

C H A P T E R I X

THE INTERVIEWS AS AN APPROACH TO THE PREJUDICED PERSONALITY

Else Frenkel-Brunswick

A. INTRODUCTION: COMPARISON OF GROUPS

Reference to the interviews has so far been limited to the discussion of two individual cases, with emphasis mainly on the pattern of social and political issues (Chapter II). A series of five chapters beginning with the present will show the purpose and value of the interviews in their own right, covering in a systematic fashion a variety of topics; furthermore, analysis will be in terms of groups rather than of single individuals (Chapters IX to XIII). Some special individuals or groups as well as some special issues will be taken up once more in later chapters, bringing in additional material from the interviews (Chapters XX to XXII). The problem of ideology as revealed through the interviews is not being considered in the series of chapters which makes up the present Part II; this problem will be taken up in Chapters XVI to XIX.

The major advantage of the interview technique lies in the scope and freedom of expression it offers to the person being studied. Thus we may learn what he thinks about himself, about his hopes, fears and goals, about his childhood and his parents, about members of the other sex, and about people in general. It is through careful and critical evaluation of sources of this kind that an adequate view of the total personality can perhaps best be approximated.

Rather than making an attempt to establish the dynamic interrelationships of the significant factors for each single individual, however, we shall look for a basis of generalizations within groups which will permit us, it is hoped, to come to grips with the social and psychological trends typical of the highly prejudiced and of the unprejudiced. Does the family constellation differ in the typical prejudiced home as compared with the typical unprejudiced home? Do prejudiced individuals tend to have different images of their parents than do unprejudiced ones? How does the handling of discipline vary

in this respect? Do prejudiced and unprejudiced individuals differ in their sex life, their way of choosing friends, their values, their general cognitive and emotional approach to life? These are some of the questions which will be the prime concern of the present series of chapters. By virtue of its specificity and unique character, the interview may be called upon to yield, in the first place, information of this broader kind on the personality of those scoring high or low on anti-Semitism.

In fact, it was a preliminary review of some of the crucial factors of this kind in a set of exploratory interviews which led to the construction of the F scale (Chapter VII). However, it was this and other scales, consisting of given statements calling for indications of agreement or disagreement only, upon which group comparisons between the personalities and the attitudes of prejudiced and unprejudiced subjects—now to be extended to the richer and more flexible type of evidence as given by an interview—have been thus far exclusively based in the present volume. On this comparatively limited basis, marked differences between these two groups were established.

Questions as to the specific meaning and connotation of the various statements for the individuals concerned, however, had to be left open to a considerable extent. Further validation of the questionnaire data can be effected by probing in greater detail into the spontaneous elaborations a subject may be willing to make on the topics covered by the questionnaire. To obtain such additional information on results gathered by other techniques is a further goal in the subsequent analysis of the interviews.

While the importance of the interview as source material is generally agreed upon in the social sciences, there are specific difficulties in evaluating such material. This is due mainly to the fact that interview material is highly diversified and unstructured. At the same time, the richness, flexibility, and spontaneity of this material are the features which constitute its major asset; room is left for unanticipated variations. To preserve all of this uniqueness and flavor, we should have to reproduce all, or at least the most outstanding, protocols in full—allowing the reader to form his own impressions and draw his own conclusions.

Presentation in full, though doing maximal justice to the material, has its serious drawbacks. It would not be easy to survey and would of necessity leave to the reader much of the burden of interpretation, or else introduce a potentially arbitrary distribution of emphasis in the process of interpretation. In the same manner, if we were to limit presentation itself to a few select protocols we might easily be criticized on grounds of possible arbitrariness in selection.

For these reasons it was decided to attempt some kind of quantification within groups, rather than to present only clinical results based on intensive but more impressionistic case studies as was originally planned. For the kind of evaluation chosen, hypotheses were already formulated on an empirical

basis, giving "hunches" for potential validation. The procedure consisted of a careful evaluation of the interview material in terms of an extensive set of scoring categories. These categories had been designed to encompass as much as possible of the richness and intricacy of the material at hand. (See E. Frenkel-Brunswik (31, 32, 36)). They were a product of intensive study of the interviews with full consideration of all the other evidence obtained from the individuals in question, especially their standing on the prejudice scales. The result was establishment of a Scoring Manual comprising about ninety categories and subcategories (see below).

Evaluation of the interview protocols was by raters unfamiliar with the specific ideology of the subject, the Scoring Manual serving as a guide for ratings in terms of the various categories.

In order to offer to the reader as much direct contact with the raw material of the interviews as possible, numerous quotations are inserted into the subsequent chapters. The raw material is arranged through the medium of the scoring categories, and the relationship of the latter to, or even their dependence on, the original material will become evident there. Many of the quotations presented were directly instrumental in designing the categories employed in their evaluation. Actually, the system of scoring categories reflects the theory or the interrelationships between personality and prejudice which was empirically developed in the course of the exploratory study of the bulk of the interviews, individual by individual. This exploratory study preceded the more elaborate checking procedure in which the individual lost his identity in a mass of statistical evidence organized in terms of the scoring categories and evaluated in terms of larger groups. It is only through such a statistical procedure that the original hypotheses can be, and in fact have to a considerable extent been, verified.

It was hoped that use of the variables defined by the scoring categories would help to bridge the existing gap between the studies of groups and of individuals and perhaps contribute to the establishment of a mutual give and take of facts and concepts. Indeed, some of the variables and relationships which were originally conceived of in the course of the generalized, statistical establishment of personality patterns in samples of prejudiced vs. unprejudiced people, were at the same time found to be crucial in the intensive study of single individuals or small groups (see Chapters XX, XXI, XXII).

The subject's view of his own life, as revealed in the course of the interview, may be assumed to contain real information together with wishful—and fearful—distortions. Known methods had to be utilized, therefore, and new ones developed to differentiate the more genuine, basic feelings, attitudes, and strivings from those of a more compensatory character behind which are hidden tendencies, frequently unknown to the subject himself, which are contrary to those manifested or verbalized on a surface level. To cope with such distortions cues are available or may be developed to guide

interpretations. The methodological safeguarding of such interpretations is one of the central problems in the approach to the interviews. The subsequent analysis of the interview data will include discussion of this point. In general, it endeavors to add to our knowledge of the relationship of surface cues and underlying strivings, with special reference to the problems raised by the personality of the ethnically prejudiced.

In the present chapter the securing of the interview material and the technical aspects of its analysis will be discussed. The sample of the subjects interviewed as compared with the total sample will be described first. A characterization of the interviewers in terms of their background, training, and psychological point of view will also be given. Next, the Interview Schedule used and the technique employed in interviewing will be presented. This will be followed, in the concluding sections of this chapter, by a discussion of the methods used in the evaluation of the interview data.

In the four following chapters a statistical analysis and discussion of the results gained from the study of the interviews will be presented, first in terms of a detailed set of rating categories (Chapters X to XII), and then in terms of over-all ratings and comprehensive description (Chapter XIII).

B. SELECTION OF SUBJECTS FOR THE INTERVIEWS

1. BASIS OF SELECTION

The selection of the subjects to be interviewed was determined, in the first place, by their responses on the A-S or the E scale. With few exceptions (see below), all interviewees belonged either to the uppermost or to the lowermost quartile in this respect, the proportions of high-scoring and low-scoring subjects being approximately equal.

Secondly, consideration was given to the response to the three scales of the questionnaire. Thus, an effort was made to include in the sample interviewed not only the most "typical" high scorers and low scorers, i.e., subjects with correspondingly high or low scores on the PEC and F scales, but also some of those more atypical subjects who obtained a high score on the first scales but a relatively low score on one or both of the others.

Thirdly, an effort was made to balance our samples of high-scoring and low-scoring subjects in terms of age, sex, political and religious affiliation, as well as national or regional background.

Of the thirty to forty different socioeconomic groups to which the questionnaire had been administered (see Chapter IV), subjects for interviews were selected from the following twelve: Psychiatric Clinic Patients from the Langley Porter Clinic of the University of California (men and women, abbreviated *LPC*); University of California Public Speaking Class (men

and women, *PSM* and *PSW*); Alameda School for Merchant Marine Officers (men, *Maritime*); San Quentin State Prison Inmates (men, *SQ*); University of California Extension Testing Class (men and women, *TC*); University of California Extension Psychology Class (men and women, *EG*); University of California Summer Session Education Class (men, *EdPs*); Students at the Pacific School of Religion (men, *PSR*); Employment Service Veterans (men, *Vets*); Professional Women—public school teachers, social workers, public health nurses (*N* and *RW*); University of Oregon Summer Session Students (women, *OG*); Students at the University of California Medical School (women, *Med*).

In all, approximately one hundred persons were interviewed. Some of the interviews could not be used in the final scoring, however. One reason for this was that some of the subjects scoring at the very extreme ends of the *F* scale distribution had been used by the scorers in a last checkup on the scoring manual and had therefore to be excluded later from the main analysis which was to be a "blind" one (see below). Other records had to be discarded because of their brevity or barrenness.

The results to be reported in the subsequent chapters are based on the records of 80 interviewees, 40 men and 40 women. Of the men, 20 were high extremes on the *E* scale; and 20 were low extremes. For the women, the corresponding numbers were 25 and 15. The survey presented in Tables 1 (IX) and 2 (IX) shows for each interviewee the code number, group extraction, standing on responses to the various scales of the questionnaire, with parentheses used to designate membership in one of the middle quartiles.

The rater's "blind" diagnosis of the interview responses makes up the right half of the tables. It is to receive full discussion in Chapter XIII.

2. REPRESENTATIVENESS OF THE INTERVIEWEES

A breakdown with respect to further characteristics of the interviewees, and a comparison of the samples interviewed—approximately one-tenth of the total of the groups mentioned above—with the entire upper and lower quartiles of our over-all samples, will show that our interview samples are fairly representative of the extreme quartiles defined in terms of overt anti-Semitism or ethnocentrism. A quantitative comparison is given in Table 3 (IX). Inspection of the means of all the subjects falling into the upper and lower quartiles with those of corresponding groups of interviewees reveals a sufficiently close agreement. The interviewee samples are, more often than not, somewhat farther to the extreme end of the scale than the corresponding total extreme quartiles. This trend holds in spite of the fact that, as seen from Tables 1 (IX) and 2 (IX), in a few instances interviewees had to be taken from the extreme ends of the middle quartiles of the *E* scale.

A further breakdown has been undertaken with respect to age, religion,

TABLE 1 (IX)

SURVEY OF 20 PREJUDICED AND 20 UNPREJUDICED MEN INTERVIEWED^a

Code No.	Group ^b	Standing on Questionnaire ^c				Interview Scores ^d		Composite Standing on 72 Categories	Intuitive Over-all Rating of Interviews
		A-S	E	F	PEC	"High"	"Low"		
M1	LPC	h	h	(h)	l	27	1	H	H
M4	PSM	h	h	l	h	47	2	H	H
M6	PSM	h	h	h	h	41	2	H	H
M7	PSM	h	h	(l)	l	6	32	L	L
M11	PSM	h	h	h	h	52	2	H	H
M13	PSM	h	h	h	(h)	52	1	H	H
M14	PSM	h	h	(h)	(l)	8	32	L	L
M17	PSM	h	(h)	l	h	25	4	H	H
M18	LPC	h	h	h	h	33	3	H	H
M20	Maritime	-	h	l	l	5	40	L	L
M40	SQ	h	h	(h)	h	55	2	H	H
M41	SQ	h	h	h	h	49	2	H	H
M43	SQ	h	h	h	l	43	3	H	H
M45	SQ	h	h	h	h	48	2	H	H
M46	TC	h	h	l	h	42	6	H	H
M47	SQ	h	h	h	h	44	2	H	H
M51	SQ	h	h	h	h	36	5	H	H
M52	SQ	h	h	h	h	51	4	H	H
M57	SQ	h	h	h	h	56	0	H	H
M58	TC	h	h	h	h	54	2	H	H
Means of 20 prejudiced men interviewees						38.7	7.3		
M2	EG	l	l	l	l	5	52	L	L
M3	PSM	l	l	(l)	l	0	53	L	L
M5	PSM	l	l	l	l	3	34	L	L
M8	PSM	l	(l)	l	h	5	44	L	L
M9	PSM	l	l	l	(h)	39	2	H	H
M10	EdPs	l	l	l	l	33	7	H	H
M12	EdPs	l	l	l	l	2	45	L	L
M15	LPC	l	l	l	l	2	43	L	L
M16	LPC	l	l	l	l	6	44	L	L
M19	PSM	l	l	(l)	(h)	35	0	H	H
M42	Maritime	-	l	l	l	1	57	L	L
M44	PSR	l	l	l	l	2	54	L	L
M48	Vets	l	l	l	l	6	37	L	L
M49	TC	l	l	l	l	4	42	L	L
M50	SQ	l	l	l	h	10	34	L	L
M53	Vets	l	l	l	l	1	52	L	L
M54	SQ	l	l	l	h	12	24	L	L
M55	TC	l	l	l	l	4	56	L	L
M56	SQ	l	l	l	l	5	41	L	L
M59	SQ	l	l	l	h	14	39	L	L
Means of 20 unprejudiced men interviewees						9.4	38.0		

^aFor discussion of the evaluation of the interviews and of the results shown in this table, see Section F of the present chapter, and Chapter XIII.

^bFor key to abbreviations, see text, p. 294/95.

^cThe upper and lower middle quartiles are indicated by the use of parentheses with the letters h and l.

^dNumber of ratings other than "Neutral." Number of Neutrals is obtained by subtracting that of "High" and of "Low" from 72 (on Table 1 (IX)) or 65 (on Table 2 (IX)). For selection of categories, see p. 335.

TABLE 2 (IX)^a

SURVEY OF 25 PREJUDICED AND 15 UNPREJUDICED WOMEN INTERVIEWED

Code No.	Group	Standing on Questionnaire				Interview Scores		Composite Standing on 65 Categories	Intuitive Over-all Rating of Interviews
		A-S	E	F	PEC	"High"	"Low"		
F22	PSW	h	(h)	h	(h)	28	1	H	H
F24	PSW	h	h	h	h	37	4	H	H
F25	LPC	h	h	h	h	20	7	H	H
F26	N	h	h	(l)	h	9	22	L	L
F28	RW	h	h	h	h	19	7	H	H
F31	PSW	h	h	(h)	h	51	0	H	H
F32	N	h	h	h	h	34	3	H	H
F33	TC	h	h	h	h	3	32	L	L
F36	TC	h	h	(h)	(l)	27	5	H	H
F37	EG	h	(h)	h	h	21	10	H	H
F38	PSW	h	h	h	h	25	14	H	H
F39 ^a	N	h	h	h	(l)	24	5	H	H
F60	RW	h	h	h	(h)	30	6	H	H
F61	LPC	h	h	l	l	23	8	H	H
F64	RW	h	h	h	h	0	26	L	L
F66	PSW	h	h	h	l	35	7	H	H
F67	RW	h	h	h	h	3	28	L	L
F68	N	h	(h)	l	h	32	4	H	H
F69	PSW	h	h	h	h	37	7	H	H
F71	PSW	h	h	h	h	47	2	H	H
F72	LPC	h	h	h	h	17	26	H	L
F74	PSW	h	h	h	h	45	4	H	H
F77	LPC	h	h	h	l	37	4	H	H
F78	PSW	h	h	h	(h)	44	1	H	H
F79	OG	h	h	h	(h)	36	4	H	H
Means of 25 prejudiced women interviewees						27.4	9.5		
F21	PSW	l	l	l	h	24	0	H	H
F23	TC	l	l	(l)	l	2	46	L	L
F27	PSW	l	(l)	l	l	0	53	L	L
F29	LPC	l	l	l	l	7	36	L	L
F30	RW	l	l	l	l	3	44	L	L
F34	PSW	l	l	(l)	l	1	49	L	L
F35	TC	l	l	l	l	1	42	L	L
F39	PSW	l	l	l	l	38	5	H	H
F62	PSW	l	l	l	h	1	44	L	L
F63	LPC	l	l	l	l	4	42	L	L
F65	PSW	l	l	h	l	6	44	L	L
F70	Med	l	l	l	l	0	38	L	L
F73	PSW	l	(l)	l	l	1	35	L	L
F75	PW	l	(l)	(h)	l	3	43	L	L
F76	PSW	l	(l)	(h)	(l)	14	22	L	L
Means of 15 unprejudiced women interviewees						7.0	36.2		

^aSee footnotes to Table 1 (IX).

TABLE 3 (IX)
 REPRESENTATIVENESS OF INTERVIEWEES IN TERMS OF SCORES ON THE ETHNOCENTRISM SCALE^a

Questionnaire form	Total of all subjects taking Forms 78 or 45		High-quartile interviewees		Low-quartile interviewees		Low-scoring interviewees	
	Range	Mean	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
78:	17-82	46.4	64.6	7	29.1	6	30.3	6
	14-86	46.2	69.5	18	28.2	10	33.6	10
45:	10-70	43.2	59.7	12	25.0	11	15.8	11
	10-70	35.4	54.8	6	15.6	5	13.6	5

^aSince 75 out of the 80 interviewees are from among the subjects tested by Form 78 or Form 45, comparisons are here limited to these two groups.

and politics. To maintain anonymity, these data are not included in the tables just mentioned which deal with individual subjects, but are presented in a statistical manner in Tables 4 (IX) to 6 (IX). For men, a few data on religion and politics are missing; hence the discrepancies in the sums relating to the total quartiles.

On the whole, the distributions of the interviewees and of corresponding extreme quartiles are not at too great odds with one another, considering the difficulties in finding subjects with the exact combination of qualifications. The more striking deviations from close correspondence may be listed as follows:

With respect to age (Table 4 (IX)), there are no low-scoring women interviewees in the age bracket of "46 and over"; the share of this bracket

TABLE 4 (IX)
AGE DISTRIBUTION IN TOTAL EXTREME QUARTILES AND INTERVIEWEES
(NUMBERS OF THE LATTER ARE SPECIFIED IN PARENTHESES)

Age Groups	High Quartile		Low Quartile	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
16 - 22	59 (6)	70 (8)	60 (4)	60 (9)
23 - 30	88 (8)	55 (5)	90 (10)	61 (3)
31 - 45	78 (5)	59 (6)	93 (4)	75 (3)
46 and over	53 (1)	51 (6)	36 (2)	49 (0)
Sums	278 (20)	235 (25)	279 (20)	245 (15)

is added to the youngest age group. Furthermore, there is only one high-scoring male interviewee in this highest age bracket. Our interviewee sample is therefore on the younger side when compared with all the subjects.

The major deviation with respect to religion (Table 5 (IX)) is that three (i.e., 20 per cent) of the low-scoring women interviewees are Catholics while the corresponding figure for the "low" women in our total sample is only

TABLE 5 (IX)
RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION IN TOTAL EXTREME QUARTILES AND INTERVIEWEES
(NUMBERS OF THE LATTER ARE SPECIFIED IN PARENTHESES)

Religious Affiliation	High Quartile		Low Quartile	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Catholic	47 (7)	40 (7)	29 (1)	10 (3)
Protestant	185 (11)	184 (17)	156 (14)	156 (7)
None	15 (2)	9 (0)	65 (5)	70 (5)
Blank	13 (0)	2 (1)	11 (0)	9 (0)
Sums	260 (20)	235 (25)	261 (20)	245 (15)

10 (4 per cent). On the positive side, we may single out for special mention the fact that there is close agreement of corresponding figures for both high scorers and low scorers when the categories "None" and "Blank" are pooled; it may thus be said that both high-scoring and low-scoring interviewees are representative of their extreme quartiles with respect to indifference to or rejection of religion.

As to politics (Table 6 (IX)), "liberal" women are more numerous among the interviewees than among the corresponding quartiles, especially so far

TABLE 6 (IX)

POLITICAL OUTLOOK IN TOTAL EXTREME QUARTILES AND INTERVIEWEES
(NUMBERS OF THE LATTER ARE SPECIFIED IN PARENTHESES)

Political Outlook	High Quartile		Low Quartile	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Liberal	99 (7)	98 (17)	156 (14)	173 (12)
Conservative	112 (10)	109 (5)	45 (2)	23 (0)
Leftist	0 (0)	0 (0)	22 (3)	21 (2)
Misc. and blank	49 (3)	28 (3)	38 (1)	28 (1)
Sums	260 (20)	235 (25)	261 (20)	245 (15)

as the high scorers are concerned (98 to 17, i.e., 68 to 42 per cent). This latter fact, however, does not hold for men. The comparatively small group of leftists or radicals (covering those who gave their attitude as "socialist" or as "communist") is represented with relatively greater frequency among interviewees (two women and three men, all low scorers).

3. APPROACHING THE INTERVIEWEES

An effort was made to maintain anonymity for all those interviewed as well as to convince them of the fact that they would remain unidentified. Pains were taken to conceal from the interviewee the true basis of selection.

In particular, the following procedure was adopted in securing the co-operation of the prospective interviewee: After the questionnaire responses had been evaluated, the person who had administered the questionnaire appeared at one of the next meetings of the group in question and announced that further information was required of some of those who had answered the questionnaire. Those selected were identified in terms of their birthdates only and asked to arrange for an appointment after the meeting.

At the beginning of the actual interview they were told that they had been selected on the basis of age and regional origin. The interviewers gained the impression that in this way the anxiety as to the basis of selection was suc-

cessfully removed. Actually, not one of even the highest scorers ever showed signs of knowing the true reason for his or her selection, although some of them showed signs of suspiciousness of a more general nature. The reason for this naiveté seems to lie primarily in the fact that most high scorers do not think of themselves as particularly prejudiced.

In most cases an invitation to be interviewed was readily accepted. The motivation seemed to be primarily the desire to talk about oneself and the implicit hope of receiving some advice in the process. To some of the subjects the added incentive of a remuneration (\$3 per test or interview) seemed not unimportant.

The interviews lasted from one and a half to three hours and were usually conducted in one session. As a rule they were held in one of the offices of the Berkeley Public Opinion Study, in an atmosphere of comfort and quiet. When it was impractical or impossible for the subject to come to the office (as was the case especially with the prison group) the interviewer went to see the subject.

C. THE INTERVIEWERS

Certain specifications were also maintained as far as those conducting the interviews were concerned. Men were always interviewed by men, women only by women. All high-scoring subjects were interviewed by American-born Gentiles.

There were altogether nine interviewers. Although all were college graduates and psychologically trained, their backgrounds varied to a considerable extent. More than half of them had special experience and training in clinical psychology and considerable familiarity with the basic concepts of psychoanalysis. Four of them had undergone psychoanalysis, and one of these is a practicing psychoanalyst. Two of the remaining interviewers had primarily a social psychological rather than a clinical orientation. Another two had the traditional rather than the dynamic clinical approach. In consequence, some difference of emphasis in the collection of data had to be anticipated. This probably made for greater variety of scope in the interviews as a whole, although at the sacrifice of strict uniformity of procedure.

In order to secure a reasonable amount of uniformity, a detailed Interview Schedule, described in Section E, was worked out in advance. Not all the questions could be asked of all subjects, but an effort was made to cover all the major points with each interviewee. A relative preponderance of the ideological or of the clinical aspects was found to exist in accordance with the background of the interviewer.

All interviewers had a copy of the Interview Schedule together with a special instruction sheet, both to be discussed in detail below. In preliminary

conferences all interviewers clarified every point of inquiry before seeing any of the interviewees.

D. SCOPE AND TECHNIQUE OF THE INTERVIEW

1. GENERAL PLAN FOR THE INTERVIEW

As was the case in the preparation of the questionnaire, the Interview Schedule was developed on the basis of theoretical considerations as to what is relevant with respect to the topic under investigation. We can roughly differentiate two types of hypotheses underlying the schedule, the "directed" ones and the "categorical" ones. The former are based on specific expectations in regard to the relationships to be obtained (e.g., it was tentatively assumed that a positive relationship would be found between "rigidity" and prejudice). This relationship can be hypothetically deduced from general psychological considerations and, besides, it was tentatively supported by preliminary studies. In contrast to this type of directed hypothesis, the categorical ones assume that there will be some relationship between a certain category and prejudice without its being possible to anticipate its direction.

The Schedule was revised on the basis of the evidence gained in exploratory interviewing. As the Interview Schedule is described, the reader should keep in mind that not all of the dimensions there proved equally discriminating. The idea was to study the major fields of sociopsychological development in relation to the establishment of social and political beliefs. In the present chapter the entire Interview Schedule is reported, but it will not become evident until the results are discussed in the subsequent chapters which dimensions are the crucial ones in differentiating prejudiced and unprejudiced subjects.

The major areas covered in the interviews are: 1. Vocation; 2. Income; 3. Religion; 4. Clinical Data; 5. Politics; 6. Minorities and "Race." Each of these headings has been covered in part by previous techniques. The interviews, however, went considerably beyond the information gathered by the other techniques.

In each case the interview was preceded by the study, on the part of the interviewer, of the information gathered previously, especially a detailed study of the questionnaire responses.

Our selection of the particular categories listed seems justified in view of the fact that we are dealing with patterns of political and social beliefs in relation to personal and environmental factors, the latter being regarded as potential determiners of a choice on the part of the subject between alternative ideologies offered by our culture.

There was no rigid adherence by the interviewer to any particular order of topics. The rationale for the suggested order—that in which the topics are taken up in the discussion which follows—was that it might be well to start with something relatively peripheral, like vocation. People like to talk

about their vocation and are often looking for advice in this matter. This provides the necessary warming up for the interviewee. Income comes next, since it is also considered relatively peripheral, though in some cases there is considerable sensitivity about this matter. The interview then could turn to religion and from there proceed to the more intimate clinical data. It usually concluded with questions about politics and minorities in the hope of getting, at the end of the interview, more personalized reactions on these topics which are so crucial for our major problem. At the same time, these topics lead back, at the end of the interview, to more external issues.

2. "UNDERLYING" AND "MANIFEST" QUESTIONS

In preparing the Interview Schedule, an analysis was made of the relevant psychological and social factors in each of the main areas to be covered. This analysis was based both on general social and personality theory and on findings from the exploratory interviews. As a result of these considerations, a number of so-called "underlying questions" were formulated to indicate for the interviewer which psychological aspects of the particular topic should be covered. These underlying questions were meant only as a guide for the interviewer. They had to be concealed from the subject in order that undue defenses might not be established through recognition of the real focus of the interview.

A set of direct, "manifest" questions, on the other hand, gave the interviewer suggestions as to the kind of questions that should actually be asked in order to throw light on the "underlying" issues. It was not intended, however, that the interviewer should rigidly adhere to the questions suggested. Depending on the subject's personality structure and on what topics he brought up himself, the interviewer formulated manifest questions as he went along, bearing in mind constantly, however, the underlying questions. As experience accumulated, more suitable manifest questions were formulated in advance of the interviews and used in a more uniform manner.

3. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS TO THE INTERVIEWERS

The general instructions which were given to the interviewers are as follows:

The careful and rather minute detail of the present Interview Schedule should not mislead the new interviewer. We do not intend that he should follow this schedule literally, in fact, we are definitely against this. Rather, the Interview Schedule should be regarded as providing a general orientation for the interviewer. It lists kinds of things we hope to obtain from the subject as well as suggestions as to how these things might indirectly be obtained by questioning. Not all of the kinds of things are relevant to each subject nor should all of the questions be asked each subject; in many cases an entirely original line of questioning will be necessary.

Different types of interviews can be thought of as varying between two extremes: on the one hand, a completely "controlled" interview in which the interviewer follows a rigidly defined set of questions for all subjects; and on the other hand, an extremely "free" interview in which the interviewer asks only the most general

questions, the sequence of questions being determined primarily by the subject's answers.

Our prototypic interview falls between these two extremes but is somewhat closer to the latter. There are six broad areas which must be covered: Vocation, Income, Religion, Clinical Material, Politics, and Minority Groups. Within each area we make a basic distinction between *Underlying Questions* and *Suggested Direct Questions*. (Note that within each area in the interview schedule, we first list the Underlying Questions, and then the Suggested Direct Questions.) The Underlying Questions are those which the interviewer *asks himself* about the subject; they are the variables by means of which we want to characterize the subjects; but you don't ask a person "Do you really libidinize your work?" or "What is your underlying image of the Jew?" The procedure here is methodologically the same as our procedure with the indirect items of the F scale; we ask questions the answers to which give insights regarding hypotheses which are never explicitly stated in the interview. Clearly, the Direct Questions used to get answers to a given Underlying Question will vary greatly from subject to subject, depending in each case on the subject's ideology, surface attitudes, defenses, etc. Nevertheless, we have been able to formulate for each underlying question a number of direct questions, based on our general theory and experience. The list of direct questions, as stated above, should be regarded as tentative and suggestive only. The suggested direct questions, like other surface techniques used by the study, should be changed from time to time in the light of new theory and experience.

The interview should be related closely to the subject's questionnaire. As a result of the coordination of interview and questionnaire, the latter contains items bearing on each of the six broad areas of the interview. For the convenience of the interviewers, an initial section within each of the six areas contains references to the relevant questionnaire items. It must be emphasized that *careful study of the questionnaire beforehand* is essential for an adequate interview. The questionnaire by itself reveals many important points under each topic; it also suggests hypotheses which can be verified in the interview. Pre-interview study of the questionnaire, then, gives the interviewer a more structured approach to the interview and should be done in all possible cases.

(Some further general directions are given below as parenthetical comments to the headings of the sections listing the underlying and the direct questions where they first appear in the Schedule.)

E. THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE¹

A detailed description of each section of the Interview Schedule will help to clarify the procedure described.

1. VOCATION

By means of the questionnaire, information was obtained about the present and the desired occupation of the subject and about attitudes toward work in general. Over and above that, the main function of the underlying

¹ While the responsibility for the analysis of the interview material rested mainly with the author of the present and the subsequent chapters, the Interview Schedule presented here is a joint product of the entire staff of this project.

questions guiding the interview in this area was to find out (a) the meaning which vocation has for the subject, in its work and social aspects, and (b) the determinants of the choice of his vocation.

More specifically, it was relevant to our problem to find out how much genuine interest and libido the subject has for his work. Does his work represent for him a gratifying and constructive form of self-expression and achievement or does he consider his work as "drudgery" and as a mere means to some end such as attaining money, status, or power? Keeping in mind that the importance of success is a generalized pattern in our culture, we still expected that our material would differentiate people who are oriented primarily toward the subject matter of their work and toward real achievement from those for whom only the peripheral aspect of the work is meaningful, e.g., as a means for placing them within a hierarchy (leader or follower, an adjutant to the boss). Vocation can thus be viewed from the angle of its possibilities as a means to group identification and especially to identification with higher social circles. The wish to be a link in a hierarchical chain seems of importance to many of our subjects. The emphasis on the constructive content or the social values of work as contrasted with emphasis on mastery of technology and manipulation of resources and people is relevant in this connection. As an illustration of the background elements continually entering into the construction of the Interview Schedule, the well-known connection between Nazi ideology and emphasis on technology may be mentioned here.

In the attitude toward work, however, as in all of our material, the possibility of orientation on different levels has to be kept in mind. The wish to escape a kind of work which is experienced as drudgery often goes hand in hand with a superficial emphasis on the importance of "hard work," both for reasons of success and for reasons of morality. A very general emphasis on the importance of work is often associated with an absence of concrete and specific ideas about the content of work. On the other hand, a more libidinated attitude toward work is often both more relaxed and more specific, and it differentiates less between work and pleasure. The role of the social aspects of work, e.g., intergroup feeling, or general sociability and friendship, has also been explored. Attention of the interviewer has been directed, further, toward other personality needs as expressed in special cases.

The problem of how far identification with, or rebellion against, the parents determined the choice of vocation, was the starting point for further inquiry.

After listing the underlying questions which seemed relevant to the problem of vocation, a set of manifest, direct questions was suggested after the fashion described above. The part of the Interview Schedule dealing with vocation is presented here in full. Since most of the direct questions are self-

explanatory in their purpose and rationale, no further explanations will be made. (In order to structure the somewhat lengthy Interview Schedule when in use by the interviewer, key words and phrases which were intended especially to catch his or her attention were underscored or capitalized. All such matters are left intact in the entire presentation of the schedule so as to reflect all shades of emphasis, using *italics* for underscoring.)

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

I. VOCATION

Underlying Questions (What it is that we want to find out):

- a. *Meaning* of vocation to subject (in work and social aspects):
 1. *Work-libido*: subject-matter interest, relatedness to work, integration of work, and leisure activities. Genuine *Sublimations*.
 2. *Aspirations*: *Real Achievement* drive *versus* interest in "Success," Status, Prestige, Money, Power.
 3. *Technological-Manipulative* attitudes?
 4. *Hierarchical* thinking (leader-follower; the "lieutenant," etc.).
 5. *In-group* feeling.
 6. Concern with "*Social Value*" of the work.
 7. Role of *Sociability* and friendship on the job. (Distinguish superficial gregariousness versus genuine friendship.)
 8. Attitudes re *Wife working*.
 9. *Other* special personality needs.
- b. *Determinants* of choice:
 1. *Parental* identification or rebellion.
 2. *Other*.

Suggested Direct Questions:

(It is understood that in no interview can all of these questions be asked. The interviewer proceeds with his attention fixed primarily upon the underlying questions, using whatever direct questions seem most promising in the context of the moment. Moreover, it is not expected that the interviewer will always use the phraseology set down here. It is our belief, however, that all of these questions are good; they are being used frequently by the interviewers at the present time, and as experience accumulates, there will be more and more subjects who have been asked exactly the same question.)

Appeal

- a. In what ways does _____ Appeal to you? (N.B., *Don't* ask automatically, "How does the job appeal": if subject is a janitor, e.g., find out first *Whether* subject's job appeals to him; if appropriate, find out what *Would* appeal to him and inquire about this instead.)
 What does _____ offer you?
 What are the main Advantages of (being a) _____? Satisfaction?
 What it is like to be a _____?
- b. What are the Less Attractive aspects of (being a) _____? Disadvantages?
- c. What does the Future look like in this field?

Alternatives

- d. Do you feel that you are "cut out" for this type of work (or profession)?
 What Other Things do you feel you might be "cut out" for?
 Have you ever seriously considered other Vocations? Had Other dreams?
 Under what conditions might you Change (i.e., from present vocation)?

History

- e. When did you Decide to be a _____?
 How did you come to be interested in _____?
 What made you decide to be a _____?
 What did your Parents (father, mother) want you to be?
 What do your Parents think of _____?
 How has your father liked his work?
 (Get work history if striking jobs, or many changes.)

Wife

- f. Does your Wife Work? (If subject is woman: Have you worked since your marriage?) How do you feel about that? (How does your husband?)

2. INCOME

Here, as in the case of vocation, some gross information, e.g., size of income, was gained by means of the questionnaire. The function of the interview was to find out the degree of "money-mindedness," the aspirations and fantasies centering around money. Is money per se important, or is it important for what it can give? Of relevance here is the emphasis on status as narcissistic enhancement of one's own person, own power, or own security, which can be realistic or exaggerated. There can be a realistic emphasis on a good life or on exaggerated craving for luxuries; the latter is often observed in those of our subjects who are not rooted in the constructive task of daily living but whose repressed anxieties, aggressions, and infantile cravings call for an escape into a living that is full of excitement. Here again the orientation toward different levels is important. An extreme money-mindedness as revealed in more concrete and specific contexts often goes hand in hand with denial of the importance of money on a superficial level and often even with an emotional rejection of the "rich."

The attitude toward charity was also explored in this connection as a possible manifestation of atonement which, in turn, is known to be a reaction to aggression. From a social point of view, charity often has the function of keeping the underprivileged in their place, kindness acting in effect as a humiliating factor.

Another important factor leading to a group of underlying questions is realism vs. autism with respect to thinking and to goal behavior in this field. A considerable discrepancy between fantasies and reality in the attitude to-

ward economic goals, combined with lack of a structured path and lack of readiness to work and to postpone pleasure, might make one susceptible to the use of socially destructive behavior as a means of attaining, by a short cut, fulfillment of one's infantile dreams and gratifications. Again, lack of a real readiness to work can be hidden behind general emphasis or overemphasis on work, especially since work in these cases represents an unpleasant duty. Over and above this, psychoanalysts have claimed that the attitude toward money reveals early instinctual fixations and anxieties and the way of dealing with them, e.g., anal retention or expulsion, or money as a symbol of potency.

Of particular theoretical importance is the set of questions which deals with socioeconomic background, especially the changes in economic level in the family of the subject. Sudden changes either upward or downward might be followed by a lack of adaptation in the whole socioeconomic sphere and might make this sphere similar to a "weak organ," especially susceptible to becoming a medium for the acting out of difficulties. This is what H. Hartmann has called the "compliance of social factors," in analogy to Freud's concept of the "compliance of organs" in the occurrence of physical disease. Inquiry was also made into the ways financial matters were handled by the parents. The role of economic frustrations was followed up.

A final question of interest is whether a certain personality structure alone is sufficient to establish a selection from among existing ideologies, e.g., prejudice, or if, in addition to that, a special socioeconomic history and condition of the family is required for, or especially conducive to, the acting out of difficulties in the social sphere.

The underlying and manifest questions in the sphere of income are contained in the following part of the Interview Schedule.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

2. INCOME

Underlying Questions:

- a. *Money-Mindedness.*
- b. *Aspirations and Fantasies.*
 1. Status (narcissistic).
 2. Power, Manipulation.
 3. Security (Realistic versus Neurotic).
 4. Charity-Nurturance-Guilt Fantasies.
 5. Lavish Living, Excitement. (Q. Is a subject with "live dangerously—win a lot or lose a lot"—attitudes *really* willing to take chances?)
- c. *Realistic versus Autistic Thinking.*
 1. How much distance separates present from aspired status?
 2. How well is the path to the goal structured for subject?
 3. What are subject's Real Chances of reaching the goal?

4. Is there a Discrepancy between subject's Fantasies and his Actual Expectations?
- d. *Determinants in Social Background.*
 1. Parental Attitudes toward money.
 2. Parental Socioeconomic Level (including changes) during subject's childhood and adolescence.
 3. How much Status-Change has (an older) subject experienced since youth?
 4. What Economic Frustrations has subject experienced?

Suggested Direct Questions:

Present Frustrations

- a. How do you Get Along on (present income)?
Do you have a Car? (What make, model, and year?)
What do you Miss Most that your present income doesn't permit?

Aspirations and Fantasies

- b. What would you Do with (Expected Income)? With Desired Income?)
What would it Make Possible (Enable you to do?)
What would it Mean to you?
- c. What is the Most Important Thing Money can Give a person?
Some people say that the best things in life are free; others say that when you come right down to it, money is really important. How Important is Money Really?
How much is an adequate income for, say, a family of four?
There's an old saying, "A penny saved is a penny earned"; but then again, some people prefer the idea of "Easy come, easy go." How do you feel about that?
Some people like to take Chances: "Win a lot, lose a lot"; then other people are more Cautious about money. What's your attitude?

Realism

- d. What's the Likelihood of your making _____ ten years from now?
How good are your Chances of making _____? How do you expect to Reach that income?
What are your Plans for Attaining that income?

History

- e. How did you Get Along during the Depression? (If necessary to get a clear picture, inquire as to specific details of living.)
Were you Out of a Job for any length of time?
What's the Highest Income you've ever had? When was that?
How much did you make on your First Job? (i.e., the first full-time job after leaving school.)
- f. (If he chooses, the interviewer may obtain at this point—rather than later under Clinical—information re Parental Socioeconomic Level during subject's childhood and adolescence. Ask specific questions to get information re type of home, number of rooms, neighborhood, vacations, cars, servants, recreation, entertaining, allowances for children versus necessity for children to work, whether worked, whether father ever out of a job, etc. Get subject's reactions to this—especially to changes in level.)

- g. (Get at Parental Policies and Attitudes re spending—casualness; display; etc.—saving, consistency of policies, any differences between mother and father, etc., by special inquiry in connection with discussion of subject's own attitudes, especially those elicited by questions under (c) above. Or, some of the above questions—especially those not asked of subject—may be repeated for the parents.)

3. RELIGION

Religion, perhaps more than the preceding areas, seems to lie at the point of interaction of social and personal factors. The purposes of the underlying questions in this category was to find out whether religion represents to the subject a further effort toward belonging to a privileged group and the explicit acceptance of a set of conventionalized mores and rules of behavior prevalent in a majority group, or whether religion represents a system of more internalized, genuine experiences and values. In the former case religion tends to assume the function of an external authority deciding what is good and what is bad, thus relieving the individual from making his own decisions and assuring him at the same time of membership in a privileged group. The rejection of outgroup religions goes hand in hand with this attitude.

The manifest questions on religion were designed to find out which of the attitudes just described is dominant in the subject. Furthermore, they were aimed at various subtle aspects of these different attitudes. Questions such as that inquiring into the concept of God were introduced to reveal whether God is conceived more directly after a parental image and thus as a source of support and as a guiding and sometimes punishing authority or whether God is seen more as an abstract entity representing general values and principles. In the former case an attempt was made to ascertain whether the emphasis is more on the punitive or on the nurturant qualities.

An effort was also made to inquire into the reasons for rejection of religion. A rejection of religion on rational and scientific grounds belongs in a different syndrome from rejection of religion out of an attitude of sober cynicism and manipulative opportunism. Questions as to the history of the conflict, in the subject, between science and religion were also asked. Areas in which there was a readiness to follow a rational approach were noted, as well as those in which irrational explanations were preferred.

It is of interest for our purposes to ascertain further whether the attitude toward religion is simply taken over from the parents or whether any change has occurred in the direction of rebellion against religious attitudes prevalent in the family or in the direction of an increase and deepening of religious feelings as compared with those of the parents. How did agreement or difference of opinion in the parents with respect to religion influence the outlook of the subject?

The underlying and manifest questions about religion are as follows:

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

3. RELIGION

Underlying Questions:

- a. *Ingroup-Outgroup feelings* (including moralism). (Does subject have idea of "Good enough for my fathers, so good enough for me"?)
- b. Attitudes toward *Organized Religion* and the Church.
- c. *Internalization*.
- d. *Philosophical Pattern* (personalization; concern re "Beginning," etc.; degree of dogmatism and fundamentalism; nature and crudity of wish-satisfactions).
- e. Nature and degree of *Supernaturalism*. (Including attitudes toward irrational experiences and toward unusual coincidences.)
- f. Role of *Ethics* (degree of internalization). (Get subject to go into detail on Christianity, and bring up later in discussing race.)
- g. *Role of Superego*: Internalized Conscience vs. Externalized Authority.
- h. *Special Personality Meanings*.

*Suggested Direct Questions:**General Importance*

- a. What are your Views on religion?
 What does your religion Offer you?
 What Appeals to you most in religion?
 What is the Most Important Thing in Religion?
 How Important Should Religion be in a person's life?

Philosophy

- b. What is your conception of God?
 What is your attitude toward (do you think about) Prayer, the Bible, Immortality?
 Do you believe there is conflict between Science and Religion?
 Has there been such a conflict in the past?
 Is there likely to be in the future? (If No: Inquire whether subject accepts (1) a rationalized system of belief; (2) a dichotomy between science as physical, religion as spiritual; (3) a fundamentalist rejection; or what.)

Ingroup

- c. What are the main (most important) differences between your religion and others?
 How important are the differences among the various sects?
 What do you think of Atheists?

Ethics

- What does it Mean to be a Christian?
 How can you Tell a Christian?
 What is the Main Difference between Christians and Other People?
 What is the Most Important of Christ's Teachings?

History

- d. What was the nature of your early Religious Training?
 What was the Religious Atmosphere in your Home?
 In what ways do you differ from Your Parents in Religion? From your Wife (Husband)?

In what ways did your Parents Differ in Religious Matters? (If subject broke away from parental teachings: Get history; also get reactions to differences with spouse.)

Have you ever Questioned your religious beliefs?

Since data on religion and political ideology had to be excluded from the material presented to the interview rater (see below, Section F, 3), the part of the interview based on the preceding questions will not be taken up for discussion until later in this volume (Chapter XVIII).

4. CLINICAL DATA

In the clinical section of the interview an attempt was made to obtain as much personal data relevant to our problem as was possible in a single sitting and without producing anxieties in the subject. With respect to this area, even more than in the case of the others, the subject had to be unaware of the direction intended by the interview. Care was taken to avoid offering interpretations to the subject for which he was not ready and the effect of which could not be followed up and worked out. Here, as in the other sections, the almost general desire of the subjects to talk about themselves in a professional and confidential situation was of great help to the interviewer.

A variety of personal data had been collected by previous techniques. This material, as pointed out above, was at the disposal of the interviewer, who studied it before starting the interview. The first two sheets of the questionnaire brought out some gross information about the subject's personal life. Above and beyond that, the type of information which had to be obtained by the interviewer was based on hypotheses as to what aspects of personal life might be expected to influence the pattern of social beliefs and attitudes.

The information gained in the entire clinical area by previous methods is represented in the Schedule below. In view of the length of the clinical part of the interview schedule, the questions are presented and discussed under six major headings, as follows: (a) Family Background: Sociological Aspects; (b) Family Figures: Personal Aspects; (c) Childhood; (d) Sex; (e) Social Relationships; (f) School.

a. **FAMILY BACKGROUND: SOCIOLOGICAL ASPECTS.** The sociological aspects of the family background seem of particular relevance in the present context. The national origin of parents was explored in order to find out whether relative "purity" or mixture of national origin is related to prejudice. Although this problem was considered important, there was no specific expectancy as to the direction of the results.

The group memberships of the parents were to be taken as an indication of how much stress was placed by the family on the idea of "belonging" and of how much the parents considered themselves as individuals or mainly as members of different groups and organizations. The whole socioeconomic picture of the parents, and possibly of the grandparents, the status achieved

as well as that aspired to, had to be understood in order to throw light on the security or the tensions existing, in this area, within the family.

The underlying and direct questions on the sociological aspects of the family background are presented here.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

4a. FAMILY BACKGROUND: SOCIOLOGICAL ASPECTS

Underlying Questions:

- a. *National Origins* of father and mother (not just racial; e.g., third generation Polish, German immigrant, etc.).
- b. Important *Ingroup Memberships* of father and mother (e.g., unions, Masons, etc.).
- c. Picture of *Socioeconomic Status* of Parents and Grandparents (as reflected in occupation, education, way of life, etc.), with special attention to Social Mobility.

Suggested Direct Questions:

Background

- a. Father's and mother's National Antecedents, occupation, education, politics, religion.

Economic

- b. Actual Standard of Living of father and mother (Ask specific questions to get clear: cars, servants, housing, entertaining, etc.; enough to eat, on relief, have to work as child, etc.).

Ingroups

- c. Who were your father's (mother's) Friends mostly?
What Organizations did your father (mother) belong to?
How did your father (mother) spend his (her) Spare Time?

b. FAMILY FIGURES: PERSONAL ASPECTS. After the inquiry into the sociological aspects of the family background, the personal conception of the family figures by the subject was recorded. The subject's conception of the parent figures could reveal, among other things, whether the picture was dominated by the authoritarian aspects of the parent-child relationship or by a more democratic type of relationship. In this connection the attention of the interviewer was further focused on the ability of the subject to appraise his parents objectively—whether on the more critical or on the more loving side—as contrasted with an inclination to put the parents on a very high plane, exaggerating their strength and virtuousness.

The conceptions concerning the siblings were likewise made the topic of a special inquiry. This was done with the idea in mind that the rivalries connected with sibling situations are an important source of the establishment of interpersonal relationships. An attempt was made to record the existing hierarchies in the sibling situation, the attitudes toward older and younger siblings, as well as the preferences, resentments, and envies arising in this connection.

The power-relationship between the parents, the domination of the subject's family by the father or by the mother, and their relative dominance in specific areas of life also seemed of importance for our problem. The sources within the family of satisfactions and tensions in general were also explored.

In this area, dealing with various personal attitudes, especially careful thought was given to the formulation of the manifest questions regarding which the subject was likely to be sensitive and in conflict. One of the primary functions of these questions was to encourage the subject to talk freely. This was attempted by indicating, for example, that critical remarks about parents were perfectly in place, thus reducing defenses as well as feelings of guilt and anxiety. But since it was obvious that we could by this method never be sure of having obtained a true answer, especially in the case of some individuals—due more often to unintended than to deliberate camouflage—a number of less conspicuous, very specific matter-of-fact questions were also designed to catch general attitudes with as little distortion as possible.

The underlying and manifest questions in this area are as follows:

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

4b. FAMILY FIGURES: PERSONAL ASPECTS

Underlying Questions:

- a. *Subject's Conception of Parent-Figures and Actuality* (i.e., get basis for inferring latter): Degree of Critical Objectivity of subject.
- b. Same for any important *Siblings* (Domination by older sibs? Displacement by younger sibs? Which is most important?)
- c. Pattern of *Power-Relations between Father and Mother* (domination-submission, activity-passivity, etc.).

Suggested Direct Questions:

Images of Father and Mother

- a. What sort of Person is your father? (Mother?)
 What things do you Admire most in your Father? (Mother?) (Require subject to illustrate stereotypes by specific traits and situational examples.)
 Assuming most people aren't perfect, what Human Frailties do your father (mother) have?
 Which Parent do you Take After; are you most Like; Influenced you Most?
 What were his (her) ideals, etc.?

Power-Relations of Father and Mother

- b. How did your parents Get Along together?
 In what ways were your Parents most Alike?
 In what ways are they Different from each other?
 Who Made the Decisions usually? (Get specific information e.g., re finances, recreation, discipline of children, residence, etc.).
 Disagreements arise in every family from time to time; what Bones of Contention did your parents sometimes have?

Siblings

- c. Same initial questions for any Important Siblings. Also:
 Who was your Favorite Brother (Sister)?
 What did you Like About him (her)?
 What did he (she) Mean to you?
 What things did you sometimes Quarrel about?

c. **CHILDHOOD.** Some attempt was also made to obtain information about the earlier phases of childhood. It has to be kept in mind, however, that in view of the type of inquiry used in this study, no differentiation can be made between real childhood events and present tendencies projected into childhood. The assumption was that both types of material are psychologically relevant as long as the possible duality of sources is not overlooked in the interpretation of the material. Thus, the manifest question, "What were you like as a child?" was asked to get either the subject's idea about himself as a child or the possible description of the type of child he might have been. It was observed that the subject, especially if he were a prejudiced one, often attributed to himself as a child characteristics which at the present time he seemed eager to repress.

The inquiry regarding early memories, wishes, fears, dreams, and so forth had the purpose of getting material which stood out for the subject in connection with his childhood and seemed relevant as a basis for inference. Among the underlying questions, the structure of the emotional attachment to the parents seemed of paramount importance. Here we were specifically interested in the parents as objects of cathexis as well as of identification. In the case of a man, it was important to learn whether there was at any time an explicit rebellion against the father, and against what sort of father, or whether there was only passive submission. The assumption behind this question, later proved correct, was that the pattern developed in the relationship to the father tends to be transferred to other authorities and thus becomes crucial in forming social and political beliefs in men. In this connection it is of importance to know not only about rebellion against the father but also how far such rebellion is conscious and accepted as such.

Rebellion against, or submission to, the father is only one part of the picture. Another part deals with the question of identification, or the lack of identification, with the father, and thus with the masculine role in general.

The establishment of masculinity in the boy is, of course, also closely connected with the boy's attitude toward the mother. To what degree was there love for the mother and to what degree identification with the mother? Was such an identification, in its turn, sublimated and accepted by the ego, or was it rejected on the conscious level because the mother symbolized not only something "admirable" but at the same time something weak and therefore contemptible? How did the boy defend himself against the rejected and feared passivity? A compensatory display of "toughness" and ruthless-

ness is, according to findings from the F scale, correlated with antidemocratic social and political beliefs.

Considerations analogous to those made in the preceding paragraphs were also applied to women.

An attempt was also made to probe into pre-Oedipal fixations, that is, to pay attention to the "orality" and "anality" of the subject and especially to the defense mechanisms with which these and other instinctual problems had been handled. The problem of homosexual tendencies, their degree, and the subject's acceptance or rejection of them was also given consideration. It will be seen to be of rather crucial importance for the social and political orientation of the individual how much passive striving there is in men, and even more important, how much counter-cathetic defense is built up against it, and how much acceptance and sublimation of masculine identification there is in women. The problem of homosexuality relates to the different ways of failure in resolving the Oedipal conflict and the resultant regression to earlier phases.

Since, as earlier chapters have indicated, the attitude toward authority is crucial for psychological syndromes related to social and political attitudes, an attempt was made further to find out as much as possible about the type of discipline to which the subject was exposed, and about his reactions to it. Was the discipline consistent or capricious, strict or lenient? Did both parents handle discipline in a similar way or was there much difference between the parents in this respect? Was the matter in question explained to the child and was he included in the discussion of it or did the discipline appear to the child as unintelligible, arbitrary, or overwhelming? Did the parents adhere rigidly to the conventionalized values of their class, with great intolerance toward disobedience and any deviations, especially when the deviations seemed to the parents to be manifestations of lower-class behavior, or were the values the parents tried to transmit less conventional and more in the nature of internal and humanitarian values for which the child's understanding and cooperation could be secured? Was the reaction of the subject mostly fear of authority, which could be met only by acquiescence, or could the child grasp the issues involved and feel that the consideration of certain convincing social values would assure him of his parents' love? In case of failure, did the child feel that everything was lost and that something very bad might happen, or did he feel that renewed efforts would regain for him the love of his parents, only temporarily lost? It was hypothesized that the parents' emotional attitude toward the child, their permissiveness toward his weakness and immaturity, furnished the model for his future behavior toward objects which he considered as weak.

Since the way in which the parents transmit social values to the child, and the punishment and rewards with which they reinforce them, are decisive for the establishment of the superego, we are led from highly personal

problems back to problems of social conscience. The effects are mirrored in interpersonal relationships, on a smaller scale in one's private life and on a larger scale in one's public function as a citizen. A person with a mature, integrated, and internalized conscience will certainly take a different stand on moral and social issues than a person with an underdeveloped, defective or overpunitive superego, or a person who still, as in childhood, clings to a set of rules and values only as they are reinforced by an external authority, be it public opinion or be it a leader.

The underlying and manifest questions under the heading of Childhood History and Attitudes follow.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

4c. CHILDHOOD

Underlying Questions:

- a. *Structure of the Oedipus-Complex:* major identifications, loves, hates in relationships to parent-figures and -surrogates. (Formulated especially for men; adapt for women.)

Has there been an underlying trend of rebellion and hostility against the father, or of submission and passivity?

Has the hostility against the father been admitted into the ego?

Was there real identification with the father? (If not, why not? E.g., was the parent too strong, too weak, not at home, etc.?)

Was there genuine satisfaction in the relationship with the mother?

Was the early attachment with her secure or insecure?

Were there early signs of ambivalence?

Was she a real love-object?

Did subject ever conceive of himself as her champion, or protector, or ally? Or did he ever feel that she was unworthy, or untrustworthy, etc.?

Was there identification with the mother?

Femininity? How handled: by sublimation, or by overcompensation and reaction-formations, etc.?

- b. What were the main *Pre-Oedipal Fixations*, and How Handled? Sublimations versus Reaction-Formations, projections, etc.

Homosexuality? Its level?

- c. *Passivity:* Accepted in the Ego, or Repressed and Overcompensated?

- d. *Reaction to Punishment.*

1. Fear of loss of love, leading to introspection, understanding, psychology, etc., versus:

2. Fear of authority and of capricious discipline, etc. (Get detailed picture of punishment-and-discipline.)

- e. How much *Internalization of Superego*? Is the dominant trend toward neurosis or normality—or toward psychopathic-delinquent attitudes?

Suggested Direct Questions:

Pre-Oedipal

- a. What were you Like as a Child?

What things about your Childhood do you Remember with most Pleasure?

With most Satisfaction?

What is your Earliest Memory?

What things did you Worry about most as a child?

Almost everybody has had some recurrent Bad Dreams; what kinds of bad dreams did you have as a child?

Oedipal Phase

b. Which Parent did you feel Closer To when you were, say, about 6?

Superego and Reaction to Discipline

What about when you were 10? 16? 25? Now? (If there was a shift: What led to this change in your esteem?)

What were your main Satisfactions in your relationship with your father?

With your mother?

What were the chief Bones of Contention?

Which Parent do you think had More To Do with your Becoming the kind of person you are?

Which Parent Exercised the Discipline in your Family?

Whose Discipline did you Fear most? Why? (N.B., fear of physical punishment versus fear of loss of love.)

What Kind of Discipline did your Parents use?

What Things did They Discipline you for mainly?

c. What Other People were Influential in your development?

d. **SEX.** It is well known that the pattern of sexuality mirrors in great detail the state of the entire psychosexual development. A lack of adequate heterosexual adjustment on the physical level is usually found together with inadequate object-relationships on the psychological level; it is manifested in a lack of fusion of sex and love, or in promiscuity, or in inhibition, or in a dependent and exploitative attitude toward the other sex. A lack of warmth and "inwardness" will lead to degradation of the other sex and/or an overglorification which often turns out to be disguised hostility. As mentioned before, the conception of the masculine and feminine role, by men and women, the rigidity versus flexibility of the conception of these roles, and the intolerance versus tolerance toward tendencies of the opposite sex in oneself are of crucial importance for our problem since these attitudes tend to become generalized and projected into the social sphere. The questions concerning this issue are as follows:

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

4d. *SEX*

Underlying Questions:

What is the *Major Pattern of Sexuality?*

a. Mature, Heterosexual Attitudes?

b. If not, What (promiscuity, exploitation of other sex, dependence on other sex, degradation of other sex, or putting other sex on pedestal, rejection of opposite sex, homosexuality, etc.)?

c. In Heterosexual Relationships: degree of inhibition, degree of "inner-

ness" in relationships, degree of hostility and disrespect, degree of emotional warmth in sex relations, degree of fusion of love-and-sex?

Suggested Direct Questions:

Pattern of Sexuality

Where did you get your sex instruction?

What is the earliest sex experience you can remember?

How important is sex in marriage?

What main difficulties have you found in married life?

Have you met many homosexuals in your travels?

e. **SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS.** Some aspects of interpersonal relationships were considered under the preceding headings. Here the more generalized pattern of social relationships is in the focus of attention. Again the question concerns the degree of social libido invested in personal relationships as contrasted with emphasis on utilitarian and manipulative aims. The degree of rejection of other people or of superficial sociability is contrasted with genuine acceptance of others. The history of the sociability and of the social security of the subject had also to be included here. How far was the subject accepted or rejected by the groups in which he participated? Under what conditions does the fact of being rejected lead to identification with, or to hostility toward, the underdog? Participation in boyhood gangs very often shows the first clear manifestation of participation in a "group superego," a state which often continues into adulthood. What, on the other hand, are the effects of being relatively isolated during the formative years of early school life? What are the early manifestations of an internalized superego?

In particular, the questions on Social Relationships are as follows:

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

4c. *SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS*

Underlying Questions:

- a. Degree of *Rejectiveness*: Moral, Arrogant-Individualistic.
- b. Role of *Utilitarian* considerations (status, power, conventionality, manipulateness and exploitiveness, leader-follower attitudes, etc.).
- c. *Degree of Social Libido*: Warmheartedness, Group-Involvement versus being "Outside," etc. (Any history of being rejected or teased or scapegoated, etc.? Any important boyhood (fascistic) gangs, producing a "group-superego" attitude? Rituals, blood-brotherhood, secrecy, hierarchy, etc. How much genuine feeling versus detached insight?)
Type of Social-Libido: Deeper ("inner") relationships versus Superficial Sociability?

Suggested Direct Questions:

Utilitarianism

a. How Important are Friends in a person's life?

What is the main thing Friends have to offer (can give) a person?

Social Libido

What attracts you in a Friend?

How do you Choose your Friends?

What do you Enjoy Doing with your Friends? (Get enough details to reveal the meaning; e.g., if "talk," what about?)

Are you the sort of person who has a Few Close Friends, or do you tend to have a Lot of Friends, or

Rejectiveness

b. What things do you find most Offensive, Annoying, Objectionable, Irritating in other People?

c. Did you belong to any Boyhood Gangs? (If so, get details.)

f. SCHOOL. In connection with the school history, emphasis of the inquiry was placed on the direction of the interests manifested during this period. Had there been interest in the academic aspects of school; and was such interest more directed toward intellectual topics dealing with human problems and often requiring introspection, or was it mainly in mechanical and technological subjects?

The questions pertaining to School History are:

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

4f. SCHOOL

Underlying Questions:

Predominant Interests and Values: Degree of Acceptance of *Sensuous and Intellectual* (especially Intraceptive) Values and interests versus Anti-Pleasure, Anti-Intellectualism, and emphasis on *Mechanical-Manipulative, Power* values?

Suggested Direct Questions:

Values

How did you Get Along in School?

How was your school record?

What Subjects were you Best in? Which did you like most?

In what ways did they appeal to you?

What Subjects were you Poorest in? Which did you like the least?

What did you dislike about them?

5. POLITICS

Information about the subject's attitudes in the area of politics was gathered rather systematically by means of the questionnaire. The party preference of the subject and of his parents was established on the first two sheets of the questionnaire, and an indication as to where the subject stood on the radicalism-liberalism-conservatism-reactionism dimension was afforded by the PEC scale. Moreover, the presence or absence of a tendency toward projection of personal needs onto the political sphere was noted in the responses on the questionnaire. As mentioned before, the interviewer was thoroughly acquainted with the subject's responses to the questionnaire before starting the interview.

The underlying questions taken up in this section of the Interview Sched-

ule were designed to follow up directly some of the questionnaire material in order to get the subject's expanded and spontaneous reactions to these topics. Thus the problem of conservatism-liberalism was taken up in greater detail in order to get the more subtle shades of the subject's beliefs. The conception of the relationships among labor, business, and government was a good indicator of the subject's tendency toward liberalism or laissez-faire conservatism or fascism or radicalism. The manifest questions listed below were aimed at finding the degree to which the political beliefs of the subject were merely projections of his personal needs and anxieties and the degree to which they were based on information and objective situational requirements. The need for a strong leader, for an external guiding authority, can be found again in this sphere, as transferred from the more personal sphere discussed in the clinical section. Internal anxieties not faced as such may be projected, and experienced as fears and threats arising out of the political scene.

For the history of the political opinions of the subject it was of special interest to know whether these were taken over from the parents, uncritically or critically, or whether they were established despite the fact, or because of the fact, that they were bound to lead to disagreement with the parents.

The questions in this area were:

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

5. POLITICS

Underlying Questions:

- a. *Reactionism-Conservatism-Liberalism-Radicalism; Attitudes toward Labor-Business-Government; Democratic-Antidemocratic trends.*
- b. Personalization.
- c. Amount of *Information and Interest.*
- d. *Parental Identification versus Rebellion in political Attitudes.*

Suggested Direct Questions:

General

- a. What do you think about the Political Trends in America Today?
 What are the Major Problems facing the country today?
 What is the Outlook for the future?
 How do you feel things are shaping up for the Future in America?
 In world affairs?
 What is your understanding of Democracy?
 What would an Ideal Society be like?
- b. What do you think of (Where do you stand on; How do you feel about): Labor Unions? (Get elaboration with specific questions, preferably on current issues: e.g., 30 per cent wage increase demand; current strikes; PAC; labor leaders; American Business; Free Enterprise; etc. \$25,000 limitation.)
 Government Control? (E.g., OPA; Unemployment Compensation;

Full-Employment Bill; Public Health Insurance; antitrust; etc. Also anti-PAC; antistrike, etc.)

Personalization

- c. What is it about a man that Makes him Worth Voting for (e.g., in presidential choice in last election)?
- d. What Ought to be Done about (any group or movement objected to)?
What Groups have the Most Influence on political affairs?
How do they work?
What do you consider the Most Dangerous Threats to our present form of government?
What ought to be done about it?

6. MINORITIES AND "RACE"

Since this topic has been given detailed consideration in previous chapters, we may be brief in outlining the underlying and manifest inquiry concerning it. As far as *opinions* are concerned, it was of interest to find the cognitive and emotional line drawn by the subject between ingroup and outgroup and the characteristics he specifically ascribed to each. How stereotyped and how automatic is the attribution of traits to outgroups? A comparison of this part of the interview with the previous ones, especially the clinical, made it possible to ascertain to what degree a subject's innermost preoccupations, such as sex, dependency, "anality," are projected into the social sphere. How far are the accusations against the minority group completely generalized stereotypes and how far is the specific content of these accusations conditioned by the personal problems of the accuser? Is there a special negative or positive affinity between the subject and one particular outgroup? Does the subject believe in social and psychological determination of individual and ethnic characteristics and does he feel his personal responsibility in this respect, or does he think of these characteristics as "inborn" and thus not flexible? The degree of realism in thinking about minority groups belongs here.

The amount of awareness of hostility, the readiness to act against outgroups, are among the major problems concerning *attitudes* toward outgroups. Of relevance in this connection is the degree of inner conflict resulting from being prejudiced. Does the subject feel the need of reconciling his prejudice with democratic and Christian ideals and with respectability, and so forth, or is he ready to act in a straight antidemocratic fashion? In the first case, what are the conditions under which he could lose his inhibitions and act antidemocratically?

The sources of opinions and attitudes were approached by inquiry into parental beliefs, into religious and educational training, and into group memberships. The question was posed as to what degree prejudice may be a function of specific experiences with minority groups.

Occasionally some attempt was made, at the conclusion of the interview, to influence prejudice by argument, by making prejudice disreputable, or by

other means, in order to gain information about effective methods of combating prejudice.

The questions in this area follow:

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

6. MINORITIES AND "RACE"

Underlying Questions:

a. *Opinions.*

1. How *General* or how *Specific* is the Prejudice? (What outgroups are rejected? What outgroups have peculiar Fantasy-value? How does this group differ from other outgroups?)
2. What are the *Main Stereotype Characteristics* of the main outgroups (e.g., power, acquisition, sex, dirty, lazy)?
3. How *Stereotyped* and how *Automatic* is the attribution of traits to outgroups (i.e., phrasing, assurance and categoricalness, recurrence of similar projections, etc.; exceptions)?
4. Is there an "Essential" Race Theory (i.e., can those faults be eliminated, or are they "basic"; whose responsibility is it to make the change)?

b. *Attitudes.*

1. Degree and Form of Hostility (or attraction) toward outgroup(s)? How much is Conscious? Unconscious? How Openly is this Expressed to Others? To the Self? (i.e., how much veiling by pseudodemocratic façade?)
2. Degree and Form of *Aggressiveness* (or willingness to act aggressively) toward outgroup(s)? Is the attitude essentially one of Persecution—or Active Discrimination—or Segregation (with "equality")—or Exclusion only? Check specific readiness to support Antidemocratic measures; and type and degree of Pseudodemocratic Façade.
3. Degree and Nature of *Inner Conflicts* re prejudice? What forces oppose prejudice (e.g., rationality, respectability or ingroup feelings, Christian antiaggression)?

c. *History:* Sources of opinions and attitudes.

1. *Parental* opinions, attitudes, and teachings (also relatives and siblings).
2. *Religious, Educational Training.*
3. *Significant Group Memberships.*
4. *Experience* with minority group members; to what extent is the prejudice a function of frustrations and "Surface Resentments"?

d. *Ingroup Feelings:* Meaning?

e. *Therapy:* What therapeutic techniques are most effective in combating prejudice?

Suggested Direct Questions:

a. *Opinions.*

General

1. What do you think about the problem of Minority Groups in this country? Jewish problem? Negro problem?

What do you think is (are) the most important Minority Problem(s)?

What minority group(s) present(s) the Biggest Problem in this country?

What racial groups do you find the Least Attractive? Which do you like the Least?

(For any group about which subject shows a particular concern, get his ideas of what it is like, and what ought to be done. If he mentions Jews first, get this information on other groups later.)

Stereotype

2. (How) Can you tell a person is a Jew? A Jew from other people? What are the most Characteristic Traits of Jews? Their principal characteristics?

Do you think Dislike of the Jews is Increasing? (If Yes: Why?)

Influence

Do you think the Jews are more of a menace or just a nuisance?

Some people think the Jews have too much influence in this country; what do you think? In what areas? How did they obtain it? How do they use it?

Do you think the Jews have done their part in the War Effort?

Do you think the Jews are a Political Force in America?

"Exceptions"

3. Are there any Exceptions to the general rule? Where do you find them?

Are there some good Jews?

"Basic-ness"

4. Do you think the Jew(s) will Ever Change? Or will there always be something basically Jewish about them (him)? (If the Jew will change:) How might that be done (come about)?

What do you think the Jew(s) ought to do?

b. *Attitudes.*

General

What ought to be done about the Jews? (About the particular problem conceived by subject?)

(In general, if subject is mild at first, see how aggressive he can be induced to be. If he is extreme at first, see how readily he can agree to milder courses.)

Persecution

What action is being taken by people or groups that you know of?

How extensive is this? Are they justified?

What do you think about what Hitler did?

What would you have done if you had had Hitler's problem?

What might lead to the same thing happening here?

What might have to be done as a Last Resort if the Jews continue (doing whatever subject emphasizes as a menace)?

What might Justify taking more Extreme Steps to solve this problem?

What steps might have to be taken?

Some people think the Jews ought to be Sent Back where they came from; how do you feel about this? Should their property be Confiscated, to make sure of putting an end to this problem?

Should their money be divided up?

Discrimination

How about keeping Jews out of Important Positions?

Would that perhaps solve the problem—essentially?

What about Educational Quotas to keep Jews from taking over certain professions?

Segregation

What about keeping Jews out of Gentile Neighborhoods?

Exclusion

Should Gentiles and Jews Mingle socially?

Do you think Gentiles should Intermarry with Jews?

“Exceptions”

(Concerning any proposed measure:) Should this be done to *all* the Jews? How to distinguish?

c. History.

Where did you First Learn about the Jews?

What Personal Experiences have you had with Jews?

Have you had any Contrary Experiences?

What were your Parents' Attitudes toward the Jews, as you were growing up?

Have you Ever Felt Differently about the Jews?

As was the case with interview data on religion, interview material on political and racial attitudes is being postponed for discussion in some of the later portions of the book (Chapters XVI and XVII).

F. THE SCORING OF THE INTERVIEWS

1. QUANTIFICATION OF INTERVIEW DATA

Systematic treatment of interview material presents special problems inherent in the nature of the data. On the one hand, the interviewee has to be given as much freedom as possible for the spontaneous expression of his attitudes and needs. Guidance by means of the Interview Schedule had thus been made as noninterfering as it could be, in view of the definite direction of emphasis that was to be maintained. Material obtained under such circumstances, although contained within a common general frame, is, on the other hand, characterized by a good deal of uniqueness and personal flavor to which only presentation in the manner of case description can do full justice.

In view of the fact that the focus of this study is on group trends rather than on the single case, it seemed possible, as anticipated in the introduction to this chapter, to effect a certain compromise between case study and statistical approach and thus to gain in comprehensiveness and conclusiveness far more than is being lost in immediacy and directness. A kind of crude quantification of the interview material was achieved by counting, in terms of a number of specially designed interview scoring categories, the occurrence of certain characteristics in the interviews of those scoring extremely high and those scoring extremely low on overt anti-Semitism or ethnocentrism. Since this procedure has intrinsic shortcomings, to be discussed below,

the numerical results are not meant to yield conclusive evidence for the validity of the personality differences found between our high and low scorers. They do, however, describe in a relatively systematic, organized, and controlled way the impressions formed about these personality differences in the course of intensive studies of individual cases.

This agreement between interview scoring and case studies justifies increased confidence in the figures presented in the next four chapters. The entire approach should be considered, however, as an initial attempt to combine the study of variables on a group basis with the study of individuals.

2. BROAD OUTLINE OF CATEGORIES IN THE INTERVIEW SCORING MANUAL

The list of categories as well as the more formal part of the explanations accompanying each of them, which together make up the Scoring Manual, will be presented in full, together with the discussion of the specific results, in Chapters X, XI, and XII. There are sixty-two main classifications. Subdivisions of some of them bring the total number of scoring categories used for women to ninety, the total being slightly less for men. These categories cover (1) predominantly factual material such as childhood events or family structure, along with (2) data dealing with attitudes toward oneself, one's parents, the opposite sex, or people in general, and (3) highly interpretative dimensions exemplified by technical psychodynamic terms (such as "counter-cathetic rejection" of certain drives) or else by more "formal" characterizations (such as "rigidity," "intolerance of ambiguity," "anti-intracativeness," and so forth).

The factual material and the evidence on attitudes are presented under the four headings of "Family" (Chapter X) and of "Sex," "People," and "Self" (Chapter XI).

The dynamic and formal categories are especially emphasized in a fifth and concluding part of the scoring scheme, under the heading of "Character Structure and Personality Organization" (Chapter XII). Although these categories were to a considerable extent inspired by psychoanalysis, they should not be considered as psychoanalytic in the narrower sense of the word, since classification of our material is done primarily on the basis of present personality structure rather than on the basis of psychogenetic data. The entire framework, length, and condition of our interviews made it impossible directly to obtain material of a depth-level comparable to that of genuine psychoanalytic material. At the same time, however, there was enough spontaneous material at hand to make it possible for raters trained in dynamic psychology to infer some of the major structural problems and types of defense mechanisms in our subjects, in accordance with the categories provided by the Scoring Manual.

A certain parallelism, although by no means an exact duplication, between

the Interview Schedule and the Scoring Manual will be noted when comparing the two in detail.

3. THE INTERVIEW RATING PROCEDURE AND THE RATERS

Since our major purpose in analyzing the interview material was to gain additional evidence concerning the relationship of prejudice to personality, it was important to conceal from the rater the explicit stand of the subject with respect to ethnic tolerance or prejudice as well as with respect to political ideology in general. All references to these topics throughout the interview were thus carefully deleted before the protocols were handed to the raters. The diagnosis of the subjects' personality was thus rendered "blind." The raters did know, of course, that their subjects had scored either high or low on the scales for measuring prejudice, but they did not know which were the high and which the low scorers.

In all other respects the interview protocols remained unchanged.

a. **RATING BY CATEGORIES.** The rating of the interviews was done for each of the categories separately. The score for the category in question, however, was obtained in a synoptic rather than a piecemeal fashion. The major source for the assignment of a score was the clinical part of the interview, but evidence was utilized from any part of the interview which might be brought to bear on each category.

Scores were in terms of a three-point scale. Since, as was mentioned above, a careful study of the interviews had preceded the construction of the Scoring Manual, certain more or less definite expectations as to what might constitute the personality aspects of a prejudiced as contrasted with an unprejudiced subject had been developed in the way of advance hypotheses. In view of this, the two opposites within each category were tentatively designated as the *presumably* "High" and "Low"² variants or alternatives, i.e., those expected to be typical of prejudiced and of unprejudiced persons, respectively. In the Manual the left column was used for the presumably high and the right column for the presumably low variant.

The third rating, "Neutral," comprised two distinct possibilities: (1) the existing evidence was too colorless or self-contradictory within the category in question to warrant assignment to either the "High" or the "Low" alternative; or (2) there was no evidence at all pertinent to this category. The former case is much less frequent among the "Neutral" ratings actually given than one might expect beforehand. In some of the protocols possibilities (1) and (2) were scored separately; their proportion was found to be about three to seven. In particular, factual questions were somewhat more likely to yield

² Note that the initial letter of the terms "High," "Low," (and "Neutral") is capitalized when referring to interview ratings in order to distinguish these ratings from the actual "high" or "low" scores of the subjects on prejudice and on the other scales of the questionnaire.

"no evidence" than interpretative categories, but even in the case of the group of categories subsumed under character structure the number of cases in which the material was too ambiguous to make a decision possible remained within comparatively low limits.

In absolute terms the number of "Neutrals" is considerable, especially in the case of some of the categories dealing with childhood events (see Chapters X to XII). For many variables lack of information is by no means always due to the impossibility of gathering evidence but rather to the spottiness of either the spontaneous responses of the subject or of the inquiry on the part of the interviewer who, as stated above, could not possibly cover the entire ground in each case. Both the Interview Schedule and the Scoring Manual make an attempt to cover systematically as many as possible of the very numerous areas, but it could not be hoped that each case would furnish material on all of the questions involved.

b. INTUITIVE OVER-ALL RATINGS. Besides the ratings on each of the categories, the raters were asked also to make intuitive over-all ratings. They were instructed, that is, to give their conclusive impression as to whether the subject involved was prejudiced or not. One of two alternatives, "High" (H) or "Low" (L), had to be chosen (for data see final column of Tables 1 (IX) and 2 (IX); discussion in Chapter XIII).

c. THE INTERVIEW RATERS. The ratings were made by two members of the staff of the study, here to be called M and R, one of them male and the other female. Both are well-trained psychologists and were thoroughly familiar with the nature of the categories and the underlying implications as to personality theory. These raters had participated actively in numerous conferences at which the scoring procedure was thoroughly discussed, prior to making the ratings.

Each of the raters scored approximately half of the men and half of the women, high and low scorers being distributed at random in about equal proportions within each group. (Concerning added duplicate ratings to check on reliability, see below.)

In particular, the interviews of cases *M*₁ to *M*₂₀ and *F*₂₂ to *F*_{39a} among those scoring high, and of cases *M*₂ to *M*₁₉ and of *F*₂₉ to *F*₃₉ among the low-scoring interviewees were evaluated by rater M, and those of the remaining interviewees, listed farther down in the respective subdivisions of Tables 1 (IX) and 2 (IX), were evaluated by rater R. It should be added that the code numbers used were distributed at random among the various groups so that each rater rated not only men and women, low scorers and high scorers, but also approximately equal proportions of subjects who had been given Forms 78 and 45 of the questionnaire (see also Table 3 (IX)).

4. RELIABILITY OF THE INTERVIEW RATINGS

There were three ways in which some light was thrown upon the difficult question of the reliability of the interview ratings, although only the second

of these deals directly with reliability in the technical sense of the term. The other two refer to aspects which are merely more or less closely related to this problem.

a. PROPORTIONS OF RATINGS GIVEN. First, the proportion of High, Low, and Neutral ratings within each category was compared for the two raters and found to be in fairly good agreement. One method used in computing an index for this agreement was the following: the frequencies of "High" responses, as scored by the first of the raters on each of the variables was plotted on a scatter diagram against the frequencies of such responses as scored by the second rater. In this comparison, the two raters are represented by the different nonoverlapping groups they were assigned to rate. Similar scattergrams were obtained for "Low" and "Neutral" ratings, and in each of the three cases men and women were plotted separately. With one exception, the correlation coefficients computed from the six scattergrams were between .70 and .82. This indicates that the two raters tended to concur fairly well in giving either a relatively large or a relatively small number of "High," or of "Low," or of "Neutral" ratings within any of the approximately ninety categories, showing a certain uniformity at least for one aspect of the rating policy.

(It may be added that in absolute terms there is also good agreement, the range of frequencies of "High" scores being 0 to 12, and 0 to 14, for the two raters, respectively, the various categories being considered for each of the sexes separately. For "Low" scores the corresponding ranges were 0 to 11 and 0 to 13. Thus, while both the raters neglect to use some of the alternatives offered by the Manual (as indicated by "o"), neither of them uses the opposite alternatives indiscriminately, i.e., in the characterization of all or nearly all the interviews analyzed by them.)

In view of the fact that the two staff members rated different samples of subjects, the coefficients and other data given above suggest that the character and distribution of ratings given for the various categories are to a considerable degree intrinsic to the category in question, at least within our specific combination of raters.

b. INTERRATER AGREEMENT. Secondly, we turn to reliability proper. Nine interviewees in the group assigned to rater M were, in an additional checking procedure not used for the main analysis or for the survey in Tables 1 (IX) and 2 (IX), also rated by rater R under the identical detailed set of aspects. Two of these nine subjects were deliberately chosen from the relatively small group—12 of the 80 interviewees, i.e., 15 per cent—of those for whom the composite standing based on the detailed ratings of the original rater had missed the correct diagnosis as to prejudice. These subjects were *M19* and *F39*. As may be further seen from Tables 1 (IX) and 2 (IX), the remaining seven are likewise mostly not from among the clearest cases as far as interview ratings are concerned.

A comparison of the gross results of the two rating procedures is shown

TABLE 7 (IX)
RELIABILITY OF INTERVIEW RATINGS:
INTERRATER AGREEMENT ON NINE SUBJECTS

Interviewees	Prejudice score (from questionnaire)	Percentage of High ratings on interview Rater M Rater R	Composite standing on interview Rater M Rater R	Intuitive rating on interview Rater M Rater R
M3	low	19.2 36.1	L L	L L
M4	high	77.3 78.1	H H	H H
M5	low	31.4 31.7	L L	L L
M6	high	72.7 74.4	H H	H H
M19	low	70.4 31.1	H L	H ?
F24	high	70.5 70.0	H H	H H
F29	low	33.3 34.4	L L	L L
F31	high	79.4 77.7	H H	H H
F39	low	72.2 27.2	H L	H L

in Table 7 (IX). The prejudice scores based on the questionnaire are taken from Tables 1 (IX) and 2 (IX). However, the numerical scores appearing on these tables for the subjects listed here, as based on the ratings of rater M, are limited to a selection of the more discriminating categories (see below, Section 6). The figures in Table 7 (IX) are based upon the ratings on all categories and are further given as percentages of "High" ratings relative to the possible maximum of ratings as given by the total number of categories. Thereby the number of Neutral ratings—easily obtained by subtracting both "High" and "Low" ratings from the total number of categories, 86 for men and 90 for women (see below)—has been added half and half to the "High" and the "Low" ratings. Composite standing as indicated by a percentage score of over, or of under, 50, and finally intuitive over-all ratings of the interview make up the remainder of the table.

Percentage scores show excellent interrater agreement for six of the nine subjects. Of the remaining three, those with really striking discrepancies are the same two mentioned above as having been misjudged by the original rater, M, namely *M19* and *F39*. In both cases, the second rater has rectified the error very clearly by establishing percentage scores in the neighborhood of 30 which contrast sharply with those in the neighborhood of 70 as obtained from the first rater. The correlation coefficient between the columns representing the two raters—not very meaningful under the circumstances—is .61. It would be raised to about .8 if one of the two "controversial" cases just mentioned were eliminated so as to adjust the proportion of such cases more closely to that referred to above as existing in the total sample of interviewees, namely 15 per cent. Such a figure, if verified on a broader basis, would be quite satisfactory for the kind of material involved.

In terms of composite standing and intuitive ratings, agreement is perfect save for the two cases mentioned. (Intuitive ratings on one of the controversial subjects, *M19*, is incomplete due to the fact that rater R, contrary to instructions, declared herself as unable to make up her mind in this particular case.)

It may be added that the means of the percentage scores for the two raters are quite close to one another as well as to the ideal value of 50. They are 58.4 for M and 50.9 for R. This augments the evidence brought forward above under (a) with respect to the proportion of ratings given by the two raters. The slight preponderance of "High" ratings in rater M is also reflected in his intuitive over-all ratings. In fact, it is concentrated in the two cases where he makes his mistakes and where the second rater evens out the score.

A breakdown for the six major areas covered by the Scoring Manual, namely family patterns (see Chapter X), attitude toward sex, other people, and self (see Chapter XI), and dynamic character structure and cognitive personality organization (see Chapter XII) is given in Table 8 (IX). The number of categories for each area is also indicated. Considering the smallness of these numbers, pairs of averages from raw scores in terms of number

TABLE 8 (IX)
 INTERRATER AGREEMENT ON INTERVIEW RATINGS FOR SIX MAJOR AREAS

Areas in Scoring Manual	Number of categories	Average number of ratings ^b received by four high scorers ^c		Average number of ratings ^b received by five low scorers ^c	
		Rater M H-L	Rater R H-L	Rater M H-L	Rater R H-L
Family pattern (parents, etc)	28	6.8-1.3	9.3-1.3	3.8-5.6	3.0-8.6
Attitude toward sex	7	4.5-0.3	5.3-0.3	1.8-2.2	1.0-3.4
Attitude toward other people	11	6.3-0.0	6.3-0.3	2.2-3.2	0.4-5.0
Attitude toward self	16	9.3-1.3	9.5-1.5	3.0-6.6	1.0-9.8
Dynamic character structure	22	15.3-0.3	14.5-0.5	5.8-6.2	1.6-8.8
Cognitive personality organization	6	5.0-0.0	5.0-0.5	2.0-2.8	0.4-5.0
Totals	90 ^a	47.2-3.2	49.9-4.4	18.6-26.6	7.4-40.6

^aFor men the total is only 86; no adjustment to this slight difference has been made in the present table in the case of the men subjects.

^bRounded to one decimal place

^cSee Table 7 (IX)

of "High" and "Low" ratings (H-L) are given for the four high scorers as contrasted with the five low scorers listed in Table 7 (IX). No indices of reliability were computed here; but comparison of the first with the second and of the third with the fourth pair of figures in each row of Table 8 (IX) reveals a good deal of agreement between the two raters. The fact that this agreement is less pronounced in the case of the low scorers as shown in the columns containing the third and fourth pairs of figures, and that, furthermore, the values of H and L within these pairs often show less clear-cut differentiation than they do in the left part of the table, is due—as was revealed in more detailed analysis not presented here—to the fact that both cases with controversial diagnosis, *M19* and *F39*, happen to be in this group. Perhaps with the exception of family pattern and attitude toward self, this lack of differentiation for the group of low scorers, especially in rater M, and the ensuing disagreement with rater R, is about evenly distributed over the various areas; for high scorers differentiation and agreement is about equally good for all the areas, and the "totals" are in excellent agreement with one another.

Discounting the controversial cases, i.e., the 15 per cent in our total sample of interviewees for which the original rater arrived at a diagnosis opposite to that given by the defining score on the prejudice scales, the results of this fragmentary analysis of reliability are quite encouraging. In fact, if the trend as discussed for Table 7 (IX) should be representative of the entire sample, interrater agreement for the remaining 85 per cent of the interviewees would be close to .9. For the other 15 per cent one may contemplate challenging the validity of the defining prejudice score along with doubting the validity of the interview rating. The "questionnaire-high" may after all be considered the product of an approach that is by definition less concerned with underlying dynamics than is the diagnosis of the "personality-high."

Further data on interrater agreement on the interview will be presented in Chapter XIII.

The problem of agreement of various types of ratings among themselves, such as in our present context especially of composite standing and intuitive over-all rating, will be discussed in Chapter XIII. In a broader sense such aspects are also included within the general concept of reliability.

A third avenue of scrutiny somewhat akin to reliability problems is through the study of "halo-effects," to be discussed next.

5. MINIMIZING HALO-EFFECTS IN RATING THE INTERVIEWS

We return now to the problem of the carry-over from one category to another, much in the way of the "halo-effect" known in social and educational psychology. One way of preventing or minimizing the halo-effect would have been to use designations other than "(presumably) High" and

“(presumably) Low” to characterize the two opposites within the various categories. But such a procedure would have prevented only raters unfamiliar with the underlying hypotheses from succumbing to halo-effects. Such raters, on the other hand, would have been undesirable from other, more crucial points of view. It was thus decided to leave control of halo-effects to special analytical attitudes the raters were asked to maintain, and to ascertain the degree of relatedness in a statistical analysis of the completed ratings. It must be noted that—as in all cases of halo-effects—a certain amount of correlation may be fully justified by fact, i.e., by existing correlation of real traits. Exactly how much of the halo is realistic would require further intensive study for all combinations of categories involved.

Both the variability of the discriminatory power of the single categories (see below) and the variability of the proportion of “High” and “Low” ratings ascribed to the various subjects seem to indicate that the raters succeeded, at least in part, in keeping the halo-effect within reasonable bounds in rating the subjects. Evidence on the second of these points is contained in Tables 1 (IX) and 2 (IX) in the first two of the columns relating to ratings of the interviews. As is readily seen, hardly any of the subjects are classified as “High” or as “Low” on all categories even when the “Neutral” ratings are excluded from consideration, and for some of them there is an approximately equal number of “High” and “Low” ratings. This shows that the raters were quite capable of separating the various issues involved, and of rating a person as “High” in one respect and as “Low” in another.

6. TABULATION OF INTERVIEW RATINGS BY CATEGORIES: STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

A tabulation of interview ratings by single categories was obtained simply by counting the instances of High (H), of Low (L), and of Neutral (N) ratings, on a given category, among subjects of each of four groups—high-scoring men, low-scoring men, high-scoring women, and low-scoring women (scoring, that is, extremely high or low on the direct prejudice questionnaire).

Analysis of the figures for a given category, with a view to their bearing upon the underlying hypotheses, could have any one of four outcomes—two “positive” and two “negative.” The “positive” instances are confirmatory of the original hypothesis. They include “High” ratings—i.e., those designating reactions *presumed* to occur more frequently in the prejudiced person—when given to subjects scoring high on the prejudice scales, as well as “Low” ratings given to relatively unprejudiced, i.e., our so-called “low-scoring,” subjects, in short, the hH and lL combinations. The remaining two figures, indicating the frequency of prejudiced subjects receiving a “Low” and of unprejudiced subjects receiving a “High” rating, in short, the hL and the lH combinations, constitute the “negative,” nonconfirmatory instances.

The series of tables in Chapters X to XII (Tables 1(X) to 2(XII)) presents, for the two sexes separately, the numbers of prejudiced and of unprejudiced interviewees who give the presumably "High" and the presumably "Low" responses in the interviews, for each of the scoring categories. The number of "Neutrals" may be obtained by subtraction of their sums from the total number of subjects in the respective prejudiced or unprejudiced groups. The four raw figures are followed by two sums which contrast the total number of positive with the total number of negative instances. All "positive," i.e., confirmatory, evidence is *italicized*. Whenever a category is defined in the Scoring Manual by only one variant, H or L, rather than by an opposition of an H with an L, only the presence of the trait in question is registered in the tables and the remaining space is left blank.

The final column of the tables indicates the level of statistical significance of the difference, on the category in question, between prejudiced and unprejudiced extremes as defined in the present study. It thus refers to the "discriminatory power" and the importance of the category as a personality correlate—and therefore as a potential measure—of overtly expressed ethnic prejudice. Indications of significance are given in terms of whether or not the 5 per cent (satisfactory), the 2 per cent, or the 1 per cent level (highly satisfactory, since in this latter case there is a 99 per cent probability that the obtained difference is not due to chance factors) has been reached *or* surpassed, without specifying whether or by how much they have been surpassed. Significance was computed after evenly dividing the "Neutrals" among the "High" and the "Low" ratings. It must not be forgotten, in this connection, that dividing the Neutral ratings tends to lower the index of significance, the more so the larger the proportion of these ratings. Thus, in treating the Neutral ratings as we do, we are keeping on the safe side, since, as was pointed out above, the Neutral scorings are based, in a considerable proportion of the cases, on lack of information rather than on lack of actual discriminability.

Wherever the proportion of Neutrals for the total sample of interviewees is larger than 50 per cent, the statistical significance of the category in question was not computed and therefore there was no entry under any circumstances in the last column of the tables. The category was also omitted from the survey of interview scores in Tables 1 (IX) and 2 (IX). For men the total number of categories is 86, somewhat less than for women, in whose case a few more subdivisions were introduced into the Scoring Manual. Of these 86 categories, 72 yielded less than 50 per cent Neutrals, and thus remained for full treatment. For women only 65 of the original 90 categories yielded less than 50 per cent Neutrals and were thus retained for full treatment. The fact that the categories were generally somewhat more discriminatory in the case of the men than in the case of the women may be

accounted for by the fact that most of the men were interviewed at a later stage of the study and that therefore their records were more complete.

All the calculations discussed above were performed separately for men and women. Corresponding figures for each appear closely adjacent to one another in the tables, those for men (M) in the upper left-hand and those for women (W) in the lower right-hand area of each of the "cells" that one may imagine at the intersection of vertical columns with horizontal rows, the latter defined by the various categories.