

C H A P T E R X

PARENTS AND CHILDHOOD AS SEEN THROUGH THE INTERVIEWS

Else Frenkel-Brunswik

A. INTRODUCTION

In turning to the specific results of the interviews we begin with the organization of the family. Many of the attitudes and underlying needs discussed in this volume must be assumed to originate, as far as the individual is concerned, in the family situation. Here the growing child learns for the first time to handle interpersonal relations. Some of the members of the family are in an authoritative, others in an equalitarian or in a weaker position than himself. Some are of the same, others are of the opposite sex. It soon becomes evident to the youngster what kind of behavior is considered appropriate and will lead to reward and what kind of behavior will be punished. He finds himself confronted with a certain set of values and certain expectations which he has to meet.

Within the general common framework of the white American population, families vary greatly as to the rigidity or flexibility of the roles defined within the family, as well as to values in general. We shall encounter families in which considerably more emphasis is placed on obedience than it is in others. In some cases discipline is harsh and threatening, in others intelligible and mild. Or there may be rigorous adherence to conventional rules and customs rather than to more flexible and more intrinsic values which lead to greater tolerance for individual variations. Or smooth functioning within the family may depend either more on exchange of well-defined obligations and "goods," or else on an exchange of genuine affection. These and other differences in the organization of the family are under scrutiny in the light of their possible implications with respect to the personality structure of the individual and his social and political beliefs.

Although no striking relations between these patterns and gross economic factors have been uncovered in the present study, systematic investigations of a more distinctly sociological nature would undoubtedly reveal broader

cultural and subcultural determinants of these differences, say, the greater frequency of one or the other type of family organization in different national subgroups, or a dependence on the relative stability or instability of the socioeconomic family history.

While this goes to press, data from a separate project (Frenkel-Brunswick, for an advance report see 30)¹ seem to indicate that parents of extremely prejudiced children are relatively often the children of foreign-born parents or show preoccupation as to social and national insecurity.

Specific rating categories from the Interview Scoring Manual in the area of family organization, followed by tabulation of quantitative results and eventually by a discussion and the presentation of pertinent quotations from the interviews themselves, are given in Sections B to D.

B. ATTITUDES TOWARD PARENTS AND CONCEPTION OF THE FAMILY

1. DEFINITION OF RATING CATEGORIES AND QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

In line with the over-all subject matter of the present volume, the discussion concerning attitudes toward parents will, among others, center about the following questions: Is the general tendency toward glorification and lack of critical evaluation of ingroups on the part of the ethnically prejudiced also mirrored in their attitudes toward their parents? Is there a tendency toward submission, and how are the problems of rebellion, hostility, and guilt handled in our two opposite groups? How are the feelings of genuine love related to conformity as contrasted with independence?

The definitions of the specific categories of the Scoring Manual dealing with problems of this nature are listed here in the form in which they were used by the raters. It should be remembered, however, that the Manual represents merely a summary of what was developed, and discussed with the two raters, in extended conferences preceding the actual rating procedure. The subsequent text makes occasional use of the more prominent of the connotations thus established which were not formally incorporated in the Manual in order not to overload it in actual use.

Before starting the presentation of the various parts of the Interview Scoring Manual, attention must be called to the fact that strict opposi-

¹ The study on social discrimination in children referred to here is being carried out at the Institute of Child Welfare of the University of California. The project was initiated by the present writer, in cooperation with Harold E. Jones and T. W. Adorno, and sponsorship was at first by the Scientific Department of the American Jewish Committee. In developing the tests and experiments the present writer was aided primarily by Claire Brednor, Donald T. Campbell, Joan Havel, Murray E. Jarvik, and Milton Rokeach.

tion or near-opposition of the presumably "High" and the presumably "Low" variants is to be assumed only where the numbers or number-letter combinations appearing on the right side of the page are identical with those on the left. Thus Category 2, "victimization," stands in a somewhat oblique relation to Categories 2a to 2c. In some cases pairings of this kind reflect the fact that there is more than one opposite to a given variant. Beginning with Section C of this chapter, different sets of letters are sometimes used on the two sides to stress an absence of one-by-one correspondence of a series of alternatives listed on the right with a series of items on the left, although the lists in their entirety define a more clear-cut pattern of opposition. (Concerning the lopsided evaluation of asymmetrical categories in the tables to follow, see the concluding pages of the preceding chapter.)

The first subdivision of the Interview Scoring Manual follows. As in the Interview Schedule, *italics* are used to represent key phrases which had been emphasized to the raters by underscoring.

INTERVIEW SCORING MANUAL: ATTITUDES TOWARD PARENTS
AND CONCEPTION OF FAMILY
(to Table 1(X)).

PRESUMABLY "HIGH" VARIANTS

1. *Conventional idealization* of parent(s): Overestimation of qualities and status, expressed in behavioral (essentially external), conventionalized generalities, or undifferentiated "all's well" attitude
2. *Victimization* (quasi-persecutory) by parent(s): Neglect, including failure to give proper discipline, unjust discipline; "picked on"; unfair; resents preferring of rival sib or spouse (or foster-sib or step-spouse); etc.
- 3a. *Submission* to parental authority and values: respect based on fear
- 3b. *Capricious rebellion* against parents; delinquency
- 4a. *Ego-alien dependence-for-things* and support on parents: essentially exploitive-manipulative-"getting"; an externalized relationship
- 4b. *Sense of obligation-and-duty* to

PRESUMABLY "LOW" VARIANTS

1. *Objective appraisal* of parents
- 2a. *Principled open rejection*
- 2b. *Genuine positive affect*: some reference to (positive) psychological qualities; individualized characterizations
- 2c. *Blocked affect* (Presumably mutually exclusive with 2a)
3. *Principled independence*
4. *Love-seeking succorance-nurturance-affiliation* toward parents

parents: Desire to "make it up to them"

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>5. <i>Ingroup orientation</i> to family as a whole; e.g., emphasis on family heredity and "background"; homogeneous-totalitarian family vs. rest of world; aristocratic superiority of family, etc.</p> | <p>5. <i>Individualized</i> approach to members of the family</p> |
|--|---|

In Table 1(X), the results for both men and women interviewees are presented in the manner described in the concluding section of the preceding chapter. Abbreviated formulations of the categories just listed are presented, along with category numbers, for purposes of easier identification.

2. IDEALIZATION VS. OBJECTIVE APPRAISAL OF PARENTS

In view of their general tendency toward conventionality and submission toward ingroup members, it is not surprising to find in the prejudiced subjects a tendency toward "*idealization of the parents.*" This idealization is expressed characteristically in generalized and undifferentiated, conventionalized terms which primarily glorify external features of physical appearance or overt behavioral conduct rather than involving the more internal aspects of their personality. "*Objective appraisal*" of parents, referring to an ability for critical evaluation of the parents in specific and psychologically conceived terms, on the other hand, is predominant in the unprejudiced subjects.

The detailed results presented in Table 1(X) (under Category 1) reveal the striking fact that none of the low-scoring women interviewed shows the glorification of the parents just described; instead, 11 of them show objective, critical appraisal. Of the high-scoring women, 9 show glorification and 6 objective appraisal of parents. For the total group of women, there are 20 "positive" as contrasted with 6 "negative" instances in the sense defined at the end of the preceding chapter. The statistical significance of the difference between the positive evidence (i.e., that confirming the original hypothesis underlying the distinction between the "High" and the "Low" variant) and the negative (nonconfirmatory) evidence cited is found to be at the "1 per cent level," and thus highly satisfactory (see Chapter IX, Section F, 6).

A good illustration of the "High" attitude in women is given by the following quotation from the interview of one of the high scorers: "Mother—she amazes me—millions of activities—had two maids in _____ years ago, but never since—such calmness—never sick, *never*—beautiful woman she really is." The reference to external dimensions, both behavioral ("million activities") and physical ("never sick, beautiful"), can be seen clearly in the foregoing record. It must be emphasized that the subjects were asked, in this connection, "What kind of person is your father (mother)?" without further

TABLE 1 (X)
 INTERVIEW RATINGS ON ATTITUDE TOWARD PARENTS AND CONCEPT OF FAMILY
 FOR 80 SUBJECTS SCORING EXTREMELY "HIGH" OR "LOW" ON THE ETHNIC PREJUDICE QUESTIONNAIRE SCALE

Interview rating categories (abbreviated from Manual)	Sex	Number of "High" (H) and "Low" (L) ratings received by				Sums of instances "positive" "negative"	Level of statistical significance reached (percentage)
		20 men and 25 women "high scorers"		20 men and 15 women "low scorers"			
		H	L	H	L		
1. Conventional idealization(H) vs. objective appraisal(L) of parents	Men	11	1	2	13	24	3
	Women	9	6	0	11	20	6
2. Victimization by parents (H) vs. a. Principled open rejection of parents (L)	Men	6		4		6	4
	Women	8		4		8	4
b. c. Genuine affection or blocked affect for parents (L)	Men		1		3	3	1
	Women		2		3	3	2
3a. Submission to parents(H) vs. principled independence(L)	Men	4			12	12	4
	Women	3			10	10	3
3b. Capricious rebellion(H)	Men	14	2	2	10	24	4
	Women	9	0	1	8	17	1
4a. Dependence for things on parents (H) vs. love-seeking affiliation(L)	Men	9		4		9	4
	Women	6		1		6	1
4b. Sense of obligation and duty(H)	Men	13	1	1	14	27	2
	Women	13	5	2	8	21	7
5. Ingroup conception of family(H)	Men	5		1		5	1
	Women	1		1		1	1
	Men	6		2		6	2
	Women	7		1		7	1

specification (see the Interview Schedule as presented in the preceding chapter).

The overestimation of parents in more general terms is especially clear in the record of another prejudiced woman interviewee (*F24*): "Father—he is wonderful; couldn't make him better. He is always willing to do anything for you. He is about _____ years old, six feet tall, has dark brown hair, slim build, young-looking face, good-looking, dark green eyes." The same subject gives further evidence of the stereotypical conception of parents in the high scorers by repeating the same description for her mother, differentiating only the physical characteristics. After repeating the first two sentences she continues: "She is about 5 feet 5 inches, neither slim nor stocky. She's reducing. She has dark hair, blue eyes, is nice looking. She is _____ years old." These illustrations are quite typical of the responses of our high-scoring subjects.

It should be added that none of the 6 high-scoring women who show "objective appraisal" of parents was considered to manifest "positive affect" toward the parents (Category 2). This will be discussed below.

Very characteristic of high-scoring subjects is an initial statement of great admiration for parents, followed by some criticism which is not, however, recognized as such by the subject. The comparison of reactions to general questions with reactions to specific questions proved especially fruitful, e.g., when parents were characterized in general positive terms but the specific episodes and traits referred to were mostly of a negative character. (Regarding related mechanisms of self-deception, see 33, 34.) The subject is aware only of admiration toward the parents, and the reservations seem to enter the picture against "better" intention and knowledge, thus injecting into the statement an element of ambivalence.

Examples of this attitude from the protocols of high-scoring women are quoted in the following. It should be mentioned here that throughout Chapters X to XII the special code numbers used in rating the interviews are retained for greater anonymity; for the same reason, localities, occupations and related personal data are either left out or disguised.

F31: (Father?) "He has a marvelous personality and gets along well with people. He has a hot temper."

Or *F79*: "Mother was, of course, a very wonderful person. She was very nervous. Irritable only when overdoing."

Or again, *F74*: "Father is quiet and calm. He never shows irritation. He is very intelligent, and his opinions are very valid. He is very sincere and very well liked by friends and employees. He rarely puts himself out for people, but people love him. He is exceptionally good looking, dresses well, has gray hair, and is _____ years old."

Glorification of parents is equally or even more pronounced in our high-scoring men than it is in the high-scoring women. Of the 20 interviewees

in this group, 11 show this feature whereas only one has been rated as giving evidence of "objective appraisal"; and the entire category is again significant at the 1 per cent level. One of the high-scoring men describes his father as a "very, very fine man—intelligent, understanding, excellent father, in every way." Another says that his father "is always good to his family. Naturally, a kid would not think their parents had any weaknesses in them." Use of such terms as "naturally" or "of course"—the latter in the protocol of *F79* quoted above—reveals the element of conventionalism inherent in the mechanism of glorification. Another high-scoring man says:

M47: (What sort of person was your mother?) "Well, best in the world. . . . She's good, in fact, the best. In other words, she's just tops with me. She's friendly with everybody. Never has no trouble. Does anything for me she can. Writes me all the time. (What do you admire most about her?) Just about everything. When father went away, mother took care of me all her life, where she could have put me in a home some place if she had wanted to. She always stayed with me in trouble."

Or, *M52*: (What have you admired most about your father?) "Well, let's see. . . . Well, there's really no particular point that I admire most. . . . I've always been very proud to be his son. (What sort of person was your mother?) Most terrific person in the world to me. (Shortcomings of mother?) Well, I don't really think she has any, except maybe too wound up in her home, and didn't take more interest in social affairs. . . . I truthfully can't say she has any definite shortcomings."

Or, *M51*: (Going back to your father, you say you didn't accept him as a shining example when you were a child?) "He was always with me except when I was in boarding school, that is, always at home. I just took him for granted, that's all. I never analyzed him . . . when I was *very* small. Instead of asking *why* does the sun shine, how are babies made, etc., etc., my father says I took everything for granted. . . . I wonder why that was. . . ."

One of the outstanding features in the above quotations from high scorers is the use of superlatives in the description of parents, such as "excellent man in every way," "best in the world," "most terrific person," etc. If more detailed and specific elaborations are made at all, they refer to material benefits or help given by the parents. Where there is no readiness to admit that one's parents have any weakness in them it is not surprising to find later an indication of repressed hostility and revengeful fantasies behind the mask of compliance. Some evidence on this point has already been presented above.

The high scorers' emphasis on more obvious rather than on subtle and internalized characteristics cannot be traced to a lower level of education or of intelligence (see Chapter VIII). Rather it must be seen as in line with their general tendency toward greater shallowness and stereotypy and a diluted diffuseness of inner experiences.

The objective appraisal of one's parents, manifested primarily by the low scorers, has a very different quality. Instead of an apparent overestimation of the parents which, as will be seen, goes hand in hand with a fearful submission to them, we find in the typical unprejudiced subject an evalua-

tion of the parents on terms of equality. In the following records, all taken from interviews of low-scoring subjects, we find the parents described as real people with real assets and shortcomings. The emphasis in the description is on internal rather than external and physical characteristics. Concomitant with a more critical attitude, we often find in these records a closer and warmer relationship with the parents. It also becomes clear that the parents have often been a source of comfort and love for these subjects, who, in their turn, are more secure in their feelings toward their parents. They are thus able to face and to express conflicts in the areas where there is or was disagreement. Often we get the impression that the low scorers talk in a benevolently condescending way about their parents, critically and at the same time lovingly.

Thus low-scoring women are found to describe their parents as follows:

F65: "My mother is very much interested in people; she is practical and sensible, but she gets too much interested in fads. On some points I disagree with my mother very much. Mother wants me to be more social. She wants me to wear lipstick, go out to parties, etc. I am too lazy to do all those things. She is very good, nice and does the right thing, but I don't like her temperament. She is mad one minute and the next one she isn't. She gives me too much advice."

F62: "Father tries to be rational, but he is not always so. He is a dominant person, though my mother was master of the house."

F70: (What kind of person is your father?) "Father was never much in the picture; he paid more attention to me between the ages of one and six than later. I think he wanted a boy, so he paid little attention to me, so probably has not influenced my attitudes very much. Describing father is easier. He's a more definite kind of person than mother. He's a person of great intolerance; he is 'a great authority on all subjects' (spoken with some irony) including medicine and physiology."

F23: "Father was very dominating in the home, like all European men, and mother submitted to him. I almost think she enjoyed 'being a martyr'!" (It then became very clear that her mother's submissive and self-sacrificing attitude were unacceptable to the subject. The mother never got what she wanted. The things she wanted were like dreams, and she seemed satisfied to keep them as dreams. For example, she would have liked to redecorate the house or to buy a summer place, but the father would never let her.)

F26 feels that her father did not understand her point of view. She thinks he is sensitive, but does not sense other people's feelings. The mother is described as a pal, and as having a sense of humor. Subject thinks that, unlike her father, her mother understood what she was feeling.

Examples of "objective appraisal" of parents in low-scoring men follow. As is to be expected in our culture, there sometimes is a word or two of exaggerated praise at the beginning; but this is usually followed up by some more specific qualification of a less stereotyped, more vivid and direct kind.

M42: (What sort of person is your mother?) "Well, I think she is a wonderful woman . . . been very good to me . . . never put too many restrictions on my activities . . . her rules were few and far between, but what rules there were, had to be obeyed and not to be monkeyed with. . . . As a woman, she might seem to be a little

hard to get acquainted with . . . and, at first, might seem a little 'uppitish,' but . . . she tends to have relatively few friends, and comes to know them pretty well . . . quiet, listens more than she talks, very fair. (What do you admire most about her?) I don't know. I've never given it much thought. I don't think of any one trait . . . she is very fair. . . . I don't think you could talk her into cheating . . . if she feels something is right, she'll stick up for it no matter what."

M44: (What sort of person is your father?) "Oh, he's the kind of guy who never has been very happy working for somebody else. He's always had a little difficulty, especially with a very large company (laughs). He just has a venomous hatred for any big outfit. . . . He has a very vital sense of justice and honesty, and he just can't stand pressure practices. . . ."

M50: (What sort of person is your mother?) "An intellectual and a very well-educated person. Her principal gift seems to be that of perception. And a musician (piano) . . . not by trade but certainly by nature. (What do you admire most about her?) Her intellectual ability."

M53: (What sort of person was your mother?) "Well, sort of an average person, a rather happy person, quite a happy person. I think she was fairly intelligent, and there again was conditioned to mother-wife sort of thing. Always maintained a pleasant home, I mean really pleasant. (Weaknesses?) Well, I would say a certain unworldliness. (How do you mean?) Perhaps, a perfect product of her age, in a way. Kind of a respectable, average, God-fearing sort of person (laughs). . . . Didn't know much about finances . . . clinging-vine type of female, but a very pleasant person. Made not a desperate attempt, but maintained a very pleasant home . . . very pleasant, reasonable sort of person. Certain possessiveness (towards subject)."

M3: "I like my father. He is more a taciturn type, a quiet Frenchman, keeps out of trouble. I don't particularly respect my mother. She is intellectually shallow, wishy-washy—vacillating is the word. That's a hell of a thing to say about mother, but . . . (Q) "Like I'll tell her what I want to do, and she'll agree enthusiastically. Then father will come along with his ideas against mine, and she'll agree with him. You can only take so much of that. . . . I admire father for his ability to keep his mouth shut. He just says nothing and looks dignified and everyone admires and respects him. I wish I could do that. Of the two, I'd rather be alone with him. (What is your mother like?) Kindly, generous, always wishing well, seeing the bright side of things, fairly jolly, cracking jokes. Gets along with people fairly well, they like her and she likes them. Her geniality may be just practice because she's been teaching so long . . . principal of a local grammar school . . . she knows how to be amusing, hail-fellow-well-met, you might say. But slightly moralistic, morals of about 1910. For example, she is against Errol Flynn; doesn't moralize, just makes critical remarks in a joking way."

M15: "Father was born in 1890 on a farm in _____, mother in 1889 on an _____ farm. (Subject describes his father as having a bad temper and being very strict, punishing the children severely; such as beating them with a strap.) Father did not attend high school. He had many friends. Played football. Father started out as a game feeder at _____ University, also became a good carpenter and painter. In the 1920's the family moved to _____ and father became a minister in the _____ Church. The only prerequisite for that was to be able to read the Bible. His sermons are all hell-fire and brimstone." (Subject thinks that father had an 'inferiority complex,' doesn't know just how to explain it.)

Not only do low-scoring subjects express disagreement with their parents more freely, but there is evidence in the records that when they disagree they

have the strength to follow their own way, though often not without paying the price of conflict and guilt.

It is with respect to the following aspects that the unprejudiced subjects are most often critical of their parents: pressure to sociability, parents giving too much advice, too much dominance or possessiveness, lack of understanding, religious conflicts. Often hand in hand with these resentments real appreciation of the parents is expressed in specific terms by pointing to their abilities, their independence of conventions, generosity, perceptiveness, happiness.

Since typical low scorers do not really see their parents as any too overpowering or frightening, they can afford to express their feelings of resentment more readily. Being able to mobilize rebellion, unprejudiced subjects thus learn to conceive of equality as an alternative to the relationship of dominance-submission. Ambivalence toward the parents can be openly faced and worked out on this basis, preventing the crippling effect of too much repression and submission. It is in this manner that expression of rebelliousness seems to go with increased ability to give as well as to receive genuine affection while repression of resentment is associated with a more stereotypical glorification of parents that seems devoid of real feeling.

3. GENUINENESS OF AFFECT

Manifestations of *genuine positive affect* toward the parents as revealed, among other things, by references to (positive) psychological qualities, were found mainly in low-scoring subjects (Category 2b). It can be understood readily that positive affect toward parents should be found more often where there is an objective evaluation of the parents rather than where there is resentment toward them. In addition to the illustrations of positive affect given previously, we quote here one example of a very intensive expression of positive feeling for the father on the part of a low-scoring woman:

F63: "But I remember when my father left, she came to my room and said, 'You'll never see your Daddy again.' Those were her exact words. I was crazy with grief and felt it was her fault. I threw things, emptied drawers out of the window, pulled the spreads off the bed, then threw things at the wall."

The finding that positive affect toward parents is present more often in low scorers must be seen in conjunction with the results on glorification versus objective appraisal as discussed above. In fact, 6 out of the 25 high-scoring women interviewees (as against 11 out of the 15 lower scorers, to be sure) were rated as manifesting objective appraisal. From the present data, however, it is evident that the objectivity of the high-scoring women must be regarded as more hostile than positive. None of them was rated as having "genuine positive affect." Being basically an attitude of libidinated interest, true objectivity seems to be primarily the domain of the low scorers, at least

in the present context. This is far from saying that all or nearly all the prejudiced extremes exhibit this trait. In fact, low scorers sometimes display distortions all their own, caused mainly by feelings of guilt and remorse and often leading to an obsessive rather than a genuine type of objectivity (see Chapter XII).

There is some evidence of what may be called *blocked affect* in the low scorers (Category 2c). An example is given by one of the men in this classification who answered the question, "What were your parents like?" by simply saying "normal parents" without being able to elaborate on this topic when questioned further.

It was expected, on the basis of the generally greater openness of the low scorers, that if parents were rejected by low-scoring subjects, this rejection would tend to be open and based on disagreement with respect to basic principles. *Principled open rejection* (Category 2a) did not, however, prove to be statistically differentiating. This may well be due to the fact that only a few cases manifested this attitude.

4. FEELINGS OF VICTIMIZATION

Somewhat more often than open rejection of the parents, a feeling of *victimization by the parents* (Category 2) is found in the high-scoring women interviewees. These feelings include complaints about being neglected, unjustly disciplined, picked on or otherwise unfairly treated, especially in rivalry situations within the family. Eight of the high-scoring women interviewees showed this attitude, often in conjunction with a glorification of the parents. The subsequent record of a high-scoring woman interviewee gives an example of admiration for the father in general terms, as expressed by the initial phrase, "a grand person," combined with resentment and a feeling of being neglected in favor of the brothers which is brought out after encouragement by the interviewer to describe the father's faults:

F₃₂: Altogether she thinks her "father is a grand person." When asked whether, since no one is perfect, there were any little faults that she could name, she said that she couldn't think of any. He never drank; well, he swore a little bit. And he was argumentative. (However, in discussing her vocation, subject had mentioned that the father had been willing to finance the education of the boys, but that he expected the girls to stay home and be ladies, so what the girls got they got on their own. In another connection, subject remarked that she had got nothing out of her father. He provided them with the necessities of life, but would not give them anything extra. He never allowed the girls to entertain boys at home. Nevertheless, subject stated that she was closer to her father than to her mother.) When the interviewer broached the topic of her brothers and sisters, subject replied, "I'm right in the middle—don't they say middle children are forgotten children!" When asked if she thought that was so, subject closed up, merely remarking that her parents showed no partiality.

Some of the other high-scoring women are resentful against their parents

because of a feeling that their brothers were preferred by virtue of their being boys. Envy, resentment, and depreciation of the brother by high-scoring women, in conjunction with the sense of being victimized by the parents, is exemplified by the following report:

F39: "I had to get up early with mother and bake and clean all day long. I used to say that it was especially unfair because my brother would play. Mother said, well, he was a boy, and that really made me mad."

It must be emphasized that these feelings of resentment against the parents, especially when they appear in the records of high-scoring subjects, are usually not ego-accepted. Thus *F39*, whose record was just quoted above, states that her mother was "terribly strict with me about learning to keep house. . . . I am glad now, but I resented it then." The feelings of resentment are considered "bad" and therefore projected onto childhood and not accepted as present feelings.

Such strictness and the general idea of being treated as a "child" at home are often the source of feelings of victimization. At the same time there is, as will be discussed in greater detail below, submission to the demands of the parents. One high-scoring girl complains about her father: "Can't say I don't like him . . . but he wouldn't let me date at 16. I had to stay home. . . ." Another girl in this group says, "Father and mother were so anxious to adjust that they forgot us. They treated us as 16-year-olds when we were actually 18." Prejudiced subjects generally tend to feel themselves "forgotten," the victims of injustice who did not "get" enough of the things they deserved. They thus tend to resent other people, especially outgroups, of whom they readily conceive as unjustifiably threatening, as intruding on their rights, and as attempting to take privileges away from them.

As was pointed out in previous publications (E. Frenkel-Brunswik, 35, 38) and as will be shown in detail in Chapter XIV, high-scoring women tend to express a great deal of hostility toward mother figures in their responses to the Thematic Apperception Test. In their interviews, however, we find mainly admiration for the mother, although this is frequently intermingled with nonaccepted feelings of hostility and resentment. In those relatively rare cases in which there is an open expression of hostility toward the mother in the interview of a high-scoring woman, one is likely to find this hostility very intense and of an almost paranoid character. The following example is characteristic of this:

F36: Subject describes her mother variously as domineering, dictatorial, and self-centered. Her mother is good at social relationships; she knew how to get along with people. After her divorce, she worked as a traveling ——— saleswoman until subject graduated from high school. When on the road, she was very popular with the other salesmen. She worked just long enough to see subject through school, then expected subject to support her, and so quit work. When subject was in high school, she used to make all the clothes for her mother and herself. Once her mother

cut out a dress wrongly and when subject criticized what she had done, her mother cried, "You don't want to do anything for your mother!" To this, subject retorted, "I never will make anything for you again!" And she never did. In ———, subject shared an apartment with her mother; her mother wanted to run her life and made it impossible for her to have friends at home. She expected her to give in to her for everything. She practically pushed subject out of the apartment; so subject told her finally that she would have to get a place of her own. Her mother asked her how much money she was making and subject replied, "None of your business!" This was what her mother had often said to her. Her mother figured out how much she was making and then asked subject to increase her allowance. Subject retorted, "What would you do if I didn't support you!" This shut her up. Things finally became so unbearable that subject broke with her mother completely and has not seen her for years. However, she has continued to support her mother and still sends her a check regularly.

The foregoing record is atypical of the interview material but would be typical of the stories that high-scoring women tell about mother figures in the Thematic Apperception Test. In the stories told by prejudiced women about mother figures the pressure which such women exert upon their daughters is usually revealed alongside the fantasies of revenge. In the more direct descriptions of their mothers in the interviews there is, in most cases, nothing but expressions of admiration.

The intensity of hostility, once such an attitude breaks through in the interview, points toward the fact that strong defenses against it are necessary and indicates once again the source and meaning of the attitude of "glorification." In spite of the fact that the subject quoted above openly faces her hostility toward her mother, she still often feels obliged to submit to the mother although she really cannot accept this kind of dependency. Typically, the quarrel with the mother centers about material benefits and problems of exploitation.

Feelings of victimization were also found in 4 low-scoring women. However, in the low-scoring cases such feelings differ somewhat in kind from those of subjects who score high. For example, *F63*, whose intense expressions of despair have been quoted above, experiences the divorce of her parents as desertion by her father. There, the feeling of resentment has a different quality in that it seems a reaction to loss of love rather than a dissatisfaction with not "getting" enough. In other cases the feelings of resentment toward the parents in low-scoring subjects are similar to those of the high scorers, except for the fact that they are more readily accepted and therefore do not appear in the same context with glorification of the parents.

In men, feelings of "victimization" as such are still less differentiating than in women. Four low scorers and 6 high scorers, out of the 20 men interviewees in each group, show this attitude. There is again, however, a different quality in the two groups in this respect. In the high scorers, reference is usually made to the parent as a disciplinarian. One man complains of having had to work too much, another of not having been slapped enough.

M51: "Usually got my way. In fact, all I ever had to do was cry about anything and he'd do whatever it was that upset me (sic!). . . . I think if I'd been slapped around a little more as a child, I might not need to be slapped around now that I'm grown up. . . . Not only that, but my selfishness is something I can almost blame him for. His attitude and that of the whole family led me to believe that I was . . . the whole universe . . . I know now. I'm not selfish now. But I had to learn that for myself. . . . My playing cops and robbers: that was because I felt stepped on. . . ."

On the other hand, the feelings of victimization found in low-scoring men give the impression of being more directly based on reality, and tend to refer to not receiving love or some substitute for it. The following is an illustration of this:

M55: "For example, he would take a delicacy like candy, pretend to offer us some and then eat it himself and laugh uproariously. . . . Makes him seem sort of a monster, though he's not really."

5. SUBMISSION VS. PRINCIPLED INDEPENDENCE

Related to glorification of parents is an attitude to be characterized as *submission to parental authority* and values out of respect based on fear. Its opposite has been designated as *principled independence*. The importance of this aspect (incorporated here as Category 3a) has been stressed several times before in this volume, on the grounds that submission to parental authority may be closely related to submission to authority in general. And submission to authority, in its turn, has the broadest implications for social and personal behavior both toward those with power and those without it. It is therefore interesting to note that this category shows marked differences between prejudiced and unprejudiced interviewees. The percentage of high-scoring men who manifest this attitude (as well as the index of significance on this category for men) is greater than that of the high-scoring women. This gives some support to the hypothesis that high-scoring men are faced with a more serious submission problem than high-scoring women. Their longing for submission as well as their "toughness," described on previous occasions as a reaction to precisely this submission, will be traced below in greater detail to factors in the family constellation.

Examples of submission to parental authority in high-scoring men are the following:

M41: (Discipline?) "Well, there wasn't much to exercise. We just did what they said. Children didn't run wild in those days like they do nowadays."

M43: "Sun-up to sun-down. (How did you take that?) We did what the elders told us to. (Ever question it?) Well, I never questioned."

M47: "Well, to tell the truth, I don't think she was strict enough with us. . . . I'd get out and run around, come home later than supposed to. She never licked me. Just bawled me out, which was worse. Only licked me once, for stealing my brother's watch when I was 10. (What were you disciplined for?) Schoolwork, and doing what I was told to do. She was pretty strict about that being home on time. (How

did you respond?) It just hurt. I never sassed her back or said a mean thing to her. . . ."

M57: (How did you react when you were spanked?) "I just didn't do it anymore."

M58: "But, you know, I never held that against my father—I had it coming. He laid the law down, and if I broke it, there was punishment, but never in uncontrolled anger."

From the foregoing protocols it is evident that many of the high-scoring men not only submit to discipline and punishment because there is no other choice left, but often find themselves in complete agreement with the administration of harsh punishment. They identify themselves with the punisher and even seem to enjoy punishment. Not only do they appear to have had this attitude as children, but during their adult life the idea of punishment and the fear of it stays with them, often preventing them from transgressing a narrow path of seeming virtue. This holds only for the genuinely conservative type of prejudiced person, not for the delinquent or psychopathic variant (see Chapter XXI).

Examples of submission to parental authority from the protocols of high-scoring women are:

F66: "He never spanked me; mother always did that. You always did what he said, but it was right; there was no question about it."

F78: Her parents definitely approve of the engagement. Subject wouldn't even go with anyone if they didn't like him.

These short examples may suffice to illustrate that submission to authority is not only less frequent in high-scoring women than in men, but also that it has a less intense quality.

The opposite of submission to authority we designated as *principled independence*. It is found more often in our low scorers. Eight of the 15 low-scoring women interviewees and none of the 25 high-scoring ones show this trait. Correspondingly, 10 of the 20 low-scoring men interviewees and only 2 of the like number of high scorers display this attitude in their interviews. In particular, the protocols of low-scoring subjects rated as showing principled independence contain references to "being independent," to "arguing with parents on certain issues," etc. As with submission toward parents, principled independence is more outspoken in the records of men.

M44: (You talked with your mother a lot?) "Yeah (laughs), though we often disagreed. But she was very good to talk with. . . . Now I've almost quit writing about religious things to my mother . . . to avoid disturbing her. . . . She was willing to accept my ideas about things even if she didn't like them. She'd go her way and I'd go mine. I think she was very wise in that. . . ."

This record further illustrates the fact that independence in relation to parents is easily combined with tender feelings of love for them, feelings of which the low-scoring subjects are, generally, more capable (see above).

Another example of independence—here concerning religious issues—which does not disturb the basic good relationship to parents, is the following:

M55: (Reactions to Sunday School?) Older sister (one and a half years older) is more rebellious and influenced subject rather strongly, although "I really don't think I needed much influence. (Conflict with parents?) Surprisingly, it didn't; they'd get awfully angry sometimes . . . mainly over Sunday School. Didn't ever discuss the theology. When I was younger, father read the Bible, which I enjoyed a lot (age eight to eleven, about). I liked the stories, though not as religion. When went to Sunday School, then began to rebel against religion."

Unprejudiced subjects seem less in need of complete approval by their parents. The record of *M55* also points up the fact that the occasional expression of mild aggression is not detrimental to, but has a positive effect on, the basic good relationships with parents or interpersonal relationships in general. Indications in the interviews, and especially findings from the Thematic Apperception Test (see Chapter XIV), suggest that the inability of the typical high-scoring subject to express aggression toward, or independence from, parents is due to the overpitched intensity of these feelings, so that the fear of punishment is too great to allow their being openly expressed.

Still a further illustration of independence in the sphere of religion—a frequent occurrence in the low-scoring subjects—is the following:

M16: "My mother takes her religion very seriously. But I never wanted to go to church. By the time I was 6 years old I had developed ways of getting around it. There were some hills behind the town—you know the country around there in southern _____? On Sunday morning I'd be gone at dawn and wouldn't come home until evening. Just to be out of church. (Why?) I guess it was mostly boredom. I didn't want to sit there and listen to all that nonsense—salvation, Jesus Christ most of all. My mother always used to pray over me."

This record also manifests the benevolently condescending attitude of low scorers, especially the men, toward their parents in general and toward the mother in particular. It stands in clear opposition to submission; and characteristically the mother, instead of being angry, is seen as praying over her disobedient son. In some cases the strivings for independence in the unprejudiced subjects seem to be connected with the feelings of guilt and anxiety lest the intensity and warmth of the relationship with the parents might be lost in disagreement.

Though we do not find, in the high-scoring subjects, much of real rebellion based on "principled independence," there is sometimes an indication of *capricious rebellion* against the parents (Category 3b), through which resentment is expressed without any real independence being gained. Six of the high-scoring and only 1 of the low-scoring women interviewees show this trait. In men the difference is less pronounced, the rating appearing in 9 high scorers and 4 low scorers.

In high-scoring women capricious rebellion takes the form primarily of temper tantrums, which they tend to indulge in when punished or restricted by the parents. Afterwards they usually submit even more fully than before without having made any progress toward independence.

Especially high-scoring men, when dissatisfied with their parents, sometimes leave home; truancy or becoming delinquent in some other form is more frequent than fighting it out. One of the high-scoring men tells that he took to thievery because his father did not understand him.

6. DEPENDENCE FOR THINGS VS. DEPENDENCE FOR LOVE

The attitude of submission to and the absence of real rebellion against the parents, found primarily in high-scoring subjects, appears to be connected with a kind of materialistic dependence on them which is not recognized as such. It may thus be termed *ego-alien* dependence for things and support. This dependence is essentially an exploitive-manipulative, externalized relationship. It is in contrast with what we have called *love-seeking succorance-nurturance-affiliation* toward the parents (Category 4a).

The assumption was that typical prejudiced subjects want to be taken care of like children; that they want to exploit their parents as they want to exploit other people; and that, not being self-reliant, they need support and comfort, first from the parents and then from parent-substitutes. This dependence, however, is neither focused nor conscious; it is rather a need for the help of others in getting things; the persons from whom things can be gotten may equally well be parents, or the "leader," or anyone else who seems capable of offering tangible support. The kind of dependence on the parents expected to be characteristic of unprejudiced subjects, on the other hand, is the kind of dependence which people with an ability to love direct toward those for whom an object cathexis has been established. The first type of person is more dependent—for benefits and "things"—but at the same time he is less dependent on specific persons because of the ready exchangeability of objects.

The difference between these two types of dependence proved highly significant in the direction expected. As many as 13 of the 25 high-scoring women interviewees were considered to have displayed in their interviews evidence of marked *ego-alien* dependence for things, as contrasted with 2 of the 15 low scorers. Even more strikingly, 13 of the 20 high-scoring men and only 1 of the 20 low scorers show the presumed "High" type of dependence. Conversely, 14 of the low-scoring men interviewees but only 1 of the corresponding high scorers show evidence of love-oriented dependence in the interview. The affection-seeking kind of dependence in men is oriented mainly toward the mother.

The fact that in women this difference is somewhat less pronounced than in men is probably due to the fact that in spite of the existing differences

between prejudiced and unprejudiced women the orientation toward dependence tends to be stronger in women than in men.

Examples of the ego-alien dependence for things in high-scoring women and men follow:

F68: "I always say my mother is still taking care of me. You should see my closets—stacked with fruits, jams, pickles—and every couple of weeks there is chicken, eggs, cream, everything you can think of. She just loves to do things for people."

F71 writes about her father: "Right now I'm his favorite . . . he'll do anything for me—takes me to school and calls for me."

The utilitarian approach of our high-scoring subjects is shown in the record of *F79*: "Yes, as I said on my questionnaire, I was closer to my mother at 6, 9, and 12, but now I have switched to my father—that is, since I was about 20. He holds the money bags. If I want to do anything, I have to go to him."

Records of high-scoring men show the same kind of dependence for things:

M41: "Well, kids always think more of their mother than their father. They look more to their mother for things."

Or *M43*: (How do you mean?) "Good to the children—clothed, fed, took care of when sick."

M47 says about his mother: "Well, I guess her being so good and friendly to everybody, especially me. (For example?) Well, always trying to do everything for me. Very seldom go uptown without bringing something back for me."

M51 shows the dependent, parasitic attitude: "I never say any virtue in work." Subject lived on his father's insurance policy after his father's death and before that on his father. Was never really self-supporting and when "I tried to (support myself) I landed here (prison)."

M52 evaluates his father only in terms of what he got from him: "I haven't had everything I might have wanted from him. I would have liked to have a nicer home, better position, but all in all, I was very happy to be one of his boys. . . . Father was very proud of me."

Along similar lines is the record of *M57*: (What were you disciplined for?) "Well, when I wanted to go to a dance and take the car, used to make me mad if I couldn't get it. . . . (Did you have an allowance?) \$15 or \$20 a week, up. Always had plenty of money to spend." Subject spontaneously mentioned that his father would commonly give him \$50 or so to go to a rodeo, and that in adolescence started giving him money for prostitutes. He adds that his father would often leave money out on the table for him for various purposes, even before subject had asked for it.

The wish for guidance is expressed in the record of *M58*: "Father wanted me to go to college, but his death interrupted this. If I'd had someone to guide me. . . ." Subject's father wanted him to be an architect, and talked about it all the time.

M13 shows appreciation of the father because he gives everything to his children: (What things did you admire especially in your father?) "Mostly, his attention to us kids was very admirable. He's very honest, so much so that he won't condone charge accounts. He's known throughout the country as a man whose word is as good as his bond. His greatest contribution was denying himself pleasure to take care of us kids."

A blatant opportunism is revealed in the foregoing appraisal of parents on the part of prejudiced subjects, by the undisguised references to the food,

money, and other goods they received. Most crudely, however, it is expressed by the subject who tells us she "switched to father. He holds the money bags now."

An example of the affection-seeking attitude, from the record of a low-scoring subject follows:

F62: "We have all been very close. We were like one person. We liked the same things. We were always doing things for each other."

This record shows the intimacy and loving dependence of the family members on each other. Low-scoring men show a similar affection-oriented attitude. *M44* describes his home background: "Pleasantness isn't a very good word. Simplicity and *real* affection."

In the records of low-scoring men, there are quite often affectionate remarks about the mother: "On the whole we were quite fond of her," says *M55* about his mother. As will be pointed out in Chapter XXI, some of the delinquent low-scoring men even commit crimes because of a mother fixation. In one such case the motive was to rescue the mother who was in debt; in others the desire to receive love from a mother substitute had been frustrated.

The relatively pronounced emphasis on getting love, in low-scoring subjects, as compared with a more distinct orientation toward getting power and material benefits, in the high-scoring subjects, is a basic differentiation, the far-reaching consequences of which will be discussed later.

In spite of this difference, evident all through the interview material, it is noteworthy that orientation toward love and affection is less elaborately and pronouncedly expressed by our subjects than are opportunistic sentiments of the sort just quoted. The cultural trends seem, to a certain degree, to discourage affection, or at least its overt expression.

The orientation toward "getting things" may be seen in relation to an attitude of "*exchange*." When this general attitude predominates, human relationships come to be regarded as one form of "making a deal." In the attitude toward parents this is sometimes manifested in a vague feeling of obligation, of having to return in terms of material goods what one has received from the parents. The idea of having to "give" seems generally very painful to most of the high-scoring subjects, but at the same time theirs seems to be the conception, "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours," if not "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth."

Such have been the considerations behind the introduction into the evaluation of the interviews of the aspect of *sense of obligation and duty* to parents (Category 4b). It is further defined as desire to "make it up to them." According to our expectation this attitude should be characteristic of the high scorers. However, the category did not prove discriminating in women, responses of this kind being generally few. In men, there were 5 high scorers

as compared with 1 low scorer in whom this response was found. Thus *M47* feels he has to make recompense to his mother because he got a lot of things, including money, from her:

M47: (Main satisfactions with her?) "Well, that's hard to say. I guess I haven't made her very happy, but . . . when I'm out there and going straight, I'll always take care of my mother. . . . I feel I've never treated her like I really should."

The orientation of low-scoring men toward gaining affection primarily from the mother was mentioned above. High-scoring men, in contrast, seem more oriented toward the father. This orientation and the idea of making up to the father is illustrated in the following record:

M51: "My father is very unemotional. He never says what he is thinking, anyway. (Did you miss him a lot when he was away?) I missed him very much when I was at the boarding house. . . . I've saved all my letters to him. . . . He very dramatically returned all my letters, like to an old love. I loved my father very much. (Q) Yeah, I wished even before he died that I could get on my feet before he did die. When I was sick, I used to . . . daydream about his coming to see me. . . . (Q) I wanted to be more what he wanted me to be. . . ."

The idea that one has to "make it up" to the parents is illustrated directly by *M6*: "The depression had more influence on my life than on other people my age. My parents really had a bad time. I hope to make it up to them. My father was on relief at the same time I had to see the doctors."

Some of the other records indicate that the prejudiced person considers that the surest way to find favor with his parents is to do something for them, in the sense of offering them material pleasures or support.

Starting from this discussion of family relationships, subsequent presentation will show the very pronounced consistency, in the typical high-scoring subject, with respect to a materialistic, utilitarian view of interpersonal and social relationships. On the surface this may seem a kind of realism; actually it is pseudorealism, since it ultimately leads to an impoverishment and to hostilities in human relationships. The low scorer is of course by no means free of such trends although they are on the whole less pronounced in him.

7. INGROUP ORIENTATION TO THE FAMILY

As to the conception of the family as a whole, high-scoring subjects were expected to tend toward an *ingroup orientation*, as exemplified by emphasis on family heredity and background, a setting off of a homogeneous totalitarian family against the rest of the world and a stressing of aristocratic superiority of the family. This is contrasted with thinking in terms of *individuals* within the family, expected in the low-scoring subjects. Seven high-scoring and only 1 low-scoring woman, and 6 as against 2 of the men interviewees display the presumed "High" conception of the family.

Thus *F68* is proud of the prestige the family of her father enjoyed: "We lived up in the mountains, _____ County. His folks were pioneers—gold settlers and quite wealthy. Everyone knows the _____'s of _____ County up that way. My

father was the spoiled darling of the family. My mother was a German girl, proud, hard working, thrifty."

In a similar vein, *F79* describes her family: "I am Pat _____ (giving her family name)." She made it clear that she could find nothing about herself in which she could take pride except the fact that she belonged to the _____ family.

A high-scoring man, *M46*, tells that his wife was brought up "by aristocratic parents with patriarchal setup."

One of the prison inmates, *M51*, says about his mother, "She came out in Capitol society, that's where she met my father."

The same tendency to overemphasize the socioeconomic status of his family could be seen in the record of *M4*, where the mother's family status seems to be exaggeratedly described and an effort is made to conceal embarrassment about the status of the father's family: "Family on both sides have been here for several generations. Mother came from a quite well-to-do family; her grandfather was a millionaire, her father independently wealthy and never worked. There were 6 children, all devout Catholics. Grandmother was a very well trained artist; Mother herself went to high school, then married when she was about 18. Father came from a family less well-to-do." Subject couldn't quite say this, but the grandfather ran a small grocery store in _____, sold out somewhere around _____, came to California, worked in the shipyards. "Father himself went to high school, afterwards went to a _____ school, started his _____ business, which he sold later on to work for a large corporation."

A mixture of pride and embarrassment about family status is also seen in the description of *M11*: "My father's first father was named _____. His second father was named _____, and he took that name. His father, _____, worked, or still works, as _____ on the railroads. My mother's mother was _____ from _____. Her father was Spanish, born in this country."

The high-scoring subjects show a tendency to magnify the status of their families in a way which enters and essentially modifies their entire conception of their families. We find both an insecure concern about status and an ardent wish to transmit the impression that their families had repute and prestige.

In an attempt to summarize the attitudes toward parents thus far discussed, the following may be said: The prejudiced subjects show little evidence of genuine love toward their parents. On the surface theirs is a stereotyped, rigid glorification of the parents, with strong resentment and feelings of victimization occasionally breaking through on the overt level in the interview material. Usually, however, only admiration for the parent is accepted by the subject. The underlying hostility has to be kept ego-alien for several reasons: it is too strong to be fully admitted; and it interferes with the desire to be taken care of by the parents. This conflict leads to a submission to parental authority on the surface and a resentment underneath which, although not admitted, is the more active under the guise of mechanisms of displacement.

There is evidence, on the other hand, that the unprejudiced subjects received more love and therefore have basically more security in their relationships to their parents. Disagreement with, and resentment against, the

parents are openly worked out, resulting in a much greater degree of independence from them. This independence is carried over into the subject's attitude toward social institutions and authorities in general. At the same time, there is more love-oriented dependence on people, which prevents the individual from too much manipulation and exploitation of others. In spite of the conflicts these subjects carry with them, this type of relationship remains for them one of their important sources of gratification.

C. CONCEPTIONS OF CHILDHOOD ENVIRONMENT

1. DEFINITION OF RATING CATEGORIES AND QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

In this section discussion will center about the subject's conception of childhood events, including especially also the recollection and image of parental figures and their handling of discipline. The preceding section was concerned with the attitude toward the parents in general; now we proceed to describe the specific images of father and mother in the prejudiced and the unprejudiced. As stated in Chapter IX, it is difficult to say how much the image of a parent corresponds to reality and how much it is a subjective conception. However, this distinction may be of less importance when, as is the case here, personality structure rather than its genesis is the major concern. The notions our subjects have of their parents are psychologically relevant in the discussion of the parent-child relationship whether they are true or not. In a separate project, parents of prejudiced and unprejudiced children were actually studied, substantiating in kind many of the statements our present interviewees make about their own childhood (preliminary report by E. Frenkel-Brunswik, 30).

We will first consider the traits ascribed to the father by both the male and female interviewees. Since the categories under this heading in the Scoring Manual are rather specific, the total of responses in each category is not very large. Not all subjects described their parents spontaneously in such terms. The differences are, therefore, less significant here than elsewhere. The list of categories relating to the image of the parents is as follows:

INTERVIEW SCORING MANUAL: CONCEPTIONS OF CHILDHOOD ENVIRONMENT (to Table 2(X))

PRESUMABLY "HIGH" VARIANTS

PRESUMABLY "LOW" VARIANTS

6M. *Traits ascribed to father by Men:*

- | | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| a. <i>Distant, stern, bad temper, "a barrier between us"</i> | a. <i>Some demonstrativeness</i> |
| b. <i>A moral-model</i> | b. <i>Principled puritanism</i> |
| c. <i>Pseudomasculine: Determination, worked his way up, a "success"</i> | c. <i>Relaxed, mild</i> |

6W. *Traits ascribed to father by Women:*

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| a. <i>Hardworking provider</i> : "Will do anything for me" (externalized), works fingers to bone for family; or psychopath | c. <i>Warm, sociable, lovable</i> |
| b. <i>A moral-model</i> | d. <i>Understanding</i> |
| | e. <i>Intellectual-aesthetic</i> |

7M. *Traits ascribed to mother by Men:*

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| a. <i>Sacrificing, "kind," submissive</i> | c. <i>Warm, sociable, lovable</i> |
| b. <i>A moral-model</i> | d. <i>Understanding</i> |
| | e. <i>Intellectual-aesthetic</i> |

7W. *Traits ascribed to mother by Women:*

- | | |
|---|--|
| a. <i>Restricting</i> | d. <i>Some demonstrativeness</i> |
| b. <i>A moral-model</i> | e. <i>Understanding</i> |
| c. <i>"Sweet," pseudofeminine</i> | f. <i>Intellectual-aesthetic</i> |
| 8. <i>Denial of parental conflict</i> —except "mild-normal" disagreements | 8. <i>Objective verbalization of parental conflict</i> |

9M. *Power relationship, Man* (Score a or b, not both):

- | | |
|---|--|
| a. <i>Father was dominant, more influential</i> | a. <i>Mother-centered</i> (Love-nurturance) home |
| b. <i>Henpeckingly dominant mother</i> | b. <i>Equalitarian home</i> |

9W. *Power relationship, Women* (Score a or b, not both):

- | | |
|--|---|
| a. <i>"Perfect division of labor"</i> : Mother, home; father, work | a. <i>Father more important, stronger</i> |
| b. <i>Mother stronger, dominant</i> | b. <i>Equalitarian home</i> |
| 10. <i>Discipline for violation of rules, primarily moralistic</i> | 10. <i>Discipline for violation of principles, primarily rationalized</i> |
| 11. <i>Discipline threatening, traumatic, overwhelming</i> (castration-threat) | 11. <i>Discipline assimilable</i> (non-egodestructive) |

In keeping with the preliminary study of the interviews which always preceded the definition of categories, categories for men and women are not always symmetrical or analogous, and distinctions appearing as a pair of opposites within one and the same subcategory in the case of one of the sexes, may be separated for the other.

Quantitative results are given in Table 2 (X) in the manner established in Section F of the preceding chapter, and in Table 1 (X).

2. IMAGE OF THE FATHER IN MEN: DISTANT AND STERN VS. RELAXED AND MILD

We begin with the conception, in men, of a *distant, stern father*, with bad temper, and a barrier between father and son, as opposed to the picture of a

warm, demonstrative father (Category 6Ma). Twelve high- and 5 low-scoring men interviewees conceive of their father as stern; 7 low- and only 1 high-scoring men refer to the father as demonstrative. The entire category for men is statistically significant, but only at the 5 per cent level.

The "high" conception can best be understood from the actual statements of high-scoring men.

M51 declares: "My father died five years ago—he was very—I've judged him with so much prejudice. I thought he was so strict . . . actually he was just the opposite . . . not the least demonstrative . . . he disapproved of any show of emotion of *any* kind. If I ever did anything wrong, it was the Latin in me, which is the side I have more of an affinity for—my mother's side. I look more like them."

The foregoing record shows the extent to which the subject felt the (true or imaginary) coldness and remoteness of his father. At the same time he does not dare really to criticize his father; he blames himself but—characteristically—without feeling guilty; "it is the Latin strain" in him which relieves him from any real responsibility.

The barrier between parents and children in the families of high-scoring subjects is indicated by the answer of a high-scoring man, *M57*, to the question, Did you confide in your parents? "No, never had any problem to talk about." The barrier between father and son goes to the point of not talking to each other. The relationship seems to be barren of any affect. Rather than blame the parents, the subject denies the existence of any problems. After a few admiring sentences about his father, another subject says:

M11: "Maybe—well, in ways he isn't even tempered. He's as stubborn as an ox. He'd rather start a fight or an argument than do something he doesn't want to. And he can fly off the handle. We kid him out of it now. (What have you disagreed with your father about?) I have gone days without talking to him or weeks without asking any favors. . . . Well, we are lazy about such things; we are not mechanically minded, and we hate gardening. We have some trouble because he's too stubborn to ask me for help but yet he gets mad because I won't. . . . Earlier he got mad because I wouldn't wear enough clothes."

On the other hand, reference to friendliness on the part of the father is characteristic of the records of low-scoring men:

M16: (What was your father like?) "He was a very *kind* man, gentle, was always very good to us, that is, as much as was possible under the circumstances. (Strict about some things?) No, not very. He liked us kids a lot. (Q) I'm the youngest of five."

M42 gives an affectionate description of his father. We get the impression of a relaxed person who has the ability to enjoy his life deeply.

Or *M50*: "He champions my causes . . . told the other children that I had more sense in my little finger than all the other children put together. He was always in my corner . . . and of course he was fostering any latent art ability I had. . . . Curiously enough, I don't think I have any particular art ability. I think I could have become a good musician, pianist. . . ."

M53: (Pleasant memories of father?) "Lots of pleasant memories, because he spoiled us when he was home, always cooking up wonderful ideas for things to do."

M59: (How did you and your father get along?) "Well, a very friendly relationship. He was pretty much of a pal. We liked to go places together, fishing, play cards, etc. We had a lot of good times."

It is quite convincingly evident from the last three records that the fathers of these men possessed, as well as displayed, a good deal of affection for their sons. In general, the fathers of the unprejudiced men seem to have spent a great deal of time playing and "doing things" with their sons. It is interesting also to note the reference of *M50* to his father's interest in art. From all our evidence it seems likely that many of the fathers of our prejudiced men would have considered such an interest, in themselves or in their sons, as effeminate or "sissy."

A further possibility is to see the father primarily as a *moral-model*. This may be contrasted with a view of the father as an example of what may be called *principled puritanism* (Category 6Mb). This pair of opposites is intended to characterize orientation toward, and acceptance of, a set of conventional values (externalized superego, i.e., social anxiety) *vs.* an upholding of real ethical principles (internalized superego). As was expected, prejudiced men tend to describe the father as a moral-model, whereas the unprejudiced refer more often to the "puritanism" of their fathers. There is a high proportion of Neutral ratings so that the statistical significance of this difference has not been established; to be sure, there also is the difficulty in deciding, in each instance, whether we have a case of a moral model or of genuine conscientiousness before us.

A passage in the record of *M13*, a high scorer, reads as follows: "He drank but little, and he never smoked. He was very honest and strict in his dealings. He followed the church rules without going to church." It shows the emphasis on external virtue, such as abstinence from smoking, drinking, etc.

Another subject in this group, *M41*, says about his father: "He'd tell us what we should do, what he wanted us to do, and what he expected us to do. He always asked the blessings at the table and prayed at night before bedtime."

The somewhat different quality that is manifested in the records of low-scoring men in their descriptions of the puritanism of their fathers is exemplified as follows:

M56: (What sort of person is your father?) "Hard man to describe; he is a puritan really. His father is a drunkard, he reacted to that . . . very strict, but human."

When there is moral strictness in the fathers of low-scoring men, it often tends to be characterized by a definite "human" touch, rather than by an emphasis on strict conformity to custom—the wish to be a shining example in the community—that appears in the fathers of high-scoring men.

TABLE 2 (X)
 INTERVIEW RATINGS ON CONCEPT OF CHILDHOOD ENVIRONMENT
 FOR 80 SUBJECTS SCORING EXTREMELY "HIGH" OR "LOW" ON THE ETHNIC PREJUDICE QUESTIONNAIRE SCALE

Interview rating categories (abbreviated from Manual)	Sex	Number of "High" (H) and "Low" (L) ratings received by		Sums of instances "positive" "negative" reached	Level of statistical significance reached (percentage)
		20 men and 25 women "high scorers" H L	20 men and 15 women "low scorers" H L		
6M. Conception of father in men:					
a. Distant, bad temper(H) vs. some demonstrativeness(L)	Men	12 5	7 4	19 9	6 2
b. Moral-model(H) vs. principled puritanism(L)	"	5	4	9	2
c. Pseudomasculine(H) vs. relaxed, mild(L)	"	6	9	15	5
6W. Conception of father in women:					
a. Hardworking provider; or psychopath(H)	Women	6	1	6	
b. Moral-model(H)	"	4	4	4	4
c. Warm, sociable, lovable(L)	"	4	5	5	4
d. Understanding(L)	"	2	1	1	2
e. Intellectual-aesthetic(L)	"	1	6	6	1
7M. Conception of mother in men:					
a. Sacrificing, submissive(H)	Men	9	2	9	2
b. Moral-model(H)	"	6	2	6	2
c. Warm, lovable(L)	"	0	9	0	0
d. Understanding(L)	"	2	4	4	2
e. Intellectual-aesthetic(L)	"	0	5	0	0

It is interesting to find that a further conception, that of a *determined and successful father* with an element of pseudomascularity (Category 6Mc), does not differentiate much between high- and low-scoring men. Obviously, the successful man who worked his way up is so much a part of our culture that he may be found in any context of patterns. Nonetheless, reference to a father who is *relaxed and mild* is frequent in, and almost exclusive with, the interviews of low-scoring men; 9 of these, but only 1 of the high-scoring men, describe their fathers in these or related terms. Examples from the records of low-scoring men are the following:

M42, asked about his father, says: "I can't tell you exactly. I was only thirteen when he left. He's quick tempered . . . might say he is inclined to be a little slovenly . . . might go for a long time without a haircut or cleaning his nails. He is poorly educated but he is very smart. His folks are farmers . . . they never had money . . . he would send them money. I knew he never liked his dad."

This record presents the picture of a relaxed man who does not live up to the ideals and customs of his community, such as cleanliness and liking his father. He follows, however, his own principles by sending money to his parents.

In the same record there are signs of the subject's relaxation about the status of his own family and that of his father. Being relaxed about one's social status apparently parallels the psychological relaxation which is a crucial condition for absence of prejudice. "Casualness" is emphasized in the following quotation from the protocol of another low scorer, commenting about his father:

M53: "Quite a bit older than mother. I was very fond of him. A very casual sort of person, by no means a disciplinarian."

M54 tells about his father's work, bookkeeper. (How did he like it?) "Crazy about it. Worked there for thirty years. Of course, in the same old groove, can't get up or down, but pretty contented."

M59: "Well, he is not very polished. He is a little crude socially. He is very happy-go-lucky."

See also the remarks on the "easy-going low" in Chapter XIX.

In the same vein, some of the other low-scoring men describe their fathers as gentle and relaxed and not too concerned about status. Reference to libidinalization of work rather than of status in one of the above quotations should likewise be noted; it seemed to be quite typical of the unprejudiced on the basis of our material.

For the establishment of the psychology of the unprejudiced man a non-threatening father figure may indeed be of great importance. It makes it possible for the son to include in his conception of masculinity some measure of passivity. Not feeling greatly threatened by the father, the unprejudiced man is apparently less afraid of losing his masculinity. He thus does not have

to overcompensate for such fear by an overly rigid ego-ideal of aggressive toughness. The unprejudiced man did not as a rule have to submit to stern authority in his childhood; in his later life, therefore, he neither longs for strong authority nor needs to assert his strength against those who are weaker.

3. IMAGE OF THE FATHER IN WOMEN: THE ROLE OF PROVIDER

Let us now turn to the traits ascribed to the father by our women interviewees. Since our data on women are, by and large, less complete than those on the men, there will be even fewer cases in each of these categories than were found for men. Significance in the statistical sense has not been established for any of the categories used. A few illustrations will be given to illuminate the meaning of our concepts, but less emphasis will be placed upon the discussion of quantitative results.

The opportunism found in high-scoring women, together with their underlying hostility towards men, discussed later, made us expect that they would tend to see their fathers mainly as sources of provision. It was statements like the following which led to this assumption: "Father was extremely devoted to family—will work his fingers to the bone for them—never has done any drinking" (F71). Another of the prejudiced extremes, F24, in stressing how "wonderful" her father is, explains: "He is always willing to do anything for you." Another subject in this group, F69, describes her father as follows: "Works hard—very serious—gets no fun out of life at all."

Six of the high- and only 1 of the low-scoring women stress the provider quality in their fathers (Category 6Wa). It is this quality that high-scoring women seem to value primarily in men and which, rather than affection, is often the source of their dependency on men. There is indeed little evidence of a genuine positive relation of prejudiced women toward their fathers. The exploitive attitude toward men in general on the part of high-scoring women will be discussed again later in connection with attitudes toward the other sex.

The notion of the father as a moral-model did not differentiate between high- and low-scoring women (Category 6Wb).

The families of our high-scoring subjects often seem to be highly conventional and respectable; however, reference is sometimes made to a *psychopathic* background. But even in the latter case—as will be seen in the material about delinquents in Chapter XXI—there is often a great deal of conventionality and stress on middle-class values in the same context with delinquent behavior.

A few of our high-scoring women describe their fathers in such terms as to make it appear that they were psychopaths. Whether this description corresponds to fact, or is merely gross exaggeration or the result of the underlying contempt many of these women seem to have for men, is difficult to decide offhand. Our best course is probably to assume a combination

of these trends. In the accusations made by these subjects against the father, the main reproach is usually directed against his not having provided enough for the family.

F66 says: "My father could not stay put. We lived in _____, _____, _____, and I don't know how many other places."

F68 relates that her father "never worked in his life. He was a gambler, an adventurer who broke his family's heart."

This may serve as an example of the fact that once the high scorer turns against the parents—which happens only rarely—there is a tendency to make them out as real villains.

For the presumed "Low" alternatives to the above traits ascribed to the father by women, namely the conception of a warm, lovable, and understanding father, the absolute number of responses was small. Discussion of them may therefore be omitted.

However, as many as 6 of the low-scoring as against only 1 of the high-scoring women described their fathers as *intellectual-aesthetic* (Category 6We). Interest in intellectual and artistic endeavor is usually more pronounced in low-scoring persons, a fact that is in line with the "intraceptive" quality found to be more characteristic of the unprejudiced.

4. IMAGE OF THE MOTHER: SACRIFICE, MORALISM, RESTRICTIVENESS

The list of traits ascribed by our subjects to their mothers was constructed somewhat similarly to their counterparts referring to the father; and the results tend to be analogous. However, while the conception of the father by high-scoring men was, on the basis of our exploratory analysis of the interviews, expected to be best characterized by the term "stern," the corresponding image of the mother was expected to be that of a *sacrificing, kind, submissive* person. And likewise, as prejudiced women tend to refer to the provider role in their fathers, they also tend to look at their mothers primarily from the point of view of what she gives them or how well she took care of them when they were children.

Nine of the high- and only 2 of the low-scoring men had this conception of their mothers. Among the former, *M57* says about his mother: "She was a hard working lady, took care of us kids; she never did mistreat us in any way." The idea of a mother giving everything to the child is expressed especially clearly in the following quotation from the protocol of another high-scoring man, *M13*: "Mother was sick in bed a great deal of the time. She devoted her last strength to us kids." Emphasis on "devoting" the last strength carries the connotation of a limitless sacrifice devoid of healthy mutuality.

M13 further describes his mother as "a Methodist and quite strict up until her death. I was sick much of the time. She brought us up very strictly under this guidance."

A total of 6 high- and 2 low-scoring men consider the mother as a *moral-model* (Category 7Mb).

Thus another of the high-scoring men, *M47*, says of his mother: "She always taught me the difference between right and wrong, the things I should do and shouldn't."

This latter record also illustrates the absolute certainty with which many of the high-scoring subjects and their parents view "what is right and what is wrong"—the usual yardstick, however, being social approval or disapproval. This view is frequently accompanied by a good deal of intolerance toward deviations from what is "right." When present in parents, this attitude may well lead to rigid identifications and repressions in the children, thus leaving parts of their personality unmodifiable and unsublimated.

The general orientation toward affection in the low-scoring subjects, and the impression that they actually had received more love, led to the expectation that low-scoring men would conceive of their mothers as *warm, sociable, lovable*, as *understanding*, and as *intellectual-aesthetic* (Categories 7Mc-e). Of these three traits the first was the most differentiating: 9 low-scoring and none of the high-scoring men described the mother in terms similar to "warm, sociable, lovable." The warmth of the relationship between mother and son in the low-scoring men seems crucial for the development of their general concern with love (in contradistinction to power) and of their other humanitarian attitudes. The quality of "understanding" in the image of the mother did not differentiate very well; however, 5 of the low- and none of the high-scoring men mention intellectual-aesthetic inclinations in their mothers. An example of the latter attitude from the records of low-scoring men follows:

M50 says about his mother: "An intellectual and a very well educated person. Her principal gift seems to be that of perception. And an artist not by trade but certainly by nature."

Similar passages, referring to the mother's interest in music or painting, are found in the protocols of the other low-scoring men in this classification.

The woman's conception of the mother is covered by a somewhat different list of traits (Category 7W). Again, the data here are rather incomplete, due to the specificity of the categories involved and the comparative incompleteness of the women's interviews. However, 10 high- and only 2 low-scoring women describe their mothers by what may be summarized under the term *restricting*. Thus *F36*, the high scorer who was quoted above as displaying drastic rejection of, as well as submission toward, her mother, described the latter as being "domineering, dictatorial, and self-centered."

Other records are more subtle, emphasizing dominance and social success in their mothers. Unfortunately only one of the two raters scored this latter

trait which thus does not appear in Table 2(X); she found 5 out of 13 mothers of high-scoring daughters described as a *social success*. On the other hand, none of the low-scoring women emphasized this quality in her mother.

The admiration that high-scoring women are inclined to have for their socially successful, dominant mothers is being offset by hate against mother figures in the stories of the Thematic Apperception Test (see Chapter XIV). Instead of admiring the successful mother, the pressure which such mothers exert upon their daughters leads some of them in their stories to conceive of maternal figures as witches (see 31, 32). Here one is reminded of Wylie's theory of "momism" in his book, *Generation of Vipers*.

The assumption that high-scoring women would tend to see their mothers as *sweet* or (*pseudo-*) *feminine* in their interviews, that is, on the conscious level, was not borne out by our material. This quality is stressed by very few of the women interviewees. The high-scoring women probably see through the pseudofeminine façade of their mothers to a greater extent than they are ready to admit, and feel rather clearly the press of domination. As far as their picture of themselves is concerned, however, they tend to believe firmly, as will be discussed later, in their own "femininity."

Six of the high- and only 1 of the low-scoring women describe their mothers as a *moral-model*, while more low-scoring than high-scoring women speak directly about their mothers as demonstratively warm and lovable.

The remaining aspects, referring to understanding and intellectual-aesthetic qualities, showed little differentiation in women. There are two possible reasons for this. One may be that the data in question are few, the other that the hostility of the high-scoring women toward their mothers is indirect rather than direct. As pointed out above, there are some clear indications of such disguised hostility in the interviews, and direct evidence of hostility in the reactions to the Thematic Apperception Test.

5. PARENTAL CONFLICT

We now turn our attention to the subjects' notions concerning the relationship between the parents. *Denial of parental conflict* as contrasted with *open and objective verbalization of parental conflict* (Category 8) will be discussed first. This pair of opposites was not enough differentiated in the Scoring Manual; it did not provide for the distinction between absence of real conflict and denial of existing conflict. Furthermore, differentiation between absence of conflict due to "smooth functioning," on the one hand, and due to real love, on the other, was likewise not considered. Either for this, or for other, still more intrinsic reasons, there was practically no difference in the denial of serious conflict between parents in high- and low-scoring men. Overt admission of such conflicts, however, occurs somewhat more often in the records of low-scoring men, but the entire category still

does not differentiate significantly between the prejudiced and the unprejudiced.

In a few of those cases in which the raters, proceeding in accordance with the Manual, scored "denial of conflict" as the "High" variant in subjects who were later identified as low scorers, they added as a comment: "real love." This is quite in line with what was said above about the unsatisfactory formulation of Category 8.

Typical examples of denial of parental conflict by high-scoring men are:

M41, in answer to the question, How did your parents get along together, says: "Fine, never did hear no quarreling."

Or *M58*: "If there were any conflicts between mother and father I didn't know."

Examples of admission of parental conflicts from the records of low-scoring men are:

M15: "Mother accuses father of 'keeping her down.' She talks about her ambitions too much. Mother thinks of herself first. She doesn't want to settle down in any church. Keeps suspecting father lets another singer get ahead of her. There are many quarrels between them, which upset me. Father sometimes threatened to leave."

Or *M50*: "Father was temperamental and father and mother had considerable domestic strife. I didn't like it and I didn't like my father as champion. Preferred my mother as champion. . . . My sister became psychologically against my mother . . . nothing very definite, nothing you could put your finger on—very subtle. . . . I didn't realize it then. . . ."

M55: "Mother went along with him on all the moralizing, though not as harsh as he was, not really a very good marriage. Mother should have married someone a lot more human and he probably would have been a lot better off . . . well, it's hard to imagine him with anyone with whom he would get along."

M59: "Well, just the usual family quarrels. Maybe raise her voice a bit. (What bones of contention?) Well, the fact that in the first ten years of my mother's married life, my dad used to get drunk quite often and he would beat her physically and later on, as the children were growing up, she resented my father's influence, though he contributed to our support. . . . He used to come about twice a week, sometimes oftener."

The foregoing records illustrate the frankness and the greater insight into the marital conflicts of the parents, characteristic of low-scoring men. In addition, they show the tendency, mentioned above, of men to side with the mother.

In the records of women, on the other hand, denial of parental conflict differentiates between high scorers and low scorers in a proportion of 8 to 1. The fact that denial of parental conflict is more often found in female than in male high scorers is perhaps due to the fact that our sample of high-scoring women is, on the whole, more conventional than that of the high-scoring men. Examples of denial of parental conflict are:

F24: "Parents get along swell—never quarrel—hardly ever. Just over nonsense if they do. They quarrelled once after drinking wine over who got the last. Silly stuff like that."

F31: "My parents get along very well with each other, so far—knock on wood. They have their arguments, but they're never serious because of my mother's easy-going personality. Father teases her terrifically. She takes his jokes, but not too well. They have no serious arguments, just sort of silly things."

The foregoing records show that for some of the high-scoring women it seems important to assert that there was a good marital relationship between their parents, minimizing conflicts by presenting them as "silly little things."

6. FATHER-DOMINATED VS. MOTHER-ORIENTED HOME

As far as the *power relationship between parents* is concerned, 10 of the high-scoring and only 3 of the low-scoring men see the father as the more dominant and more influential; 2 additional high-scoring men think the mother is "henpeckingly dominant," bringing the number of "High" ratings up to 12 (Category 9M). Some of the high-scoring men who conceive of the home as father-dominated speak of their fathers' having made all the decisions, and of the submissiveness of their mothers.

An example is the record of *M52*: (Who made the decisions usually?) "My father. (Any bones of contention?) Well, I don't think there were any to speak of. . . . I've often tried in later years to analyze my father's wanderlust. . . . Apparently seeking business success. . . . My mother has remarked that I am just the opposite of him. . . ."

Conversely, only 1 high-scoring but 10 low-scoring men interviewees think of theirs as a mother-centered (love-nurturance) home, or as an equalitarian home. The entire category differentiates to a statistically high degree between prejudiced and unprejudiced men.

If the conceptions of our subjects can be taken to represent reality—and to a certain degree they probably can—there appears to be a tendency toward *father-domination*, or just "domination," in the families of the high-scoring, and toward *mother-orientation*, in contradistinction to mother-"domination," in the families of the low-scoring men. This finding, if substantiated and found crucial in a larger sample, would have far-reaching sociological and psychological implications. It would then be more understandable why the German family, with its long history of authoritarian, threatening father figures, could become susceptible to a fascist ideology. The son of such a father figure can apparently never quite establish his personal and masculine identity; he thus has to look for it in a collective system where there is opportunity both for submission to the powerful and for retaliation upon the powerless (see G. W. Allport, 10; O. Fenichel, 26; E. Fromm, 42; E. H. Erikson, 25). It must be emphasized that looking at a fascist society from the point of view of the needs of the individual does not exclude recognition of

larger socioeconomic determinants which may well be responsible both for the organization of society and for that of the family.

Following up for a moment this line of psychological reasoning, could it then be inferred that, because of the predominant mother-orientation of the American home there is less danger of fascism here? To answer this question, sociological and economic factors beyond the scope of this project would have to be considered. It might, however, be important to remember in this connection the 2 cases of high-scoring men who refer to a henpeckingly dominant mother. In both these cases it seemed evident the mother had taken over the threatening function of punishment in the family as a whole. By contrast, the family of the typical low-scoring man seems to be centered about a mother whose primary function is to give love rather than to dominate, and who is not too weak or submissive.

On the basis of their dichotomous conception of sex roles and their antagonism toward men it was expected that high-scoring women would have the following conception of the power relations between the parents: strict division of labor, mother home and father works, or else "mother stronger and dominant." On the other hand, it was expected that in the case of the records of low-scoring women the father would be experienced as more important and stronger, or that there would be an equalitarian home.

Actually, 7 high-scoring women displayed one of the first two alternatives (mostly the second), as contrasted with only 2 of the low-scoring women. The second pair of alternatives was found with only slightly greater frequency in the low-scoring group, probably because the data on this issue are not complete and because some of the high-scoring women report a dominant father.

In consequence, for women as contrasted with men, the category as a whole is not statistically significant. The data do, however, lend some further support to the original assumption that prejudiced men tend to experience the father, prejudiced women the mother, as the major figure of the family. It perhaps may be said that prejudiced women tend to have a stronger though more ambivalent tie to the mother, conversely the prejudiced man to the father. A greater inclination toward latent or overt homosexuality may be connected with this (see Chapters XI and XXI).

7. DISCIPLINE: HARSH APPLICATION OF RULES VS. ASSIMILATION OF PRINCIPLES

How parents, being the first authorities in the life of a child, handle the problems of discipline must be assumed to be of crucial importance in the establishment of attitudes toward authority. Was the issue in question explained to the child and was he included in the discussion of it, or did it appear to the child as unintelligible, arbitrary, and overwhelming? Did the

parents in their application of discipline adhere to a rigid set of conventional rules, or were they guided by more intrinsic values? These are some of the questions for which data were collected from our interviews.

In particular, discipline for violation of *rules*, primarily "moralistic," was contrasted with discipline for violation of *principles*, primarily "rationalized" (Category 10). As the first of two variables to be considered in this context, the choice between these two opposite alternatives on the part of the parents would seem to be crucial for the establishment of the child's attitude toward what is considered right or wrong: it probably decides the externalization vs. internalization of values. These two types of discipline further imply different resultant attitudes toward authority.

In the first case, discipline is handled as "*vis major*," as a force outside of the child, to which at the same time he must submit. The values in question are primarily the values of adult society: conventions and rules helpful for social climbing but rather beyond the natural grasp of the child. At the same time this type of value lays the foundation for an attitude of judging people according to external criteria, and for the authoritarian condemnation of what is considered socially inferior.

The second type of discipline invites the cooperation and understanding of the child and makes it possible for him to assimilate it.

Fourteen of the high- and 6 of the low-scoring men interviewees report having been submitted to discipline for violation of rules whereas 5 low-scoring men and only 1 high-scoring man report discipline for violation of principles. With respect to violation of rules the difference is even greater for the women interviewees: 12 high scorers and only 2 low scorers report this type of discipline in their home. Discipline for violation of principles is reported by only 4 women, and this in even proportion among high and low scorers. On the whole, discipline for violation of rules is more characteristic of high scorers than discipline for violation of principles is of low scorers. The latter report an altogether smaller number of incidents of being disciplined.

Related to the distinction just described is the differentiation between a *threatening*, traumatic, overwhelming discipline, and an *assimilable*, and thus non-egodestructive, discipline (Category 11). The first type of discipline forces the child into submission and surrender of his ego, thus preventing his development. The second type contributes to the growth of the ego; it is similar to a therapy in which the therapist becomes an ally of the patient's ego, helping him to master his id. This second type of discipline seems an important condition for the establishment of an internalized superego, and thus crucial for the development of an unprejudiced personality. This category proved differentiating at a high level of significance. In men, 13 of the high scorers had the "threatening," none the "assimilable," type of discipline (7 received a Neutral rating due to lack of data). This finding is highly

important since it seems to uncover a source of the basic fear so frequently exhibited by high-scoring men—and so often compensated for by sadistic toughness.

Furthermore, 9 of the low-scoring men—as contrasted with none of the high scorers (see above)—received the assimilable non-egodestructive type of discipline. Four of the low-scoring men were disciplined in a threatening manner.

Since discipline is of particular importance for our general theory concerning the genesis of the prejudiced personality, a series of examples from the records of high-scoring men is given herewith:

M45 reports that his father “did not believe in sparing the rod for stealing candy or someone’s peaches off the tree.”

M51: “My father spanked me on rare occasions, did it solemnly and it didn’t hurt; and when he did it everybody cried. . . . But mother had a way of punishing me—lock me in a closet—or threaten to give me to a neighborhood woman who she said was a witch. . . . I think that’s why I was afraid of the dark.”

A similar psychologically cruel way of punishment is reported by *M44*: “Father picked upon things and threatened to put me in an orphanage.”

M52 who, as quoted above, was struck on the finger with a knife at the table for being a bit too hungry, also reports that he “got a whipping (with a razor strop) that I thought was a little unreasonable.” He tells a story about a friend who at the friend’s home, in playing around, accidentally shoved subject through a window. When his father learned about it the same day, subject “got a whipping without a chance to explain. . . .”

M58, asked which parent he was closest to, answers: “I think my father. Although he beat the life out of me.” He continues to emphasize that his father always gave everyone, including himself, “a square deal.”

A good example of how some men in this group were frightened into obedience and submission is the following:

M57, asked about spanking, reports, “Not after 17. . . . Father had to give us one look and we knew what he meant.”

An example of delayed punishment experienced as meaningless and cruel is given in the following quotation:

M20: (Nature of discipline?) “She would hold me back in. Never let me play if I’d done something wrong. . . . If I did anything wrong during the day, they couldn’t spank me in public, in the hotel; they would spank me at night when I had maybe forgotten what it was for and resented it. Too delayed.” Subject says he usually cried when he was spanked in order to get it over sooner, because when he started to cry, his grandmother would usually stop shortly. “It hurt my pride. . . . Just another restriction. . . . Or, sometimes, they would take away a movie.” Subject says he resented this particularly since movies were few and far between for him anyway. “Grandfather never spanked me. . . .” About 10 or 12, subject says, he started running around more. . . . “and they sort of lost their grip on me. I just stayed away from home. More school activities and work. . . .”

Another high-scoring man expresses his own ideas about the necessity for harsh punishment as follows:

M41: "If they have to whip them, I believe in whipping them. I don't believe in sparing the rod and spoiling the child; though I don't believe in abusing them. . . . Go down the street and hear a mother (threaten a spanking), the child says, 'Oh, mother, you know you don't mean that.' If I'd have said that to my mother, I wouldn't be able to sit down."

Further examples of the "High" type of discipline, taken from the records of high-scoring men and containing, among other things, deference to the emphasis on "being told" in terms of "petty" rules or "laws" lacking sufficient explanations, are the following:

M43: (Who gave the discipline?) "Uncle. (What kind?) Whip us. (How often?) Two or three times a month. (What for?) Going off without asking, not doing things we were told. (Was he always fair?) Well, after you'd think it over, you had it coming. (Ever question whether he was right about it?) No."

To the question whether he has been often punished, *M45* answers: "Often, and the hard part about it was that my stepmother would tell him (father) that my brother or I had done things and he wouldn't give us a chance to explain. . . . (What was your reaction?) Well, I ran off twice. . . . It didn't cause me to hate him. I held it mostly against her. (Did he exercise most of the discipline?) He did. (Did she sometimes punish you?) Yes, but not often. (For what?) Oh, things that seemed so trivial, like getting home late from school to do my chores."

M47: (What was the usual nature of the discipline?) ". . . just bawl us out. (Q) She made it seem like it was hurting her more than it did us. . . . I think I'd rather have a licking than a good bawling out. (Q) She'd look hurt. (What were your feelings?) . . . Make me feel hurt . . . ashamed of myself. (Example?) One time I stayed out pretty late one night. When I got home, why she bawled me out, just little things like that. . . . Or going some place where she told me not to go . . . like some kid's house she told me not to play with."

Similarly, to the question, for what sort of things have you been punished, *M51* answers, "Usually something petty, stealing fudge off a shelf or something like that."

M58: "Well, my father was a very strict man. He wasn't religious, but strict in raising the youngsters. His word was law, and whenever he was disobeyed, there was punishment. When I was 12, my father beat me practically every day for getting into the tool chest in the back yard, and not putting everything away . . . finally he explained that those things cost money, and I must learn to put it back."

Another high-scoring man, *M6*, reports: "My father left the discipline to my mother, though he was the law when you came right down to it. I don't mean to say that either of them dominated us, but they kept us on the right track. I always had more respect for my mother than most. It was just the idea that she wanted me to do things that kept me on the right path. She spanked me sometimes. Father laid the strap on rarely; the last time was when I was 12 or 13 for talking back to my mother."

There is much reference to cruel punishment such as "whipping," "not sparing the rod," or "beating the life out of me" in the records of high-scoring subjects. Furthermore, the above quotations show that the discipline in the home is experienced as something arbitrary. Often it is implied that the

punishment was unjust or "unreasonable" and that the subject had to submit to it without being given a "chance to explain" the situation. This is especially evident in the use, without further comment, of delayed punishment, an example of which was given above: "They would spank me at night, when I had maybe forgotten what it was for and resented it."

Furthermore, there is in these records a great deal of stress upon the fact that punishment was administered for something which seemed petty to the subject, for the violation of an external rule rather than of a basic principle.

Quite different are the reports of low-scoring men about the type of discipline they received:

Asked as to how discipline was enforced, *M16* relates: "Father lectured a good deal about honesty and integrity, etc."

A relaxed type of discipline with few restrictions is clearly indicated in the protocols of the following two low-scoring women:

F75: (Family training?) "Mother was in charge although they handled us well, I think. We were good, almost too good—and we were punished only rarely. Then it was a little spanking or scolding. There were never problems about going out. We could have had more freedom than we took."

F70: (What kind of things did she stress in your upbringing?) "She seems to me thoroughly liberal; there were not many restrictions anywhere. She accepted practically anything I did."

As is true in the case of many of the other categories, the material in the interviews on the issue of discipline of the women is not very complete. Thirteen of the high-scoring women received a Neutral rating; of the remaining 12, 9 report the threatening, and only 3 the non-egodestructive type of discipline. The following are quotations from the records of high-scoring women:

F66 relates: "I was kind of temperamental when I was little. I had temper tantrums if I didn't get my way. My mother cured them—she dunked me under the water faucet until I stopped screaming."

F36 reports a type of punishment psychologically quite cruel: Subject's mother criticized all her friends and interfered with all her friendships. In _____, subject had a boy friend eight years older than herself with whom she dated. Her mother scolded about the time she came home—said it was one or two o'clock in the morning, although it was never later than eleven p.m. Her mother said that everybody in town was talking about subject's relationship with this fellow and that she would not be allowed to teach next year (in a small town). This worried her so that she finally went to the vice principal of the school board, who had got her the job, and asked if he had heard anything about her. He said, no, that everybody liked her and liked Gus too. So that's how she knew her mother was making it all up. Her mother no doubt thought she would never check up on it.

The difference in the type of discipline found in the families of our high-scoring as compared with those of our low-scoring subjects, in conjunction

with the difference in the family structure and the personality of the parents (stern vs. relaxed) may be considered part of the foundation for an authoritarian vs. democratic approach to interpersonal relationships. Evidence from the present study as well as from others (see Lasswell, 66; Fromm, 42; Erikson, 25) supports the psychoanalytic axiom that the first social relationships to be observed within the family are, to a large extent, formative of attitudes in later life.

D. CHILDHOOD EVENTS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD SIBLINGS

1. DEFINITION OF RATING CATEGORIES AND QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

The rating categories under the heading of "Childhood Events and Attitudes toward Siblings" fall into three groups: First, concern of the family with social status (Category 12), second, factual data on death, impairment of health, or divorce of the parents as well as sibling distribution (Categories 13 to 19), and third, psychological aspects of the relationship to the siblings (Categories 20a to 21c). The respective portions of the Scoring Manual are as follows:

INTERVIEW SCORING MANUAL: CHILDHOOD EVENTS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD SIBLINGS

(To Table 3(X))

- | PRESUMEDLY "HIGH" VARIANTS | PRESUMEDLY "LOW" VARIANTS |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 12. <i>Family status-concerned</i> | 12. <i>Family relaxed re status</i> |
| 13. <i>Death of father:</i> | |
| a. <i>In childhood</i> (age 1-6) | |
| b. <i>In prepuberty</i> (age 7-12) | |
| c. <i>In adolescence</i> (age 13-19) | |
| 14. <i>Death of mother:</i> | |
| a. <i>In childhood</i> (age 1-6) | |
| b. <i>In prepuberty</i> (age 7-12) | |
| c. <i>In adolescence</i> (age 13-19) | |
| 15. <i>Invalidism of father:</i> | |
| a. <i>In childhood</i> (age 1-6) | |
| b. <i>In prepuberty</i> (age 7-12) | |
| c. <i>In adolescence</i> (age 13-19) | |
| 16. <i>Invalidism of mother:</i> | |
| a. <i>In childhood</i> (age 1-6) | |
| b. <i>In prepuberty</i> (age 7-12) | |
| c. <i>In adolescence</i> (age 13-19) | |
| 17. <i>Divorce of parents:</i> | |
| a. <i>In childhood</i> (age 1-6) | |
| b. <i>In prepuberty</i> (age 7-12) | |
| c. <i>In adolescence</i> (age 13-19) | |

- d. *In whose care* was subject placed?
(Father? Mother? Other relative (specify)?
Other (specify)?)
- 18. *Sibling distribution*:
 - a. Only child
 - b. Youngest child.
 - c. Eldest child
 - d. Middle child
- 19. *Older sibling influence predominantly*:
 - a. Masculine
 - b. Feminine
- 20a. *Conventional idealization* of siblings
- 20a. *Objective appraisal*
- 20b. *Feelings of victimization* by siblings
- 21a. *Principled open rejection*
- 21b. *Genuine positive affect*
- 21c. *Blocked affect*

Quantitative results are given in Table 3(X). Since on the factual aspects of childhood covered by the second group of categories little differentiation was found between the prejudiced and the unprejudiced (see below), tabulation has been omitted for these categories. The three topics will now be discussed in reverse order. Since the last of these, attitudes toward siblings, follows most logically the preceding discussion on parents, it will be discussed first.

2. ATTITUDES TOWARD SIBLINGS

Differentiations similar to those applying to the parents were expected for psychological sibling relationships. Thus *conventional idealization* (Category 20a) as well as *feelings of victimization* (Category 20b) were expected primarily in high-scoring subjects, whereas *objective appraisal* (Category 20a) as well as *genuine affect* (Category 21b), *blocked affect* (Category 21c), and *principled open rejection* (Category 21a) were expected to be present more often in the typical low scorer.

In the categories dealing with attitude toward siblings there is an unusual proportion of Neutral ratings, so that possible trends are to a large extent obscured. In the interviews this topic was often thought of as relatively less crucial, and the interviewers skipped it altogether when time ran short. In spite of this, the results, on the whole, show some interesting trends.

Since siblings are considered a part of the intimate ingroup, we find some glorification of them by our high-scoring subjects. The fact, however, that siblings are not authorities, or at least not authorities in the same sense as parents, probably accounts for the lesser absolute frequency of idealization manifested toward them. Thus only 4 high-scoring and 1 low-scoring male interviewees idealize their siblings.

An example of glorification of siblings from the record of a high-scoring man is *M52's* description of his brother: "Well, he's a wonderful kid. . . . Has been wonderful to my parents. . . . Now 21. Always lived at home. . . . Gives most of his earnings to my parents. . . ."

Again, as in the attitude toward the parents, low-scoring subjects tend to give a realistic, insightful, and openly affectionate picture of their siblings, whereas high-scoring subjects tend to repeat the stereotypical clichés that have been observed in their descriptions of the parents. The parallelism is manifested not only in the use of such terms as "a wonderful kid," but also in the opportunistic flavor of the evaluation as exemplified by the phrase "gives most of his earnings to my parents."

Neither "victimization" nor "open rejection (on grounds of general principles)" proved differentiating between the two groups of men. In women, however, there is some trend in the direction anticipated.

"Objective appraisal" of siblings, however, is much more clearly differentiating, with 12 low-scoring and 1 high-scoring men showing this attitude. Examples of objective appraisal from the records of low-scoring men follow:

M60 tells about his sister: "My father represented authority in my house. When he died my sister lost her only authority and became quite a problem. Now has a happy, average home. . . . She was raised without adequate supervision."

The description of his sister by *M55* is along similar lines: "She's quite an amazing character, gotten to be a haphazard person now, careless . . . my parents ruined her, she's really quite bright, but has no initiative. However, a delightful person to live with because of her lackadaisical, I-don't-give-a-damn attitude . . . she's aware that she wasn't happy in her childhood. Parents were much more severe with her because she was more rebellious. She is extremely lenient with her own children."

"Genuine or blocked affect" responses, grouped together for certain purposes, were more differentiating in men than in women. Only 1 of the male high scorers but 11 of the male low scorers displayed this variant, due mostly to the presence of "genuine affect" toward siblings in low-scoring men. Examples of manifestations of real affection toward siblings from the protocols of low-scoring men are:

M59 says about his sister: "A lot of common trends. . . . Used to get a lot of pleasure in taking her out to shows, etc. because she was naive and used to get so much pleasure out of it. I used to help her with her schoolwork. She was more or less a tomboy when she was young and we had a lot of fun." Subject adds that he, and to a lesser extent her other brothers, taught her how to fight with her fists and comments that this has stood her in good stead, for example, as a professional ice-skater. "None of her competitors try any funny stuff with her because they know she can take care of herself."

M56 says about his young brother: "A good kid. A little inclined to be indiscriminating about his friends." Subject played big brother to him and made the decisions usually. (Satisfactions with brother?) "Oh, things shared together. (Q) Hunt, fish, both like people, as business partners got along swell."

M16 (answering the question, What about your brothers and sisters?): "The

TABLE 3 (X)
 INTERVIEW RATINGS ON CHILDHOOD EVENTS AND ATTITUDE TOWARD SIBLINGS
 FOR 80 SUBJECTS SCORING EXTREMELY "HIGH" OR "LOW" ON THE ETHNIC PREJUDICE QUESTIONNAIRE SCALE

Interview rating categories (abbreviated from Manual)	Sex	Number of "High" (H) and "Low" (L) ratings received by				Sums of instances "positive" "negative"	Level of statistical significance reached (percentage)
		20 men and 25 women "high scorers" H L	20 men and 15 women "low scorers" H L				
12. Family status-concerned(H) vs. status-relaxed(L)	Men	10	4	12	22	5	2
	Women	12	1	3	15		
20a. Conventional idealization(H) vs. objective appraisal(L) of siblings	Men	4	1	12	16	2	
	Women	6	0	7	13		
20b. Victimization by siblings(H)	Men	4	4		4	4	
	Women	7	3		7		
21a. Principled open rejection of siblings(L)	Men	3		3	3	3	
	Women	0		3	3		
21b. Genuine affection(L) or blocked affect(L) toward siblings	Men	1		11	11	1	
	Women	7		2	2		

brother fifteen years older; I was very close to him, we were good companions. (See him now?) I go to see him once in a while. Oh yes, we go into the garden together and look at his things, discuss things, philosophize. He thinks about the same way I do. He's a very intelligent sort of fellow; his IQ must be about in the genius range. (What are his interests?) Well, he's a _____; he plays in churches and different bands and he also has designed a new _____ with a different key that is easier to play. When he was fourteen, he built a steam engine for the shop." Subject describes very eagerly and seems very proud of his brother's achievements. (What is his occupation now?) "He putters around, shingles houses when he needs money and raises _____. He was interested in horticulture for a while. He likes shingling houses; he can sit up on the roof, think and philosophize. He's pretty poor, that is, he has some property, his house and another house that he rents, but he enjoys doing what he's doing. (What about your sisters?) Well, I have a sister two years older. I was sort of a pal of hers. And then one sister thirteen years older. She took care of me as a child. She was sort of a second mother to me. I'm not very close to either sister although I always got along with them alright. (Did your parents have any favorites among the children?) I don't think so. Well, probably I was the favorite of my mother because I was the baby. And my brother, the one six years older, he was so different from mother, she felt he was different, she didn't understand him. Father didn't know how to handle him."

The foregoing records give good illustrations of the way low-scoring men often display nurturant affection for their sisters, giving them support and love. The same may hold for the brothers, but mainly if there is a large age difference, with the subject being the older. Some of the records give evidence of the "fun" and pleasure they had with their sisters. Brothers near the age of the subject are often talked of in a way which indicates rivalry feelings. High-scoring men, on the other hand, tend to carry their feelings of rivalry into every relationship, and this often prevents them from having affectionate feelings toward any of their siblings.

A similar trend can be seen in women. Seven low scorers show "objective appraisal" of siblings, but none show "conventional idealization," whereas 6 of the high-scoring women interviewees do give evidence of the shallow glorification of siblings covered by the latter term. Since the number of Neutral ratings is even larger for the women interviewees than it is for men, the question of statistical significance was not approached.

An example of objective appraisal of siblings is demonstrated in the record of the following low-scoring woman:

F65 says: "One (sister) is fifteen. She thinks she resembles my mother's family. She is original and writes very cleverly, yet she is very naive and unconsciously funny. She is friendly and more social than I. She reforms everybody. My youngest sister is eight. She is very active, much more so than me. She is different than we. We are more quiet. We are 'drippy' in contrast to her. (Q) I used to have fights with my first sister."

Again we find, as so often in the case of the unprejudiced subjects, an imaginative, intraceptive quality in the description of other people, in this

case of siblings. "Originality," "clever writing," being "unconsciously funny" are the characteristics appreciated in the sister. A certain self-critical tendency on the part of the subject is expressed by her reference to herself as "drippy" in comparison with her younger sister.

On the other hand, the following record of a high-scoring woman shows glorifying admiration for a sibling side by side with feelings of victimization, a combination discussed in connection with attitudes toward parents:

F69: (Parents?) "Everything was fine until my brother came into the world—Albert was such a sweet child, the whole family adored him—even grandparents. He's blond, nice looking, sickly as a child, but not now. Short nose."

Typical in this protocol also is the emphasis on physical features which is similar to that found in the high scorers' descriptions of their parents.

There is, furthermore, on the whole a greater, though not statistically significant tendency in high-scoring interviewees to manifest feelings of being victimized by siblings. The record of *F69*, quoted before, was an example of this tendency. Another example from the interview of a high-scoring woman is:

F32: "The situation with the youngest sister is very different." Not only did subject take care of this sister after the mother's death, but she gave her financial aid. Because of their father's policy of giving the children only the necessities and none of the extras, the young sister would have had to go without evening dresses and other things that a girl really has to have in high school, if these had not been supplied by subject. The interviewer asked if subject also heard regularly from this sister. With much bitterness, subject replied that she was lucky if she heard from her sister once in three months. She feels that this sister has the family characteristic of being self-sufficient and independent, and that she has never really shown any gratitude for all that subject has done for her.

This record shows clearly that the subject resents both mother and sister, without daring to criticize them.

In all, only 3 of our low-scoring and none of our high-scoring women interviewees show "open rejection" of siblings. One example may suffice as an illustration of this attitude:

F29: "Sister aged 19 years. She is in Hollywood getting into the movies. We are not particularly good friends. First real hate was my sister. Intensely jealous of one another." Subject hasn't been near her for years. After high school, sister had little money. Met a fellow who supported her. "She sort of ruled him. She went to dramatic school. Is a very beautiful girl—not conventionally beautifully—beautiful in a masculine way." Subject does not think her sister was the mistress of the man. Sister has had homosexual affairs.

Having genuine, or else blocked, affect did not differentiate significantly between the two groups; again there was a scarcity of ratable material.

It is interesting to note that low-scoring men show more "genuine affect" for siblings in their interviews than low-scoring women. This fact may be

due to a greater inclination toward envy in women as compared to men, a trend noted by Freud and others.

3. CHILDHOOD EVENTS

Under the heading of "Childhood Events" the Interview Scoring Manual contained provisions for the registration of such facts as death of father or mother, divorce of parents, sibling distribution, etc. Since, as expected, the prejudiced and the unprejudiced showed, on the whole, little differentiation with respect to these categories, they were omitted in Table 3(X). A few remarks will be made here in a more informal way.

There is but little difference between the numbers of low and high scorers, women and men alike, who lost their fathers through death. The same holds true as far as the death of the mother in the case of women subjects is concerned, but the absolute number of those involved is very small in this case (2 out of the 25 high scorers and 1 out of the 15 low scorers).

However, 7 out of the 20 high-scoring men interviewees lost their mothers through death in their childhood or pre-adolescence, while all of the mothers of the 20 low-scoring men are still living. This objective finding gives support to the hypothesis, set forth above, that the relationship with the mother is important for the development of humanitarian values in the son. Early death of the mother may, it seems, contribute to the establishment of intolerant attitudes in the son.

The proportions of divorces of parents are very similar for men and women, high scorers and low scorers.

The position within the sibling distribution was likewise not found to be differentiating between the prejudiced and unprejudiced subjects.

4. STATUS CONCERN

The only aspect relating to "childhood events" which is explicitly listed in Table 3(X) (Category 12) is less palpably "objective" than those just mentioned. Yet it proved highly discriminatory. It deals with *social status*, the parents and family being classified either as "status-concerned" or as "status-relaxed" on the basis of the interview with the subject. Ten of the high- and only 1 of the low-scoring men describe a status-concerned attitude within their family. Conversely, 12 of the low-scoring men and only 4 of the high-scoring men describe their families as status-relaxed. The entire category is significant for men at the 2 per cent level.

An example of hierarchial thinking in the attitude toward work from the interview of one of the high-scoring men is the following:

M13 reports that, in spite of the fact that his father had to be careful with money, he would not let the subject work because he thought "it was beneath me."

Another of the prejudiced men interviewees gives a striking example of looking at marriage and children solely as a means to conserve possessions:

M51: "The only thing I really want—I have been paying storage on my mother's things. . . . I want a home and I want to get married, not because I want a wife, but because I want a child. I want the child because I want someone to pass my things on to—I suddenly have become very conscious of my background that I forget about. (How do you mean?) Family background. . . . And another thing is, if I have no issue, father's money will go to father's relatives. I want it to go to mother's side."

Another subject in this group shows the relationship between home discipline and aspirations to climb into "higher classes":

M57: (What were you disciplined for?) "Well, they didn't want me to run with some kind of people—slummy women—always wanted me to associate with the higher class of people."

The relaxed attitude toward status, with some tendency toward understatement, as found in unprejudiced interviewees is exemplified in the record of:

M53: (Parent's feelings about money?) "Well, kind of hard to answer. You see, my father died in. . . . I grew up in _____ (middle-class town). Neither extremes of poverty or wealth. Pretty typical middle-class community. (Did you have to work as a child?) Didn't have to. I did work in high school. (How did parents get along economically?) Well, they were lucky. Father left enough of an estate that mother didn't have to worry." Always a nice home, car, etc. "We always had Buicks (laughs) . . . which I think is typical of. . . ."

Another subject in this group displays even a lack of knowledge about the family's background:

M59: (How important was money to your parents?) "Well, I don't believe it was overemphasized or too important, was a means of providing food and shelter . . . but they found their happiness in work and little pleasures on weekends, etc." Both of subject's parents were born in this country. Mother's father was also born here. Father's father was born in Germany. "My father's father was born in Germany, I believe. . . . We didn't know very much about his family. . . . My mother's mother was born in this country. . . . Father's mother, I don't know."

The absence of a greedy attitude toward money also reflected in this protocol is further exemplified in the interview of another low-scoring man:

M12: "You know what George Bernard Shaw said? (What?) He says we ought to shoot everybody who wants to earn more than three thousand dollars a year and also those who can't make that much (laughs). I guess that's about right. (Family?) My mother had and accepted a very simple way of living. She had no envy or desire for more. I guess we all felt that way. We had sort of scorn for people who wanted too much. I guess there were just two worlds; theirs (the rich world) and ours; ours was fine—it didn't need any improvement. Our whole family felt that way, I think."

References to finding one's "happiness in work and little pleasures" or "in simple ways of living without desire or envy for more" are characteristic in this respect since the status-concern of the high scorers is often connected with an antipleasure attitude as discussed in other contexts within the interview material.

Of the high-scoring women's families, 12 are status-concerned whereas only 3 seem to be relaxed on this issue. The following quotation may suffice as an example of a status-concerned family background in the case of a high scorer:

F79: At the present time the father is the owner of a mill and logging camp and he also has interests in _____. "It's a medium sized mill but I have no idea of his income. Of course, we children have always been to private schools and lived in exclusive residential sections. In _____ we had tennis courts and horses. We had more or less to start over again when we came to this country. We lived in a nice house but really couldn't afford it. It was quite an effort to get into social circles. In _____ we felt secure and fitted in. Back here, we have lived at the same level but with anxiety about it. Mother and daddy have climbed socially . . . and I don't care so much. Yes, we have always had servants. It was easy in _____, but it's hard to get them here."

As will be discussed in the next (concluding) section of this chapter, the great concern about status characteristic of the families of our prejudiced subjects may be instrumental in the establishment of many of the attitudes shown so far as predominant in high scorers.

E. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS ON FAMILY PATTERNS

The quantitative data just presented give evidence that presence or absence of extreme ethnic prejudice in individuals of our culture tends to be related to a complex network of attitudes within, and relating to, the family. Lasswell, in his pioneer study (66), found that the interrelationships of his subjects with their parents and siblings were of paramount importance in determining their future political activities.

In the following summary a composite picture of the prejudiced and unprejudiced trends as based on our material is presented.² As stated before, most of the high-scoring and low-scoring individuals exhibit "High" as well as "Low" personality traits in varying proportions. In fact, single individuals may display any kind of configuration of traits. What is attempted in the present context is no more than a schematic outline of prevalent group trends. Such a picture must of necessity do injustice to all the many existing exceptions.

It also must be reiterated that our composite picture deals with groups scoring *extremely* high or low on the prejudice questionnaire rather than with groups that are more average in this respect.

² Although the results discussed in this summary are primarily based on the statements of our subjects about their families, direct evidence gathered in a separate study on social discrimination in children and their parents substantiate our inferences about the differences in the family constellation of high scorers and low scorers (see Else Frenkel-Brunswick, 30).

Prejudiced subjects tend to report a relatively harsh and more threatening type of home discipline which was experienced as arbitrary by the child. Related to this is a tendency apparent in families of prejudiced subjects to base interrelationships on rather clearly defined roles of dominance and submission in contradistinction to equalitarian policies. In consequence, the images of the parents seem to acquire for the child a forbidding or at least a distant quality. Family relationships are characterized by fearful subservience to the demands of the parents and by an early suppression of impulses not acceptable to them.

The goals which such parents have in mind in rearing and training their children tend to be highly conventional. The status-anxiety so often found in families of prejudiced subjects is reflected in the adoption of a rigid and externalized set of values: what is socially accepted and what is helpful in climbing the social ladder is considered "good," and what deviates, what is different, and what is socially inferior is considered "bad." With this narrow path in mind, the parents are likely to be intolerant of any manifestation of impulses on the part of the child which seems to distract from, or to oppose, the desired goal. The more urgent the "social needs" of the parents, the more they are apt to view the child's behavior in terms of their own instead of the child's needs.

Since the values of the parents are outside the child's scope, yet are rigorously imposed upon him, conduct not in conformity with the behavior, or with the behavioral façade, required by the parents has to be rendered ego-alien and "split off" from the rest of the personality (see Chapter XII), with a resultant loss of integration. Much of the submission to parental authority in the prejudiced subject seems to be induced by impatience on the part of the parents and by the child's fear of displeasing them.

It is in the area of social and political attitudes that the suppressed yet unmodified impulses find one of their distorted outlets and emerge with particular intensity. In particular, moral indignation first experienced in the attitude of one's parents toward oneself is being redirected against weaker outgroups.

The lack of an internalized and individualized approach to the child, on the part of the parents, as well as a tendency to transmit mainly a set of conventional rules and customs, may be considered as interfering with the development of a clear-cut personal identity in the growing child. Instead, we find surface conformity without integration, expressing itself in a stereotyped approach devoid of genuine affect in almost all areas of life. The general, pervasive character of the tendency, on the part of prejudiced individuals, toward a conventional, externalized, shallow type of relation will be demonstrated further in subsequent chapters. Even in the purely cognitive domain, ready-made clichés tend to take the place of spontaneous reactions. Whatever the topic may be, statements made by the prejudiced as contrasted

with the unprejudiced are apt to stand out by their comparative lack of imagination, of spontaneity, and of originality and by a certain constrictive character.

Faithful execution of prescribed roles and the exchange of duties and obligations is, in the families of the prejudiced, often given preference over the exchange of free-flowing affection. We are led to assume that an authoritarian home régime, which induces a relative lack of mutuality in the area of emotion and shifts emphasis onto the exchange of "goods" and of material benefits without adequate development of underlying self-reliance, forms the basis for the opportunistic type of dependence of children on their parents, described in the present chapter.

This kind of dependence on the parents, the wish to be taken care of by them, coupled with the fear ensuing from the same general pattern, seems firmly to establish the self-negating submission to parents just described. There are, however, certain cues which seem to indicate the presence, at the same time, of underlying resentment against, and feelings of victimization by, the parents. Occasionally such attitudes manage to break through to the overt level in the interview material. But they are seen more directly, more consistently, and in more intense form in the fantasy material gathered from the same individuals.

Resentment, be it open or disguised, may readily be understood in view of the strong parental pressures to enforce "good" behavior together with the meagerness of the rewards offered. As a reaction against the underlying hostility, there is often rigid glorification and idealization of the parents. The artificiality of this attitude may be recognized from the description of the parents in exaggerated, superlative (and at the same time stereotypical and externalized) terms.

Usually it is only this admiration which is admitted and ego-accepted. The resentment, rendered ego-alien, is the more active through the operation of mechanisms of displacement. The larger social implications of this displaced hostility are discussed in various contexts throughout the present volume.

The superficial character of the identification with the parents and the consequent underlying resentment against them recurs in the attitudes to authority and social institutions in general. As will be seen, we often find in our high-scoring subjects both overconformity and underlying destructiveness toward established authority, customs, and institutions. A person possessed by such ambivalence may easily be kept in check and may even behave in an exemplary fashion in following those external authorities who take over the function of the superego—and partly even those of the ego. On the other hand, if permitted to do so by outside authority, the same person may be induced very easily to uncontrolled release of his instinctual tendencies, especially those of destructiveness. Under certain conditions he will even join forces with the delinquent, a fusion found in Nazism.

The orientation toward power and the contempt for the allegedly inferior and weak, found in our typical prejudiced subjects, must likewise be considered as having been taken over from the parents' attitude toward the child. The fact that his helplessness as a child was exploited by the parents and that he was forced into submission must have reinforced any existing antiweakness attitude. Prejudiced individuals thus tend to display "negative identification" with the weak along with their positive though superficial identification with the strong.

This orientation toward the strong is often expressed in conscious identification with the more powerful parent. Above all, the men among our prejudiced subjects tend to report having a "stern and distant" father who seems to have been domineering within the family. It is this type of father who elicits in his son tendencies toward passive submission, as well as the ideal of aggressive and rugged masculinity and a compensatory striving for independence. Furthermore, the son's inadequate relation to his mother prevents him from adopting some of the "softer" values.

In line with the fact that the families of the prejudiced, especially those of our male subjects, tend to be father-dominated, there is a tendency in such families toward a dichotomous conception of the sex roles and a relative separation of the sexes within the family (see Chapter XI).

In view of the fact that, depending upon his sex, the personality structure of a parent will have a different effect on that of a child, the same family constellation may make either the son or the daughter more susceptible to nondemocratic ideology. Thus, under certain conditions, a boy may become tolerant when his mother is tolerant and his father not, while the daughter in the same family may become intolerant. This is, perhaps, one of the reasons why siblings sometimes tend toward different political ideologies. Unfortunately, no systematic investigation of siblings could be made in the framework of the present study.

By and large, the prejudiced man has more possibilities available to him to compensate for underlying weaknesses. He may do so by demonstrating his independence, or by implicit or explicit assertion of his superiority over women. Prejudiced women, with fewer outlets at their disposal for the expression of their underlying feelings, show, as will become evident later, stronger underlying hostilities and more rigid defenses than their male counterparts.

In the case of the individuals extremely low on ethnic prejudice the pattern of family relationships differs at least in the degree of emphasis that is placed upon the various factors just listed. One of the most important differences as compared with the family of the typical high scorer is that less obedience is expected of the children. Parents are less status-ridden and thus show less anxiety with respect to conformity and are less intolerant toward manifestations of socially unaccepted behavior. Instead of condemning they

tend to provide more guidance and support, thus helping the child to work out his instinctual problems. This makes possible a better development of socialization and of the sublimation of instinctual tendencies.

Comparatively less pronounced status-concern often goes hand in hand with greater richness and liberation of emotional life. There is, on the whole, more affection, or more unconditional affection, in the families of unprejudiced subjects. There is less surrender to conventional rules, and therefore relations within the family tend to be more internalized and individualized. To be sure, this sometimes goes to the extreme of falling short of the acceptance of normal standards and customs.

Additional evidence will be offered in the next chapter for the fact that unprejudiced individuals often manifest an unrealistic search for love in an attempt to restore the type of early relations they enjoyed within their family. Exaggerated cravings in this direction are often a source of dissatisfaction and open ambivalence.

The unprejudiced man, especially, seems oriented toward his mother and tends to retain a love-dependent nurturance-succorance attitude toward women in general which is not easily satisfied. Such an orientation toward the mother, together with the conception of the father as "mild and relaxed," makes it possible for the unprejudiced man to absorb a measure of passivity in his ideal of masculinity. No compensation through pseudo-toughness and antiweakness attitudes is thus necessary. The humanitarian approach can then be adopted on the basis of identification both with the mother and with the father.

The unprejudiced woman, on the other hand, seems to have more often a genuine liking and admiration for the father, for, say, his intellectual-aesthetic abilities. This often leads to conscious identification with him.

Since the unprejudiced subjects on the whole received more love and feel more basically secure in relation to their parents, they more easily express disagreement with them without fear of retaliation or of a complete loss of love. As is to be expected, such expressions of disagreement will nonetheless often lead to internal conflict, guilt, and anxieties. This is the more to be understood since in this group the relations to the parents tend to be intensive and often highly gratifying. There is certainly a great deal of ambivalence in this type of love-oriented family attachment. Ambivalence is here more openly faced, however, than in the case of the prejudiced.

In spite of the conflicts just mentioned, unprejudiced subjects often succeed in attaining a considerable degree of independence from their parents, and of freedom in making their own decisions. Since hostility toward the parents, when present, tends to be more open, it often takes the form of rebellion against other authorities or, more generally, against objects nearer to the original objects of aggression than are the really, or presumably, weak which serve as favorite objects of aggression in the case of the prejudiced. It

is often in this form that the unprejudiced man expresses his hostility against his father.

On the whole, this type of independence recurs in the unprejudiced subjects' attitude toward social institutions and authorities in general. At the same time, the existing identification with the parents is often accompanied by a more basic identification with mankind and society in general.

The next chapter will present concrete evidence of the fact that the general attitude toward the parents, the greater ability to love, the richer and more libidinated object-cathexis, and the greater independence found in the unprejudiced recur as general traits in their interpersonal relations. Further quotations of actual statements from interviews will confirm the impression gained so far that the ethnically unprejudiced in our culture tend to be more creative and imaginative than the prejudiced and that they are characterized by a fuller integration of their personalities. The concluding chapters of Part II will round out the picture. It must be stressed, however, that the unprejudiced by no means emerges as an unmitigated ideal. Nor must, on the other hand, the prejudiced be blamed as an individual for his or her bias. Rather, the "high" character-structure must largely be considered the outcome of our civilization. The increasing disproportion of the various psychological "agencies" within the total personality is undoubtedly being reinforced by such tendencies in our culture as division of labor, the increased importance of monopolies and institutions, and the dominance of the idea of exchange and of success and competition. This may help to explain the impression the reader may have gained from a detailed perusal of the material presented in this chapter, namely, that all in all the character of the extremely unprejudiced is less clearcut and pronounced than that of the extremely prejudiced, so that one may perhaps say that the high-scorer has more "high" traits than the low-scorer has "low" traits. Of course, a full picture of our civilization will also have to account for the characteristics of the typical low-scorer. A more detailed discussion of all this will be given in Chapter XIII.