analysis will be summarized here.

Each item of the F scale was correlated with every other item. The average of the 435 coefficients was .13, the range  $-.05$  to  $.44$ .<sup>5</sup> In addition, each item was correlated with the remainder of the scale, the mean  $r$  here being .33, the range  $.15$  to  $.52$ . In the case of the E scale the mean interitem  $r$  was  $.42$ , and the mean item-total score  $r$ ,  $.59$ . Whereas the E scale has about the same degree of unidimensionality as do acceptable intelligence tests (in the case of the 1937 Stanford-Binet Revision the average interitem  $r$  is about  $.38$ , the average item-total score  $r$ ,  $.61$ ), the F scale rates considerably lower in this regard. Despite the scale's relative lack of surface homogeneity, however, we are justified in speaking of an F pattern or syndrome, for the items do "hang together" in the sense that each is significantly correlated with the

<sup>4</sup> This analysis was made possible by a Grant-in-aid from the Social Science Research Council.

<sup>5</sup> Fisher's  $Z_r$  was used in computing the average  $r$ .

scale as a whole. It will be recalled in this connection that in constructing the F scale two purposes were held in mind: (a) to seek over a wide area for diverse responses that belonged to a single syndrome, and (b) to construct an instrument which would yield a reliable prediction of scores on E. It is clear that the first purpose has been in large part realized, although the search for additional items that would help characterize the F syndrome could be continued with profit. The fact that the individual F items correlate .25 on the average with the total E scale augurs well for the fulfillment of the second purpose—a matter to which we shall turn in a moment.

Proof that the variables or groups of items used in thinking about the F scale are not clusters in the statistical sense, is contained in the data from the present group of 517 women. Although the items within each of the Form 45 F-clusters tend to intercorrelate (.11 to .24), the items in any one cluster correlate with one another no better than they do with numerous items from other clusters. We are justified in using these clusters, therefore, only as *a priori* aids to discussion.

#### D. CORRELATIONS OF THE F SCALE WITH E AND WITH PEC

Correlations of F with the E and PEC scales, based on the three questionnaire forms and derived from all the groups used in the study, are shown in Table 10 (VII). The major result expressed in this table is that the correlation between E and F has increased with the successive revisions of the scale until it has reached a point (about .75 on the average in Forms 40, 45) where scores on the former can be predicted with fair accuracy from scores on the latter.

The correlation between F and E varies rather widely from one group to another, a matter that seems to depend mainly upon the reliability of the scales themselves.<sup>6</sup> Thus, in the San Quentin group, where the reliability of F is .87 and that of E only .65, the correlation between the two scales is at the lowest, .59; while in the case of the Working-Class Women, where the reliability of F climbs to .97,<sup>7</sup> the correlation is at its maximum, .87. It is obvious, therefore, that if the reliabilities of the two scales were increased (which can be done by increasing the number of items within each) the

<sup>6</sup> The correlation between E and F does not seem to depend upon whether the two scales are administered at different times, or at the same time with items from the one scale interspersed among those of the other. The correlation obtained in the case of the University of Oregon Student Women, who were given Form 60 in two parts, is not only similar to that obtained, with the use of the regular Form 60, in the case of the University of Oregon and University of California Student Women, but it is virtually the same as the mean E.F. correlation for all groups of subjects.

<sup>7</sup> The reliability of the "A" half of the E scale, which was given as a part of Form 40 to that group, was not calculated.

TABLE 10 (VII)

CORRELATIONS OF THE F SCALE WITH THE A-S, E, AND PEC SCALES IN THE  
SEVERAL FORMS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

	N	F.A-S	F.E	F.PEC
<i>Groups taking Form 78:</i>				
Public Speaking Class Women	140	.55	.58	.52
Public Speaking Class Men	52	.52	.56	.45
Extension Class Women	40	.49	.74	.54
Professional Women	63	.57	.73	.65
Over-all <sup>a</sup> : Form 78	295	.53	.65	.54
<i>Groups taking Form 60:</i>				
Univ. of Oregon Student Women	47		.72	.29
Univ. of Oregon and Univ. of California Student Women	54		.78	.49
Univ. of Oregon and Univ. of California Student Men	57		.58	.43
Oregon Service Club Men	68		.69	.29
Oregon Service Club Men <sup>b</sup>	60			.22
Over-all: Form 60	286		.69	.34
<i>Groups taking Form 45:</i>				
Testing Class Women	59		.79	.54
San Quentin Men Prisoners	110		.59	.23
Psychiatric Clinic Women	71		.86	.62 <sup>c</sup>
Psychiatric Clinic Men	50		.76	.57 <sup>c</sup>
Working-Class Men and Women	50		.85	.70
Employment Service Men Veterans	51		.67	.62 <sup>d</sup>
Maritime School Men	179		.56	.39 <sup>d</sup>
Over-all: Form 45	570		.73	.52
<i>Groups taking Form 40<sup>e</sup>:</i>				
George Washington Univ. Women	132		.69	.53
California Service Club Men	63		.80	.59
Middle-Class Men	69		.81	.71
Working-Class Men	61		.76	.60
Middle-Class Women	154		.83	.70
Working-Class Women	53		.87	.72
Los Angeles Men	117		.82	.58
Los Angeles Women	130		.75	.61
Employment Service Men Veterans	55		.72	.62
Maritime School Men	165		.62	.39
Over-all: Form 40	999		.77	.61
Over-all: All Forms	2150	.53	.73	.52

<sup>a</sup>In obtaining the over-all group means, the individual group means were not weighted by N.

<sup>b</sup>This group of Oregon Service Club Men received a short questionnaire form containing only the F scale and half of the PEC scale.

<sup>c</sup>For the correlations of F with PEC in the Psychiatric Clinic groups, the number of women was 45, the number of men 29, due to a substitution of forms.

<sup>d</sup>These F-PEC correlations are based on both Forms 40 and 45. Since it was considered highly unlikely that the presence or absence of 5 E items would affect the correlation of F and PEC, the two forms are taken together in order to have the advantage of the larger N's. The total N is 106 for the Employment Service Men Veterans, 343 for the Maritime School Men.

<sup>e</sup>In Form 40, it will be recalled, only the "A" half of the 10-item E scale was used.

correlation between E and F would be very high indeed.<sup>8</sup> This is not to say, however, that E and F for all practical purposes measure the same thing. A correlation of .775 means that about two-thirds of the subjects who score in the high quartile on the one scale, score in the high quartile on the other, and that there are practically no reversals, i.e., cases in which a subject is high on one scale but low on the other. If one wished to use the F scale alone in order to single out subjects who were practically certain to be highly ethnocentric, i.e., in the high quartile on the present E scale, it would be necessary for him to limit himself to those scoring at the very highest extreme on F, perhaps the top 10 per cent. As pointed out earlier, there are reasons why some discrepancy between the two scales should be expected. Surely there are some individuals who have the kind of susceptibility to fascist propaganda with which the F scale is concerned but who for one reason or another tend to inhibit expressions of hostility against minority groups (subjects high on F but low on E). And we have good reason to believe that there are other people who rather freely repeat the clichés of ethnocentrism—perhaps in accordance with the climate of opinion in which they are living—without this being expressive of deep-lying trends in their personalities (subjects high on E but low on F). Such “exceptions” will be taken up in more detail later.

It is to be noted that the correlation between F and E is slightly higher on the average in the case of groups taking Form 40 than for groups taking Form 45. This means that F correlates slightly better with the A half of the E scale than with the total E scale, and that the correlation must be still lower in the case of the B half of the scale. In several groups taking Form 45 the correlations of  $E_A$  and of  $E_B$  with F were calculated, in addition to the correlation of total E with F. The results appear in Table 11 (VII). In each

TABLE 11 (VII)

CORRELATIONS OF THE F SCALE WITH EACH HALF AND WITH  
THE WHOLE OF THE E SCALE

<u>Group</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Correlations</u>		
		$E_A \cdot F$	$E_B \cdot F$	$E_{A+B} \cdot F$
San Quentin Men Prisoners	110	.56	.45	.59
Employment Service Men Veterans	51	.66	.61	.67
Maritime School Men	179	.61	.40	.56
Testing Class Women	59	.77	.66	.79
Mean		.65	.53	.65

<sup>8</sup> The correlation coefficient which, theoretically, would result if two scales were perfectly reliable, i.e., if the average obtained  $r$  were corrected for attenuation, is about .9. This indicates a striking correspondence, though not a complete identity, of what is measured by the two scales.

group  $E_{A.F}$  is notably higher than  $E_{B.F}$ , and about the same as  $E_{A+B.F}$ . It may be recalled that the A half of the scale refers to highly generalized ethnocentrism and contains no A-S items, while the B half is made up of four A-S items and one Negro item. It happened that this Negro item was a relatively poor one in the statistical sense (rank order, 5 for men, 10 for women), but this is not enough to account for the superiority of the  $E_{A.F}$  correlations. It seems, rather, that the F syndrome is actually more closely related to general ethnocentrism than to anti-Semitism. This is in keeping with the finding, reported earlier, that in Form 78 the F scale correlated more highly with the E scale than with the A-S scale. Although anti-Semitism is still to be understood primarily as an aspect of general ethnocentrism, there can be no doubt but that it has some special features of its own. Some of these features are described in Chapter XVI.

The F syndrome bears only a moderately close relation to politico-economic conservatism, the average correlation for Forms 45 and 40 being .57. Our interpretation is that high scores on PEC may proceed either from genuine conservatism or from pseudoconservatism, and that it is the latter which is most expressive of the personality trends which the F scale measures. This is in keeping with the finding that E, which is closely related to F, also shows only moderate correlation with PEC. The E.PEC correlation is about the same as the F.PEC correlation. It would appear that general ethnocentrism, as measured by the present scales, is mainly an expression of those personality structures which the F scale measures; politico-economic conservatism, while it may have this same source, may be more dependent than E upon factors in the individual's contemporary situation.

#### E. DIFFERENCES IN MEAN F-SCALE SCORE AMONG VARIOUS GROUPS

We may turn now to a consideration of the mean F-scale scores of different groups. These means have been set forth in Table 12 (VII). It is well to recall here what was stated at the beginning (Chapter I, C), that since no steps were taken to insure that each group studied was actually representative of a larger section of the population, we are in no position to generalize from the present results on mean scores, however suggestive they might be. (A large-scale community study would be necessary in order to produce a sound estimate of the relative amounts of fascist potential in different sections of the general population. The F scale, we believe, is worthy to be used in such a study, though it would have to be modified somewhat in order to be suitable for groups with little education.) It seems well to recall, too, that the group with which a subject filled out the questionnaire does not necessarily represent a group membership that is significant for the present study. The differences with which we are here concerned are not very large,

TABLE 12 (VII)

MEAN F-SCALE SCORES OF GROUPS  
TAKING THE SEVERAL FORMS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Group	N	Mean	S. D.
<i>Form 78:</i>			
Public Speaking Class Women	140	3.94	.71
Public Speaking Class Men	52	3.72	.57
Extension Class Women	40	3.75	.70
Professional Women	63	3.43	.86
Over-all mean, Form 78	295	3.71	.71
<i>Form 60:</i>			
Univ. of Oregon Student Women	47	3.32	.86
Univ. of Oregon and Univ. of California Student Women	54	3.39	.96
Univ. of Oregon and Univ. of California Student Men	57	3.82	.93
Oregon Service Club Men	68	3.74	.81
Oregon Service Club Men (A Form only)	60	3.25	.71
Over-all mean, Form 60	286	3.50	.85
<i>Form 45:</i>			
Testing Class Women	59	3.62	.99
San Quentin Men Prisoners	110	4.73	.86
Psychiatric Clinic Women	71	3.69	1.30
Psychiatric Clinic Men	50	3.82	1.01
Over-all mean, Form 45	290	3.96	1.04
<i>Form 40:</i>			
George Washington Univ. Women	132	3.51	.90
California Service Club Men	63	4.08	1.03
Middle-Class Women	154	3.62	1.26
Middle-Class Men	69	3.69	1.22
Working-Class Women	53	3.86	1.67
Working-Class Men	61	4.19	1.18
Los Angeles Women	130	3.49	1.13
Los Angeles Men	117	3.68	1.17
Over-all mean, Form 40	779	3.76	1.20
<i>Forms 40 and 45:</i>			
Employment Service Men Veterans	106	3.74	1.04
Maritime School Men	343	4.06	.77
Over-all mean, Forms 40 and 45	449	3.90	.90
Over-all mean, Four Forms (78, 60, 45, 40):	2099	3.78	

while the variability within each group is marked. Only rarely is the difference between two groups greater than one S. D. In our view, we should find large group differences in mean F score only when membership in a group has some psychological significance, and this does not seem to be true of most of the present groups. (A study of the F-scale score in relation to group membership factors such as those covered by page 1 of the questionnaire [income, religion, etc.] would probably be rewarding. In view of the high correlation between F and E we should expect results generally similar to those found in the case of the latter scale, but discrepancies would be particularly interesting.) Nevertheless, some important sociological and psychological differences among the present groups are known to exist—indeed some of these groups have been described as “key” groups—and, if the F scale is valid, we should expect differences in mean score that are intelligible in the light of our general theory.

Of all the fourteen groups taking Form 40-45, the San Quentin Inmates obtained the highest mean score, 4.73. This mean is significantly different (C. R. = 3.2) from that of the next highest scoring group, the Working-Class Men, whose mean is 4.19. Between the San Quentin group and the lowest scoring group of men (Los Angeles Men,  $M = 3.68$ ) the difference is very marked (C. R. = 7.8). In view of all that has been written concerning the close affinity of criminality and fascism, these results should not be surprising. Since the findings on the “key” San Quentin group are analyzed in detail in Chapter XXI, further discussion here is unnecessary.

Service Club Men and Working-Class Men do not differ significantly in mean F score. This will come as a surprise only to those who have become accustomed to explaining all important differences in social attitudes on the basis of socioeconomic group membership, and who look to the working man as the main carrier of liberal ideas. It is true, of course, as a matter of economic and social fact, that the crucial role in the struggle against increasing concentration of economic power will have to be played by the working people, acting in accordance with their self-interest, but it is foolhardy to underestimate the susceptibility to fascist propaganda within these masses themselves. For our part, we see no reason to suppose that the authoritarian structures with which we are concerned would be any less well developed in the working class than in other segments of the population. If it be argued that our sample of working-class men might be an unusually reactionary one, the answer is that approximately half of this sample come either from the militantly “liberal” United Electrical Workers Union (C.I.O.) or from classes at the California Labor School, and that there is no reason to suppose that men from the United Seaman’s Service or new members of the I.L.W.U.—who constitute the remainder of the sample—are more conservative than working men generally. For that matter, the extremely high scoring San Quentin Inmates come in very large part from the working class, and there

is good reason to suppose that their general outlook depends upon their background as well as upon the circumstance of their being in prison.

It appears that differences among the present groups of men depend more upon the factor of contact with liberal organizations and liberal thought than upon socioeconomic group membership. This is the basis on which we would explain the relatively low means of the Middle-Class Men (3.69) and the Los Angeles Men (3.68), both of which are significantly different (beyond the 5 per cent level) from that of the Service Club Men (4.08). The Middle-Class Men and the Service Club Men are quite similar with respect to economic and occupational status; the difference between them that is reflected in their F-scale mean lies, most probably, in whatever it is that disposes the former to appear at a meeting of the P.T.A. or the layman's league of a Presbyterian Church or at evening classes at the California Labor School, and the latter at a Service Club luncheon. This, in our opinion, is primarily a psychological matter; the difference lies in the degree of something which may be labeled, for the moment, a disposition toward liberalism or progressivism or humanitarianism. The Los Angeles Men, it will be recalled, were recruited primarily from the University and the movie communities. Thus, though their socioeconomic status was certainly no lower than that of the Service Club Men in the San Francisco area, the setting in which they were found was one of greater liberalism. The Maritime School Group, made up predominantly of men with working-class and lower middle-class antecedents who are out to raise their status, belongs on the basis of its mean (4.06) with the Service Club Men and the Working-Class Men, while the Psychiatric Clinic Men ( $M = 3.82$ ) and the Employment Service Veterans ( $M = 3.74$ ), who probably are more heterogeneous with respect to either class status or liberal affiliations, have intermediate positions in the rank order of means.

It has been pointed out that the fact of the men in our total sample having a higher mean than the women is due primarily to the presence in the male sample of the outstandingly high scoring groups that have just been considered. The present data show that where social group membership is constant, the means for men are not significantly different from those of women. Thus, in the case of the Working-Class Women and the Working-Class Men, the C. R. is only 1.22, while the differences between men and women in the Psychiatric Clinic, the Los Angeles and the Middle-Class groups are practically negligible. It is to be noted, however, that in each case the men are slightly higher, and that in a larger sample the difference might become significant.

Among the women's groups, the only difference that approaches significance is that existing between the Working-Class Women ( $M = 3.86$ ), on the one hand, and the George Washington University Women ( $M = 3.51$ ) and Los Angeles Women ( $M = 3.49$ ) on the other. If a true difference exists,

the explanation would seem to be the same as that advanced in the case of some of the men's groups: that the latter groups of women have been in closer touch with liberal trends.

It is of some interest to consider group differences in mean F score in relation to the mean E score of these same groups. In general, groups that score highest on F tend to score highest on E also. The most notable discrepancies occur in the cases of the George Washington Women, who are relatively much higher on E ( $M = 4.04$ ) than on F ( $M = 3.51$ ), and the Working-Class Men, who are slightly higher on F ( $M = 4.19$ ) than on E ( $M = 3.92$ ). It seems probable that in the case of this group of women, we have to deal with a regional difference: many observers have noted that there is more prejudice in the East than in the West. It may be, therefore, that although these college women were relatively liberal as a group, they were led by the prevailing climate of opinion to go fairly high on E. This is in keeping with the fact that the correlation between F and E in this group was one of the lowest obtained.

The group of Working-Class Men is the only one in which the mean E score is lower than the mean F score. This is probably attributable to the success of indoctrination in antidiscrimination which occurs in the "liberal" unions to which a majority of these subjects belong. Apparently, however, this indoctrination did not go so far as to modify those attitudes centering around authoritarianism, which are more pronounced in this group than in most others. One might say that if this indoctrination were dispensed with, or if propaganda having an opposite direction were substituted for it, then the results from this group would fall into line with all the others.

It has often been suggested that working-class people are relatively uninhibited in expressing the prejudice that they have and that this does not go very deep, while middle-class people are more restrained in giving vent to their—often deeper—prejudice. That nothing to support this formulation is to be found in the present data may be due most largely to the fact that our ethnocentric statements were for the most part fairly restrained, i.e., formulated in such a way that a pseudodemocratic person could agree with them and still maintain the illusion that he was not prejudiced.

#### F. VALIDATION BY CASE STUDIES: THE F-SCALE RESPONSES OF MACK AND LARRY

The responses of Mack and Larry on the F scale may now be compared with their remarks in the interview. In Table 13 (VII) are shown the scores of Mack and Larry, the group mean, and the D. P. for each of the 38 items in the F scale (Form 78), the items having been grouped according to the scheme of F-scale variables.

The mean F-scale scores of the two men seem to be in keeping with the

TABLE 13 (VII)

## RESPONSES OF MACK AND LARRY ON THE F SCALE (FORM 78)

Item	Mack	Larry	Group	Group
			Mean <sup>a</sup>	D.P. <sup>a</sup>
(N = 295)				
<i>Conventionalism</i>				
12. (Modern church)	5	7	4.67	0.19
19. (One should avoid)	2	1	3.63	0.76
38. (Emphasis in the colleges)	5	2	3.91	1.20
55. (Leisure)	7	6	5.20	2.11
58. (What a man does)	6	1	3.48	1.70
60. (Important values)	5	5	4.17	1.60
Cluster mean	5.00	3.66	4.18	1.26
<i>Authoritarian Submission</i>				
20. (Progressive education)	3	1	3.28	1.07
23. (Undying love)	6	7	3.62	2.61
32. (Essential for learning)	7	6	3.61	1.67
39. (Supernatural force)	1	1	3.97	2.54
43. (Sciences like chemistry)	1	2	4.35	2.79
50. (Obedience and respect)	6	2	3.72	3.09
74. (Tireless leaders)	2	1	5.00	1.66
77. (No sane, normal person)	6	5	4.12	2.12
Cluster mean	4.00	3.13	3.96	2.19
<i>Authoritarian Aggression</i>				
6. (Women restricted)	2	1	2.93	1.75
23. (Undying love)	6	7	3.62	2.61
31. (Homosexuals)	6	6	3.22	2.16
47. (Honor)	5	2	3.00	2.09
75. (Sex crimes)	6	1	3.26	2.81
Cluster mean	5.00	3.40	3.21	2.28
<i>Anti-intrapection</i>				
28. (Novels or stories)	5	1	3.02	1.29
38. (Emphasis in colleges)	5	2	3.91	1.20
53. (Things too intimate)	3	5	4.82	1.99
55. (Leisure)	7	6	5.20	2.11
58. (What a man does)	6	1	3.48	1.70
66. (Books and movies)	6	2	4.10	2.48
Cluster mean	5.33	2.83	4.09	1.80
<i>Superstition</i>				
2. (Astrology)	5	6	2.60	1.74
10. (Pearl Harbor Day)	1	1	2.22	2.20
39. (Supernatural force)	1	1	3.97	2.54
43. (Sciences like chemistry)	1	2	4.35	2.79
65. (World catastrophe)	1	1	2.58	1.55
Cluster mean	1.80	2.20	3.78	1.70

TABLE 13 (VII) (CONT'D)

Item	Mack	Larry	Group	Group
			Mean <sup>a</sup>	D.P. <sup>a</sup>
(N = 295)				
<i>Power and "Toughness"</i>				
9. (Red-blooded life)	1	2	3.99	2.04
35. (Law in own hands)	1	1	2.50	1.42
47. (Honor)	5	2	3.00	2.09
70. (Plots)	7	2	3.27	1.65
74. (Tireless leaders)	2	1	5.00	1.66
Cluster mean	3.20	1.60	3.55	1.77
<i>Destructiveness and Cynicism</i>				
3. (Force to restore)	3	5	3.04	1.98
9. (Return to fundamentals)	1	2	3.99	2.04
14. (Rats...germs)	6	5	4.44	1.60
17. (Familiarity)	3	1	3.33	1.86
24. (Things unstable)	5	5	5.01	0.79
30. (Reports of atrocities)	6	5	4.20	0.43
35. (Law in own hands)	1	1	2.50	1.42
42. (For one reason)	1	1	2.06	1.05
56. (Crime wave)	5	5	4.60	1.16
59. (Always war)	7	1	4.26	2.59
67. (Eye to profit)	7	3	3.71	2.21
Cluster mean	4.09	3.09	3.74	1.56
<i>Projectivity</i>				
46. (Sex orgies)	5	2	3.64	2.11
56. (Crime wave)	5	5	4.60	1.16
65. (World catastrophe)	1	1	2.58	1.55
70. (Plots)	7	2	3.27	1.65
73. (Infection and disease)	5	1	4.79	2.02
Cluster mean	4.60	2.20	3.78	1.70
<i>Sex</i>				
31. (Homosexuality)	6	6	3.22	2.16
42. (For one reason)	1	1	2.06	1.05
46. (Sex orgies)	5	2	3.64	2.11
75. (Sex crimes)	6	1	3.26	2.81
Cluster mean	4.50	2.50	3.05	2.03
Over-all mean <sup>b</sup>	4.31	2.95	3.71	1.80

<sup>a</sup>The group means and D.P.'s are based on all four groups taking Form 78 (see Table 3 (VII), note<sup>a</sup>)

<sup>b</sup>Over-all means are based on the sum of the 38 individual items, with no overlap.

earlier observation that they do not represent the most extreme cases found in the study. Mack's mean score, 4.31, is just inside the high quartile for the group of Public Speaking Men in which he was tested; it is only slightly above the average score of the Working-Class Men (4.19) and well below that of the San Quentin Group (4.73). Larry's mean score, 2.95, is barely low enough to be included in the low quartile for the Public Speaking Men. It is, however, well below any of the group means obtained in the study.

Turning to the 9 variables within the scale, it may be noted that on 7 of them Mack's mean score is above the group mean. He deviates from the group most markedly in the case of Authoritarian Aggression. This is consistent with what was set down as one of the outstanding features of his interview, that is, his tendency to blame and to condemn on moral grounds a wide variety of individuals, groups, and agencies—F.D.R., the New Deal, the O.W.I., the Civil Service, in addition to various ethnic minorities. That homosexuals, sex criminals, those who insult "our honor," and anyone who does not have undying love for his parents should be regarded in the same way is not surprising. It is to be noted, however, that he does not agree that "women should be restricted in certain ways." This inconsistency may be interpreted in the light of the following quotation from the clinical section of his interview:<sup>9</sup>

"I hope to get married to the girl I'm going with now. She is an awfully nice companion. Most girls are interested only in a good time and want fellows with lots of money to spend. I didn't have the money for giving them a swell time. The girl I'm in love with now lived nine miles from me. She attended a rival high school. I dated her once in high school. When I got back from the army, I worked in a lumber mill. This girl had graduated from \_\_\_\_\_ and started teaching. Her uncle is the vice-president of the bank. I talked to him about buying an automobile that she was interested in. I looked it over for her, since I knew something about cars, and told her it was in good condition. I got started going with her that way. I found out that she wasn't interested in money, but was interested in me in spite of my discharge from the army, my poor health, and prospects. She's just very good—not beautiful, but a tremendously nice personality. She is French with some Irish in her. She has a nice figure and is very wholesome. When we get married depends on circumstances. It's quite a responsibility. She wants to get married now; she is teaching in \_\_\_\_\_. I'm under the GI Bill. If I get assurance of four years in college, I might get married this spring. We're well suited; I know she's interested in me, because I have so little to offer. We're both at the proper age. I intend to work part time. I don't like her teaching; I like to support my wife. I've always had that idea. But maybe under the circumstances, that won't be fully possible. She is a good cook and that is an asset, what with my stomach condition. When I tell her that you approve of our marriage, she will be pleased, but, of course, I'm always a man to make my own decisions."

It seems that Mack does believe that "a woman's place is in the home," but

<sup>9</sup> Throughout the book, the interviewer's report of the interview is given in small type. Quotation marks within this material indicate a verbatim record of the subject's statements.

was prevented by the logic of his situation at the time from saying so in his questionnaire.

Sex, Anti-intracception, Conventionalism, and Projectivity, in the order named, are the other variables on which Mack is well above the group mean. Sex was not mentioned in the interview protocol given in Chapter II. The following quotation from the clinical part of Mack's interview may, however, throw some light on his responses to the Sex items in the scale:

(Where did you get your sex instruction?) "I never had any from my parents, though I did get some suggestions from my aunt; no real instruction. What I know I have picked up from reading. I've listened to men talk, but accepted little of it; I weighed it in the light of what I have read."

(What was your first sex experience?) "It was in 1940-'41, the aftermath of a New Year's party in Washington. There was liquor. I was always a backward boy."

According to well-supported theory, it is precisely the kind of sexual inhibition and "backwardness" described here, and further expressed in the extreme conventionalism of the passage about plans for marriage, that lies behind the moralistic and punitive attitude toward the supposed sexuality of other people which is the main theme of the Sex items in the scale. The inconsistency seen in Mack's disagreement with the statement that "men are interested in women for only one reason" might be explained in the same way as was his response to Item 6 (Women restricted): agreement would contradict too sharply the facts of his present situation. It is to be noted, however, that the item (For one reason) has a very low group mean and a low D. P.

Mack's interview could serve well as a model of Anti-intracception. His emphasis upon practicality, efficiency, and diligence as ends in themselves, his tendency to ignore social and psychological determinants of human characteristics and human events, his failure to take into account possible inner sources of his opinions, the discrepancies between his expressed values and what appear to be his real motives, were outstanding features of his interview. The several Anti-intracception items of the F scale seem to have afforded him an excellent opportunity to express these same tendencies. An interesting discrepancy occurs in the case of Item 53 (Things too intimate), where his score of 3 is well below the group mean. This response is not very consistent with the pattern of values that he sets forth in his interview, but it seems quite consistent with what he *does* in the interview: as the above passage in which he discusses his approaching marriage well illustrates, he is able within the space of an hour to come to a rather free discussion of certain intimate matters with a stranger. True, his generally deferential behavior in the interview is probably an aspect of his Authoritarian Submission, but, more than this, there is a strong indication that however much Mack may assert his independence he is really a rather lonesome and troubled young man who would like to talk with someone who understood him.

One familiar with Mack's interview might have expected him to go higher on Conventionalism. One of his major reasons for rejecting so many groups is that they violate conventional values, and his positive evaluations of in-groups are in the same terms—honesty, charity, thrift, diligence, etc. His ideas about work and about love and marriage seem to be utterly conventional. True, his mean score for Conventionalism is as high as it is for any other variable save Anti-intraception, and one reason why he does not stand out more sharply from the group is that the group mean itself is high—higher than for any of the other variables. Furthermore, the Conventionalism items, as a group, were not very discriminating, the mean D. P., 1.26, being the lowest of those obtained for the several variables. Item 19 (One should avoid), on which Mack's score is below the group mean, does not discriminate between the high and low quartiles; that he should not agree with it seems consistent with his expressed value for independence. It is interesting that despite his rejection of religion in the interview, he refuses to criticize the modern church when invited to do so by Item 12. His conventionalism will not allow him to attack so well-established an institution.

From Mack's interview (Chapter II) we inferred that one reason he accuses various groups and agencies of wishing to establish a closely cohesive and selfishly exploitive ingroup was that he wished to do the same thing himself; unable to justify such antisocial wishes, he sees them as existing not in himself but in the world around him. This is projectivity in a rather extreme form, and if Mack had not gone above the group mean on this variable, in his scale responses, we should have had to conclude that something was radically wrong with the scale. His score of 7 on Item 70 (Plot) seems perfectly in keeping with what he had to say about politics in his interview. His responses to Items 46 (Sex orgies) and 73 (Infection and disease) are consistent with the picture of sexual inhibition given above. That he is well below the group mean on Item 65 (World catastrophe) seems attributable to the value for hard-headed scientificness which he expressed both in his interview and in his response to items under the heading of Superstition. It is notable that his scientific "realism" does not insure that he keeps his feet on the ground when it comes to interpreting social events. (Indeed, it seems to have the opposite effect, and one might inquire if this is not generally true.)

Mack stands only slightly above the group mean on Destructiveness and Cynicism. This is a reminder of the fact that his interview leaves the impression of a relatively "mild case"; he makes no rabid statements, nor does he show any taste for violence. Attention to the individual items of the Destructiveness and Cynicism group shows that it is those pertaining to open or all-out aggression on which he scores at or below the mean, while he goes well above the mean on items that have to do primarily with cynicism. It is interesting to recall, in this connection, his outstandingly high score on

**Authoritarian Aggression.** One might say that Mack cannot express aggression directly unless it is done in the name of some moral authority or unless it is against some group that has been rejected on moral grounds.

It might be suggested that another way in which Mack handles aggression is by means of cynicism. There was certainly no want of cynicism in his interview—the bureaus grab power, the civil servants think only of themselves, Roosevelt selfishly seeks a fourth term, etc.—and he obtains top scores on the items most expressive of this trend: 30 (Reports of atrocities), 59 (Always war), 67 (Eye to profit). This is, of course, hypothesizing that Mack has unconscious aggressive tendencies which are projected onto human nature and the world. Something like a high-water mark in cynicism is reached by Mack when he agrees, rather emphatically, with both Item 30 (Reports of atrocities are exaggerated) and Item 48 (Germans and Japs should be wiped out) of the E scale: in agreeing with the former he is saying that the Germans were not as bad as they were pictured; in agreeing with the latter he is saying that nevertheless we ought to wipe out as many of them as possible.

On the strength of Mack's interview, we should expect him to obtain one of his highest mean scores on Authoritarian Submission. Glorification of such ingroup authorities as General Marshall, the War Department, the big capitalists, and God as "strictly a man," was one of the interview's outstanding features. Yet his scale score on this variable (4.0) is at the group mean. Consideration of the items which pertain to this variable can effect some reconciliation of scale and interview, but it also reveals certain weaknesses in the Form 78 scale. The items on which Mack scores well above the mean—23 (Undying love), 32 (Essential for learning), 50 (Obedience and respect), and 77 (No sane, normal person)—are those which express Authoritarian Submission in its purest form: three of them have to do with family loyalty and the third with authoritarian education. When it comes to the items which have to do with religion, however—39 (Supernatural force) and 43 (Sciences like chemistry)—and in which ideas and feelings first experienced, presumably, in relationships with parents are now represented on a cosmic plane, his value for the objective-scientific comes to the fore and his scores are as low as they could be. One might say that Mack's submissive tendencies are insufficiently sublimated to permit their expression in abstract religious terms; the forces which are important for him are more tangible; they have concrete existence either in men or in physical objects. In this light, it is surprising that he does not agree with Item 74 (Tireless leaders). This item, be it noted, has a very high group mean and a relatively low Discriminatory Power. It seems likely that for some of the truly submissive subjects, like Mack, the item is too open, comes too close home, so that in responding they go contrary to their strongest feeling, while the great majority of the subjects, for whom the item was not emotionally involving,

responded in accordance with the element of objective truth in the statement. Rephrasing of this item in later forms seems to have improved it by minimizing the rational aspect and by putting the emphasis more squarely on leadership. Another poor item, it seems, is 20 (Progressive education). Liberals and potential fascists alike, very probably, are attracted by the word "progressive." That Mack is no real supporter of progressive education is attested to by his enthusiastic endorsement of Item 32 (Essential for learning) which is about as clear a statement of educational reactionism as could be found.

Mack is below the group mean on the rather unsatisfactory Power and "Toughness" cluster. All the items of this cluster have been discussed above. The correspondence between interview and scale lies in the fact that in neither place does he show any strong inclination to be a tough and aggressive fellow. It is in his admiration for power and in his willingness to submit to it, rather than in any wish to be an aggressive leader, that his potentiality for fascism lies.

Enough has been said about Mack's extraceptive outlook, as seen both in his interview and in the scale responses discussed above, so that his very low score on Superstition is no more than is to be expected. The surprising thing, perhaps, is that he should agree with Item 2 (Astrology), when the great majority of the subjects do not. His agreement here suggests that his relative lack of superstition is not based upon a genuine identification with science as a way of life, but rather upon his general need to appear hard-headed and realistic and unlikely to be "taken in."

In general, there is rather close correspondence between Mack's interview and his scale responses. Discrepancies appear chiefly when the scale, which concentrates upon things thought to be generally significant, fails to catch something which is relatively specific and unique, and, more commonly, when the particular scale item is deficient and fails to discriminate between high and low scorers. There is reason to believe that the latter difficulty has been largely overcome in the revisions of the scale.

Turning to a consideration of Larry's case, it may be noted first, that he scores below the group mean on all the F scale variables save one, Authoritarian Aggression. He deviates most widely from the mean, in the low direction, on Power and "Toughness," Projectivity, and Anti-intracception; then come Superstition and Authoritarian Submission; and he comes close to the mean on Destructiveness and Cynicism, Sex, and Conventionalism.

Less can be said about the relative lack of these tendencies in Larry than about their operation in Mack. Larry agrees with none of the statements in the Power and "Toughness" cluster, and this accords with the interview's picture of him as a rather soft and agreeable young man. He agrees with only one of the Projectivity statements, Item 56 (Crime wave), and even here his score is barely above the group mean on a statistically poor item. His lack of this tendency was commented upon in the discussion of his interview,

where his willingness to admit his—not too lofty—motives and his inclination to find the origins of his own views were noteworthy. A low score on Anti-intracception is certainly to be expected from a man who gives considerable attention to his own feelings, makes a positive value of pleasure, says he likes to “philosophize,” and discusses psychological determinants of prejudice—as Larry did in his interview. Inconsistencies appear in the case of Items 55 (Leisure) and 53 (Things too intimate), where he goes somewhat above the mean; the former may be taken as an expression of his conventionality, while the latter would appear to be connected with his special problem—“that disease” (tuberculosis) that he had.

There was nothing in Larry’s interview to suggest that he was superstitious and, hence, it is to be expected that he should obtain a low score on the Superstition variable. Why he should agree with the astrology item is a question. Perhaps it should not be surprising to find an element of mysticism in this weak and rather passive character. Authoritarian Submission was rather prominent in Larry’s interview. He made it clear that he has a great deal of respect for his family and that he has had little occasion to rebel against them either in deed or in thought. That he is still below the mean makes it clear that in order to be high on this variable something more than ordinary respect for proper authority is required: the submission must be exaggerated or overdone, and it must be generalized to include other objects besides family members. Two of the three items on which Larry goes above the mean—23 (Undying love) and 77 (No sane, normal person)—refer specifically to ingroup feelings in regard to the family; the third, 32 (Essential for learning), gives him an opportunity to express his conventionality.

Larry is below the group mean on Destructiveness and Cynicism, but the naive optimism and friendliness toward the world which he showed in his interview is enough to raise the question of why he is not still lower. One thing to note is that the items on which he goes up have, in general, high group means and low D. P.’s. It seems that these items approach close enough to being clichés so that most people agree with them, and Larry is enough of a conformist to go along.

In connection with Larry’s score on Sex, which is .55 below the group mean, the following quotation from the clinical section of his interview is enlightening.

(Sex?) “No great problem. I thought about girls all the time, as boys will, and I looked at them. I started out with them at about 15. I liked them a lot and associated with them at school and in the neighborhood. You know, you have the usual sexual desires, but you don’t let them bother you.”

(Sex morals?) “I feel a girl should remain a virgin until 21 or 22 anyway. If she expects to marry soon after that, she should wait until after marriage, but if she is a career girl or doesn’t want to get married, then an affair with an unmarried man is OK if they keep it quiet and secluded so the moral standards of others are not

lowered. She should pick out one fellow to have a sex relation with, not carry on with several."

(You?) "Not until after I came out of the hospital, when I was 23 or 24. Since then I've had several affairs, lasting a few weeks or a month. I won't marry until I have more security. She almost has to be a virgin, though not necessarily. I lost respect for the women I slept with. I know that's selfish, but I guess that's the way most fellows are."

Although this is conventional enough—"the way most fellows are," as Larry says—it does not bespeak the kind of inhibition which we conceive to lie behind high scores on the Sex items. Actually, Larry's score on this variable would have been very low were it not for his score of 6 on Item 31 (Homosexuality). It is possible that he is not free of worry in this area—but this is a matter that had best be left until it is time to discuss the clinical material itself.

Enough has been said about Larry's conventionalism to make it appear reasonable that he should be close to the mean on this variable. A problem is presented by the fact that he is actually above the mean on Authoritarian Aggression. True, his score is still far below that of Mack, but Larry's interview gave the impression of a young man who would hardly want to punish anybody, and it is a criticism of the scale that it fails to confirm this impression. The two items on which his score goes up are 31 (Homosexuals), which was discussed above, and 23 (Undying love). This latter item, though it has an element of punishment in it, also expresses Authoritarian Submission, and Larry's response is probably to be explained on the basis of his family loyalty. The group means and D. P.'s of the Authoritarian Aggression items are, relatively, quite satisfactory. It seems that in regard to the present variable, the F scale was not a fine enough instrument to give the true picture in Larry's case.

The differences between Larry and Mack seem to be reflected fairly well in their F-scale responses. Mack scores higher than Larry on all the variables save one, Superstition. Mack is more than 2 points higher on Anti-intracception, Projectivity, and Sex, more than 1 point higher on Power and "Toughness," Authoritarian Aggression, and Conventionalism, and 1.00 and .87 higher, respectively, on Destructiveness and Cynicism, and Authoritarian Submission. It is particularly interesting that the variables which are most differentiating, that is, Anti-intracception, Projectivity, and Sex, are those which seem to be at the greatest distance from the overt content of fascist ideology. They are variables that seem to have their sources deep within the personality and to be relatively impervious to superficial changes in the external situation. It will remain for later chapters to show that as we go deeper into the person the differentiation between high and low scorers becomes more clear-cut and dependable.

## G. CONCLUSION

The attempt to construct a scale that would measure prejudice without appearing to have this aim and without mentioning the name of any minority group seems to have been fairly successful. The correlation of .75 between the E and the F scale means that scores on the former may be predicted with fair accuracy from scores on the latter. That we have achieved the second purpose underlying the F scale—to construct an instrument that would yield an estimate of fascist receptivity at the personality level—has still to be demonstrated.

Numerous variables in areas not ordinarily covered by studies of political, economic, and social ideology have been attacked directly; and they have been found to form a syndrome and to correlate significantly with antidemocratic trends in areas covered by the A-S, E, and PEC scales. This means, at the least, that the conception of a potentially fascistic pattern can be considerably extended, and that the hypothesis of central personality dispositions which give rise to this pattern is lent considerable support. It remains to be shown conclusively, however, that the variables with which the F scale has been concerned are, in reality, variables of personality. If it is true that they are, then they will be exposed directly as we consider findings from procedures designed especially for the investigation of personality and in which the individual is allowed to express himself spontaneously. If our major hypothesis is correct, then the clinical investigations soon to be reported should not only substantiate the findings of the present chapter, but give a deeper understanding of the potentially fascistic pattern and of its development within the individual.