

## CHAPTER XI

# SEX, PEOPLE, AND SELF AS SEEN THROUGH THE INTERVIEWS

*Else Frenkel-Brunswik*

---

In the preceding chapter, family patterns have been described with the focus on the difference between the descriptions given by prejudiced as compared with unprejudiced individuals. Discussion has centered especially upon the following: authoritarian as contrasted with equalitarian approach, conventionality and stereotypy vs. genuineness and richness of affect, degree and type of dependence, love-orientation as contrasted with opportunistic orientation, openness and admission of hostility, differentiation in attitudes toward the parent of the same sex and of the opposite sex.

Similar themes will now be taken up in a consideration of the subjects' evaluation of, and contact with, the other sex and people in general, and, finally, their self-evaluation. It will be of special interest to investigate in these areas the recurrence or the modifications of the patterns found within the family.

### A. ATTITUDE TOWARD SEX

#### 1. DEFINITION OF RATING CATEGORIES AND QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

The aspects to be covered in this section can best be seen from the list of categories used in rating the interview material pertaining to the area of sex adjustment. As is the case throughout the presentation of the Interview Scoring Manual used by the interview raters, the categories are presented in their skeleton form only, omitting the bulk of the extensive oral commentary and discussion offered to the raters. Some of these further specifications are presented together with the subsequent analysis and discussion of the results by categories.

## INTERVIEW SCORING MANUAL: ATTITUDE TOWARD SEX

(to Table 1(XI))

PRESUMABLY "HIGH" VARIANTS	PRESUMABLY "LOW" VARIANTS
22. <i>Status via sex</i> : E.g., "con-quests," emphasis on "dates"; rationalization of any failure or shortcoming	22. <i>Open admission of inadequacy</i> without rationalizing
23a. <i>Rejection of id</i> : Anti-id moralism; rejection of sex, or continued attachment to a frigid or impotent partner	23a. <i>Acceptance of id</i>
23b. <i>Promiscuity</i> as a prominent pattern (no extended love relationship)	23b. <i>Conscious inhibitions without moralism</i>
24. <i>Dichotomous sex attitudes</i> : Sex vs. affection and object-relations; pure vs. low women (in men); depersonalized sex relations or interests. Reference to specified practices	24. <i>Fusion of sex and affection</i> : Personalized sex orientation or relations
25. <i>Underlying disrespect-resentment</i> toward opposite sex, typically combined with externalized, excessive pseudo-admiration	25. <i>Genuine respect-fondness</i> for opposite sex, often with conflict about one's sex role and open ambivalence toward the other sex
26. <i>Power orientation</i> : Exploitive-manipulative (concrete benefits). In women: surface-submission plus aggression-castration	26. <i>Love-seeking</i> (warmth and affection)
27. <i>Values conventionally determined</i>	27. <i>Values individualized</i>
<i>Traits desired:</i>	<i>Emphasis on:</i>
Men in Women:	Companionship, common interest
Giving (kind, generous)	Warmth, sociability
Pure (wholesome, "good personality")	Sexual love
Submissive, "sweet"	Understanding
Women in Men:	Liberal values
Hardworking, energetic, getting	
Moral model, clean-cut	
Deferent	

As can be seen from Table 1(XI), five out of the seven differences studied in comparing the attitudes toward sex of low-scoring and high-scoring men are statistically highly significant. For women three categories are sig-

TABLE 1 (XI)  
 INTERVIEW RATINGS ON ATTITUDE TOWARD SEX  
 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		
22. Status via sex(H) vs. admission of inadequacy(L)	Men	$\frac{8}{10}$	$\frac{1}{1}$	16	3
	Women			$\frac{22}{22}$	2
23a. Rejection(H) vs. acceptance(L) of id	Men	$\frac{17}{9}$	$\frac{4}{8}$	$\frac{21}{17}$	8
	Women				8
23b. Promiscuity(H) vs. conscious inhibitions(L)	Men	$\frac{0}{7}$	$\frac{0}{1}$	$\frac{0}{8}$	1
	Women				2
24. Dichotomy(H) vs. fusion(L) of sex and affection	Men	$\frac{11}{16}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{17}{22}$	7
	Women				6
25. Underlying disrespect(H) vs. genuine fondness of opposite sex(L)	Men	$\frac{13}{12}$	$\frac{2}{1}$	$\frac{20}{23}$	6
	Women				3
26. Exploitive power-orientation(H) vs. love-seeking(L)	Men	$\frac{13}{9}$	$\frac{2}{2}$	$\frac{23}{23}$	6
	Women				4
27. Conventional(H) vs. individualized(L) values	Men	$\frac{12}{10}$	$\frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{18}{21}$	7
	Women				4

nificant; the remaining ones likewise show the expected trend though in a somewhat less pronounced fashion.

## 2. STATUS VIA SEX

High-scoring individuals tend to view *sex as a means of obtaining status*, and to *rationalize failures or shortcomings* in this area (Category 22). Ten high-scoring and only 1 of the low-scoring men manifest this attitude. Similar is the proportion for women (8 to 1). These results also illustrate the general tendency of high scorers to speak well of themselves.

The typical high-scoring man apparently has a particularly strong need to conceive of himself as an ideal of masculinity, and so high-scoring men tend either to boast of their sexual conquests or to justify their lack of sexual experience or success by explanations in terms of moral restraint or unfortunate external circumstances. Embarrassment is shown about facts which might point toward a less glorious masculine role, e.g., about what is considered a late sexual start. In women a similar attitude is revealed mainly by reports about popularity with men. There is evidence both of excessive moralism (see below) and of crude promiscuity in the records of the high scorers; sex relations tend to be isolated and depersonalized and thus to become peripheral rather than being integrated with the ego. All this must be seen in the context of the general cultural confusion, and the breakdown of values in general and of sex values in particular in Western civilization; low scorers, although on the whole on better terms with their sex life, are by no means entirely free from this confusion (see below).

Examples from the protocols of interviewees scoring extremely high on the overt ethnocentrism questionnaire follow.

*M45*, a high-scoring man, boasts a great deal about his ability to seduce girls: (Where get sex instruction?) "In a parked automobile. (Q) I guess when I was about fourteen or fifteen. . . . Oh, wait a minute, I'll have to go back further than that. First time was when I was about eight years old. Of course, I didn't know what I was doing. It was my cousin . . . (by mutual agreement). It made me sick though. . . . (First intercourse?) Well, must have been fifteen. (Q) Girl I hardly knew. She must have been about twenty years old, out riding, two couples in the car, a Model A. She and I went off by ourselves. . . . A one-night relationship. I don't think I ever saw her again. (Did you have many intercourses before you married?) Yes. (All momentary relationships?) Yes, that's all. (What about second wife?) I was with her twice. I was twenty. The second time didn't last long. I always get married spectacularly. We got married in a taxi cab. . . . We had intercourse before we were married, after four months' acquaintance. She was a virgin."

*M46* tells that "I have a peculiar characteristic which causes women to open up on short acquaintance and tell all about themselves."

*M18* states that, since the age of 14, he has been "woman crazy" and expressed many fantastic ideas of his sexual power. States that he proposed matrimony many times, but was always repulsed because he could not support the girls. This subject seems to believe in his "sexual power," and the fact that he has been rejected by all

girls to whom he proposed marriage is completely rationalized on the grounds of his economic insufficiency.

Embarrassment about what is felt as an overly late first sex experience is shown in the record of *M11*: (What was your first sex experience?) "At the age of 17, I'm sorry to admit. I mean, it was so late."

*F32*, a high-scoring woman, remarks that she had always had "scads of boy friends." When she was in the fourth grade there was a boy who used to carry her books home and they remained friends for many years. There was no kissing or anything of that kind. Her father had a farm in \_\_\_\_\_ and the family spent their summers there for many years. One summer when she was about 18 something very dramatic happened. One night a farmhand who had been interested in her came around to the front door and told her parents that he would shoot himself if she would not marry him. When asked how far their relationship had gone, she denied that there had even been any kissing; "he was only a farmhand."

Our low-scoring interviewees, on the other hand, are mostly frank in their *open admission* without rationalizing, of whatever is thought to be an inadequacy or undue delay with respect to sexual attractiveness, development, or adjustment. The differences on the entire Category 22 are highly significant (at the 1 per cent level) in men and satisfactory (at the 5 per cent level) in women.

Examples from the records of low-scoring men are:

*M15*, a low scorer, is a good example of the men who frankly admit lack of sexual experience without feeling the necessity to rationalize on moral or other grounds: Picked up all his knowledge from older boys. Remembers some sex play with neighborhood children, but denies active participation. Felt guilty, afraid gang's activities would be discovered.

*M49* is frank about the sexual difficulties in his marriage: "We don't—we used to have quite a bit of difficulty, but we're getting along much better now . . . after this operation, I didn't have much desire . . . for about 6 months. . . . I feel now that we're not too close to the peak . . . but it's so much better now."

*M53* describes his earliest sex experience: "Oh, I think it was about 15 or 16. (Q) With a gal that was not very satisfactory. (Q) Someone I knew fairly well." Subject indicates later that this was intercourse, although not very successful.

*M55*: "Oh, about 14, though I wasn't very successful. . . . So clumsy, I don't know whether you'd call it experience, but imagine when I was about seventeen, in the back seat of an automobile." (Other sex experiences before marriage?) Subject mentions several incidental relationships, none of which led to affairs. . . . "I think that probably contributed to my feeling of not being successful and not being able to . . . afraid of being clumsy. . . ."

*M56* tells that he has "always been rather inhibited about sex."

*M59* admits that his girl left him for another man: "At 16 about a year and a half. I felt pretty bad about it when we split up. I got a job and she started going out with another man."

Likewise frank are the low-scoring women in their admission of difficulties in adjusting to a feminine role, or of a lack of attraction for men.

Thus *F62*, asked about her boy friends, reports: "I am avoided by the male sex perhaps because I am too heavy. I only have speaking acquaintances with boys. When I meet boys I immediately try to be witty and clever and this is a great mis-

take. I never go on dates; sometimes I am glad of it because I have more time for reading—and sometimes I am sorry.”

F27 reports: (After you began to get acquainted with boys, were you at ease with them?) “Not for a long time. At first I didn’t even enjoy a date. I was so busy worrying if he would ask me for another. I can’t say I ever did enjoy boys very much. It is just the idea that they are boys. I never got all thrilled like some girls do. I never cared a lot about anyone until I met my husband.”

F30 has no difficulties in admitting that she never had a date: “We became engaged without ever having a date. In fact, I never had dates. . . . We often laugh now about the fact that we got engaged and knew we wanted to spend our lives together without ever having had a date.”

F63 tells about her difficulty in accepting the feminine role: “Can’t make myself do anything. Never have been willing to accept my role as a woman. This is just one of a long series of depressions which have resulted from having my ambitions blocked. I really love my present husband, would like to get myself straightened out while he is at sea. If I don’t I’ll lose him too.”

Generally, one of the most outstanding characteristics of our low-scoring subjects is their ability to admit shortcomings in themselves (see Section C). The above quotations show clearly that low-scoring men can admit sexual insufficiency, “awkwardness,” and “clumsiness” without further rationalization. Similarly the low-scoring women are ready to face their lack of success in this field as well as their difficulties in accepting a feminine role. Especially in the last of the records there is clear indication of conflict between love for the husband and having one’s “ambitions blocked” by marriage. At the same time, sex seems to be much more integrated with social relations in unprejudiced individuals, and much more oriented toward specific persons.

### 3. MORALISTIC REJECTION OF INSTINCTUAL TENDENCIES

It appears, furthermore, that high scorers tend to manifest what may be called a *moralistic rejection of the id* (Category 23a). The restricted type of prejudiced person manifests, in the main, explicit anti-id moralism; the less restricted—but often not less inhibited—type of high scorer, to be found primarily in our prison sample, manifests the same tendency though often more indirectly, e.g., by attachment to a frigid woman and often in context with promiscuity. If high-scoring subjects think of sex primarily in terms of success and failure, it is not surprising to find that they tend to reject the purely erotic or sensual.

Our low scorers, on the other hand, tending in general to be less repressed, seem to manifest more *acceptance of the id*. The results on the entire Category 23a show the expected trend without, however, reaching statistical significance. There are 17 positive as contrasted with 8 negative instances in men, and a similar and slightly higher ratio in women.

Examples of high-scoring men who are attached to a frigid partner are:

M40: In the past year subject has been very much in love with a married woman.

"She doesn't like her husband, but has a false loyalty to him because he is in the army, and makes herself miserable. I never met the man. I got fed up from her sheer stupidity! When I went East, I was to send her money to get her divorce and I wrote her daily and she never replied; and I came out to find out what had happened and she re-discovered her loyalty to him and she actually wouldn't let me touch her. He hurt her physically and she couldn't enjoy sex. She had a doctor treating her and she would say to me, 'I am only half a woman.' All that was a part of it all. I was prepared to take care of everything and I had arranged to take care of her younger brother and sister."

*M45:* (What sort of person was she?) "The type of person that you see a lot of. Wise and dumb, both. . . . Knows a lot about business, nothing about people. . . . She trusts everyone (subject gives an example). . . . We didn't get on too good sexually because she was kind of on the frigid line, but still in all I was in love with her and I still am. I'd like nothing better than to go back to her. . . . I don't think there's much chance of it though. . . ."

*M51:* (Marriage?) "She was 12 years older than me. (Q) She's a very literary person. We did have a lot of things in common. She's cold as a clam sexually (Did you have intercourse with her?) Yes, lots of times and I used especially . . . in the evening getting ready to go out. . . ."

*M52:* "She tried very hard to make me happy. . . . The thing that eventually broke us up was (proximity of her parents). She could always run home. . . . Another drawback was the sexual relationship. . . . She was the type that didn't care much for it. . . . She never had any desire for it."

Although rejection of the id, in the foregoing records of high-scoring men, is manifested mainly in the choice of, and attachment to, a frigid woman, it is interesting to note that some of the men at the same time show signs of crude and unsocialized sex impulses (see below). In these cases the inability to accept genuine sexuality leads to both a frequent change of the sex object without personal involvement, and involvement without sex.

Anti-id moralism is more clearly manifest in the statements of prejudiced women, who often have very definite ideas of what is to be considered as wrong. Examples from their interviews follow.

*F22:* "Sex isn't uppermost in my mind by any means. . . . I'm more for having a good time with the exclusion of sex interest. (Q) I've been shocked by the conduct of my girl friends. I didn't think they were that type."

*F31:* "I think a girl should be friendly, but I don't like necking in the back of a show. A boy and a girl should be just friends."

*F74:* "When at high school was first kissed." Subject didn't like it. She was frightened.

*F71:* (Proper?) "I don't believe in parking—no matter what you're doing. I believe in kissing. I've done my share of it, but I've never parked. . . . (A girl who did) I'd stick with, but wouldn't think much of her. . . . Mother says 'a boy admires a girl who admires herself.'"

Low-scoring subjects, on the other hand, show more acceptance of sex in general, though not without evidence of conflict.

Acceptance of instinctual tendencies is shown in the following records of low-scoring subjects:

*M56:* (Importance of sex in marriage?) "Very high. I was fortunate in being perfectly mated to my wife, sexually, that is."

*M55:* (Sex adjustment with her?) "Very well, took quite a long time, though."

*M16:* Subject was in love several times—some of the times the girls were married or did not want to marry him. Once during the depression he had an affair with one girl for several years but did not want to get married because of financial circumstances. Subject married in \_\_\_\_\_ after living with his present wife for several years. "We get along pretty well, never quarrel. (How did you get along sexually?) Pretty well."

#### 4. "PURE" VS. "BAD" WOMEN

It is probably the predominance of surface adulation of, and underlying resentment against, the mother, found in high-scoring men, that leads to what is here called their *dichotomous sex attitudes* as defined by the separation of sex and affect, or by the sharpness of the distinction between a "bad" and a "pure" woman. On the other hand, *fusion of sex and affect*, a tendency to more personalized sex relations, is found more often in low-scoring men (Category 24). The difference is significant at the 1 per cent level as defined at the end of Chapter IX.

In our sample of women we find the same trend, but the difference is not statistically significant.

Examples of the dichotomous conception of "good" vs. "bad" women, taken from the records of high-scoring men, follow.

*M51:* (Other relations with women?) "Well, yes, three or four, all older than me and they weren't anything but physical."

*M52:* "She taught me something that stuck with me all my life, that a woman is the most perfect thing in the world, that is, the right kind of woman."

*M6:* "I like a girl who is level-headed and can talk on several topics. I don't like the Maizie and Flo type or the sex boxes. Yes, I have been out with the latter, but you have to be careful. There's always the danger of disease."

The records of the following two high scorers show the kind of characteristics these men value most in the girls they would like to marry:

*M14:* (What about girls?) "Well, there is nothing definite yet, though I have known a lot. I never have found one I'd like to marry. I want a girl whose sole interest is in the home. I think a woman's place should not be in the business world. So many women have lost the sense of home. . . ."

*M20:* "They're (Indians) a reckless lot, careless about marriages and divorce. . . . (Q) Yes, I went through high school with one girl. . . . Very religious. Got with her around the church. . . . Never took each other very seriously, more or less, just accepted one another." The subject left and when he returned, she had gotten married. "She was more or less what I was looking for. Very religious. . . ."

The conception of marriage as a rather external affair not involving common interests, and also demonstrating conventional moralism, is given by the record of the following high scorer:

*M41:* (What was your wife like?) "A nice person. A nurse, before I married her."

(Q) Well, I liked her looks and manners. (In what ways were you most alike?) Well, we weren't much alike in any way. We got along all right. . . . Her mother was Christian Science. (What about her?) She was Christian Science. (Any children?) No. (In what ways most different?) Well, a little different in tastes about things. (Q) Most anything. I liked flowers and she didn't care much for flowers. (Main difficulties?) I didn't have any. We got along good. I let her have her own way. Takes two to start an argument. (Have her way in what things?) In most anything. Well, if we was going anywhere, if I went to buy a suit of clothes, I let her pick it out. If we wanted anything for the house, I let her pick it. (Childhood sex experiences?) Well, I don't remember any. When I was a kid, such things weren't taught. . . . Such things weren't mentioned by parents or anyone else. If you met a girl on the street, you'd blush. . . . I don't think it's a very good subject to teach. They learn it soon enough."

The lack of integration of sex and affection found in high-scoring men is likewise illustrated by some of these quotations. Quite commonly, in the girls they would like to marry, they require, above all, moral standards; often this is the only requirement. Frequently their marriages do not seem to be based on companionship or love. As far as their reports about premarital sexual relationships are concerned, they usually manifest contempt for the women involved. In both marriage and the more casual sex relationships there seems to be little concern with common interest and comradeship.

The difference in the attitude toward sexual relationships in high-scoring as compared with low-scoring men can perhaps best be exemplified by two records describing extramarital relationships. In both cases there is evidence of sexual and marital maladjustment. The differences, however, are characteristic of the two groups, respectively.

*M58*, a high-scoring man, reports: "And if you're not satisfied it might become uppermost in your mind, even above work, etc. . . . I believe I've seen where it is necessary for emotional stability, to relieve yourself regardless of marriage. (How do you mean?) First thing you know you're looking around . . . find something somewhere and relieve . . . then can go back and concentrate. . . . (What main difficulties have you found in your marriage?) My wife and I have always been thoroughly compatible . . . (only trivial daily problems) . . . can't think of anything . . . only one particular thing: I got to chasing around with another woman (although my wife had nothing to do with it; there was no conflict with her) it was in me entirely alone. . . ."

*M10*, a low-scoring man: "We have not enjoyed our sexual relationships almost since the first day of our marriage. I don't want it, and we often go for months without coitus . . . is that the word? My wife always takes the initiative in our relationships; she is very passionate. So am I—I have had three affairs since my marriage. I am having one now and she knows it."

The first of these men, a high scorer, talks about sex as though it were an ego-alien tension which has to be "relieved" for hygienic reasons. Thus, in the most intimate interpersonal relationships, he displays a utilitarian and (pseudo-)realistic outlook. The depersonalized attitude in this subject is drastically expressed by referring to his sexual partner as "something," and

in the phrase "find something somewhere and relieve." On the other hand, the low-scoring subject, in a somewhat evasive, unperceptive effort to integrate his extramarital relationships into his total life-pattern, exemplifies the inhibited and at the same time impulse-ridden maladjustment sometimes found in those scoring low on ethnocentrism.

##### 5. EGO-ALIEN AMBIVALENCE VS. "FONDNESS"

The isolation of sex experience in the typical high scorers is connected with an ambivalent *underlying disrespect for, and resentment against, the opposite sex*, often hidden behind an externalized and excessive *pseudoadmiration*. Low scorers, on the other hand, manifest more often *genuine respect and fondness* for the opposite sex (Category 25). The difference is highly significant (1 per cent level) for men, and satisfactorily significant (5 per cent level) for women.

An example of the "High" type of ambivalence toward women is the following statement:

*M81*: "I don't think men respect women or anything about women, the way they ought to. . . . In other words, women aren't inferior to men. If anything, they are superior. After all, they are the hands that rock the cradle." His admiration of women goes hand in hand with his conception of women as weak. Subject argues strongly at this point that restrictions should be removed on women, but still expresses his disapproval of women in business on the grounds that it would spoil the dependent (i.e., the home type) woman's chances.

More open lack of appreciation is shown in the following description of his stepmother by a high scorer:

*M40*: (What sort of person was your stepmother?) "Pretty hard to describe, just another woman, I guess . . . nothing glaringly outstanding. (In what ways was she like your father?) She wasn't. (How different?) In every way. She wasn't his equal in anything—intellectually. More matter of convenience than anything else."

Undisguised contempt for girls is displayed by another high scorer:

*M11*: "But I can't stand being around a bunch of girls, a lot of senseless chatter. They are all the same. Sororities are the cliquiest and the snottiest."

One of the high-scoring prison inmates blames his fate on his wife:

*M57*: "This last one I married was really a corker. . . . She just got her divorce. . . . I found out she was married all the time to another man. . . . She got me in here, I guess I got pussy-simple."

Correspondingly, contempt for men is expressed in the following records of high-scoring women:

*F24*: "Of course, now if you pick a boy as a friend, right away they want to get juicy. You have to be careful about boys."

*F31*: "I wouldn't want to be a factory worker, either. It's not very good to say now, when they need everybody that's working in factories, but I can't see a girl

working in jeans and around grease and putting themselves on the same level with men."

Low-scoring subjects, on the other hand, in seeking companionship with the opposite sex, more often manifest some measure of fondness. This attitude, shown by the following protocols, tends to increase in longer and more intimate relationships, as indicated by the statement of *M42* that "a successful marriage certainly leads to familiarity but not to contempt."

The necessity of frankness in marriage is emphasized by *M59*: "When I do meet the one girl for me, I shall explain all my past life to her, because I do not believe that happiness can be based on lies." The frankness but also the compulsive feature in this statement are characteristic of the type of low scorer with neurotic features (see below).

Another low scorer shows love and respect for a woman in spite of the fact that the marriage did not work out:

*M50*: "At that time I was too self-centered to be in love with anyone. . . . I did admire and respect and like her . . . but we never should have gotten married. . . . Today I think we could have a better chance of making a go of it . . . because I have grown up sufficiently."

This record further shows the inclination toward self-blame and intrapunitiveness often found in low scorers.

Real love and common interest with her husband is stressed by:

*F30*: "I thought \_\_\_\_\_ was wonderful. He was so brilliant and his ideas and aspirations and mine were just alike. . . . We were all good companions and chums, and \_\_\_\_\_ and I had settled all the world's problems but we had never really talked about ourselves."

## 6. EXPLOITIVE MANIPULATION FOR POWER

In their relations to the opposite sex as in other interpersonal relationships, high scorers tend toward an *exploitive-manipulative type of power orientation*. There is more of a *warm and affectionate "love-seeking"* attitude in the low scorers. Differences with respect to this pair of opposites (Category (26) are statistically highly significant (1 per cent level) for both men and women.

Thus, the traits which high-scoring men tend to emphasize in women are the giving of material benefits and submissiveness ("sweet," "kind and generous"), along with purity ("wholesome") and conventionality. They expect to get something from women often without giving much in return. As in the attitude toward their parents, it is again a dependence oriented primarily toward material benefits rather than a dependence stemming from the wish to give or to receive love, although the latter tendencies are by no means completely squelched. Examples are:

*M40*: (What sort of woman would you like to marry?) "Wealthy woman. Other

requirements?) Well, I'd like her to be maximum 35, preferably anywhere between 28 and 30. (Any other specifications?) I'll take that as it comes."

*M45*: "Was married three times. The first time in \_\_\_\_\_ at eighteen. It lasted six weeks. My partner in a dance walkathon. Married on the floor, no love, but received money for it from the spectators. . . . Sex relationship was more enjoyable than with either of my other wives."

In line with this, the traits which the typical high-scoring woman tends to desire in men are likewise primarily instrumental in getting the things she wants. They are: hard-working, "go-getting," energetic, "a good personality," (conventionally) moral, "clean-cut," deferent toward women. The next record shows clearly the two-sided nature of the demands high-scoring women tend to make upon a man. On the one hand, he must have a strong drive in order to get things for her; on the other, he must be deferent and "thoughtful."

*F71*: (Q) "Fine boy. Father a writer; grandfather secretary of \_\_\_\_\_ Canal; very wealthy family but he doesn't have the drive and ambition that I want; I just have to have more drive; somebody who doesn't have to lean on me. I had the feeling that if I walked away he would collapse. (War changed him?) He has more ambition but not the drive—I haven't seen him for a long time; that's why I haven't made any decision. Here you mingle with boys who have so much push and drive; another boy here has everything except that he isn't thoughtful like. . . . I've got to have someone who isn't selfish. I'm not critical—I know I'm not."

This as well as the next two records of other high-scoring women illustrate the inherently opportunistic point of view, the looking at men from the standpoint, above all, of social status and the ability to furnish support:

*F22*: "I'm going to look (among other things) for the fellow's views on supporting me. I'd like to marry someone, for instance, who is going into a profession—maybe a doctor. (Engagement?) It didn't take me long to get over it. His father died when he was 3; his mother was 40 when he was born. Father left mother lots of money. He was a playboy, worked but borrowed money from his mother. He was pretty much attached to his mother's apron strings. We were engaged 7 or 8 months. I'm not demanding, but he was selfish. We argued more and more, broke up by mutual consent. I learned a lot from it—not to go into things blindly."

*F31*: "But there is one thing that is bothering me. Saturday night I had a blind date, and I liked him a lot; only he is a sailor and my boy friend is an officer. It's not that I'm conscious of gold braid. . . . (Marriage?) Well, I'd like someone . . . with a good personality who mixes well with people. Someone who at the same time is serious about the future. My boy friend is an engineer."

By contrast, low-scoring subjects tend to emphasize as desired traits companionship, common interest, warmth, sociability, sexual love, understanding, presence of liberal values. Sometimes their quest for love is so intense and unrealistic that it becomes a source of disappointment to them. This search for the "great romantic love" seems to be based on a wish to restore a successful early relation with a parent, based on nurturance and succor-

ance. As they were found to be for parents, expressions of passionate love for sex partners are generally infrequent in our interview material, however.

Two records may suffice to illustrate, each in its own way, the different quality of what low-scoring subjects expect from their partners as well as a certain pervasive tendency toward self-blame.

*F34:* She talks of looking forward to marriage and children eventually, but she has modest financial requirements for a husband. She has had many boy friends and is the "romantic type." "I always want to feel this is my great love—and then it isn't. That sort of thing is all right when you are in school. But nowadays when your boy friend goes away to war and you write letters and build up a lot of things that may not even be there—it isn't fair to either person." She has been "sort of engaged" for two years to a boy she knew in school. He has been overseas in the navy and they have written regularly—romantic letters. She goes out with other boys and he knows this and doesn't object. She hasn't fallen in love with anyone else, but her worry is that her feeling for him is not love. He came home on furlough, and his family, who live in \_\_\_\_\_ now, had her come down to their home and stay there for several days while he was there. She feels that he sensed that she did not feel the same, and yet she could not bring herself to say anything. She believes this was very cowardly of her and shows an absence of character. She thinks it is quite possible the boy's feelings have changed too, "but why can't people be honest about things like that? And now he is gone and nothing is settled."

*M44:* Subject says that in visiting someone at the hospital, his wife seems to know naturally just how to act toward the person, or, at a public meeting knows just what kind of questions to ask to draw the person out further instead of shutting him up. "And she is a helper, she is the helpingest person, the most willing and helping person that I've ever known."

## 7. CONVENTIONALITY VS. INDIVIDUALISM

Again, as in other areas of life, the values of high-scoring subjects with respect to sex tend to be *conventionally determined* as opposed to the more *individualized* values of low-scoring subjects (Category 27). This variable differentiates significantly (at the 1 per cent level) between high- and low-scoring men; a similar trend, 18 positive and 7 negative instances, is found in women; because of the large proportion of "Neutrals," however, the difference is not statistically significant.

The following records show that in the choice of their mates high-scoring subjects tend to place a great deal of emphasis on socioeconomic status, church membership, and conformity with conventional values. The accent is on what is generally socially approved and accepted. Thus the men expect their future wives to stay home, take care of house and children, and attend church. This tendency is often found in the same men who show evidence of primitive and crude sex experience, outside of marriage (see above).

The conventional approach to marriage is best illustrated by the following records of high-scoring women:

*F32:* "Well, I think that because of the society in which we live, young people

miss a great deal by not being married in the church of their faith. They lose the reverence for marriage and don't learn the true meaning of the marriage vows, when it is done so commercially (in a public office). I think that when people are married in church—by that I don't mean a large wedding necessarily—they have one of the most beautiful experiences of their lives. . . . The thing which the church can teach youth is 'to choose.'” By this, she means principally the choice between right and wrong, but also to choose one's friends. “In a church group one meets the right kind of young people; not the kind who hang around the lake shore at night.”

*F78:* “It was just love at first sight. He has brown hair, brown eyes, white teeth, not handsome, but good clean-cut looking; beautiful smile; mixes well, easy to get along with but has a will of his own. He's lots of fun, interested in everything. He's a high school graduate, now a mechanic in the ground crew of the Naval Air Transport. He wants to go into something in the mechanical line. Before the war he was an apprentice in the auto industry. . . .” The vocation of her husband really wouldn't matter. She thinks boy friend has good chances of getting along, definitely. She would like a profession—“sort of middle class.”

*F74:* “Too much emotional feeling involved under these conditions.” (Desirable traits?) Boy friend should be about the same socioeconomic status. They should enjoy doing the same things and get along without too many quarrels.

Or in high-scoring men:

*M58:* (Wife like?) “Very good person. She has gone to church, and has continued to . . . ever since the child was born. A very good wife, good mother, and darned good cook. Considerate of my folks . . . helped my mother with money, of her own accord. (What do wife and subject offer each other?) Well, I'll be dog-goned if I know. Doesn't seem as if any bonds at all. Just she belongs there and so do I.”

*M20:* “In my mind, there's no doubt about it. Woman's place is in the home. . . . To keep up a home and make it right and a man should be able to provide for the family. . . . A woman has no business working whatsoever.”

In contrast with the stereotyped and conventional description of their desired or real mates given by the high-scoring subjects, the typical low-scoring subject takes a much more individualized attitude, as shown in the following quotations:

*M53:* (What sort of girl appeals to you?) “I don't know. . . . I think I like the ones with more independent spirit. (Q) Well, looks, charm (laughs), humor and a certain freedom of spirit. In thought, I think, more than in action. . . . (Present fiancée?) Awfully hard to say when you're sold on a girl. . . . Seems to have all the things I like . . . fun to be with, brains, pretty. She likes me, which is important. We share things together. Music, reading, swimming, dancing. Most of the things we do don't require too much energy, which makes it good.”

*M50:* (What about your first wife?) “She was an artist also and a really thorough-going individual. She had a tremendous amount of scope, both intellectually and individually. She is looking for something too. Not as serious as my case, just the case of a girl marrying the wrong person.”

*M44:* (What sort of person is your wife?) (laughs) “She's a little bit easy to hurt or touchy about some things. . . . The most admirable thing, the most attractive thing about her is her hands. She has very small, delicate hands. She uses them very well and they're very expressive . . . and she also does things very fast, adept, sews

very well, very domestic, very much the mother. She was never really herself until she had this child, never really complete."

*M2: (Ideal woman?)* "She has to be (1) intelligent, (2) mature, (3) emotionally stable, (4) have adequate physiological characteristics, as well as have (5) culture and personality that goes with this. She should have at least as broad an interest and experience as my own, if not broader. She should have a maximum of femininity, since we're all bisexual. You can think of it in terms of a polyfactorial setup (subject then quotes Rosanoff's theory of four factors in sex)."

The preceding descriptions by low-scoring subjects of their real or ideal mates reveal a conception of real people and an expectation of finding a person with "independent opinions" and "independent spirit."

#### 8. SUMMARY

Summarizing the attitude of the typical high-scoring subject toward members of the opposite sex, the following may be said: A lack of individuation and of real object relationship can be found in the field of sex as it was previously found in the attitude toward the parents. It is this lack which may be called upon to explain the attitudes described above, such as the relative isolation of sexual impulses from the rest of the personality, the paucity of affection, and the somewhat exploitive, manipulative approach in the choice of a mate. Much of this may be understood in terms of disappointments which apparently had been experienced by many of the extreme high-scorers in their first love-relations, those with their parents.

The same ambivalence which was found in the attitude toward parents can be found again in the sexual domain. Again there is surface admiration, coupled with underlying resentment against the other sex. Ambivalence also tends to be handled by establishing two separate images, one positive and one negative (good and bad women), without, however, being able really to love either of them.

Status-concern and conventionalized values again become predominant and take the place of a genuine and individualized approach. The expectations of qualities in oneself and in one's mate are quite stereotyped and rigid. Shortcomings in these respects are faced as little as they are in other fields. Thus, as pointed out above, high-scoring subjects often think of themselves as the ideal representation of the conventional conception of their sex role.

The attitudes of the low-scoring subjects reveal a rather different picture, though it is much less clear-cut than that of the high scorers. In other words, the "High" variants of the categories in question are often more typical for the high-scoring subjects than the "Low" variants are for the low-scoring subjects. On the whole, our low scorers tend toward a more individualized, more internalized, more love-oriented approach toward their mates. (See also Chapter X.)

This does not mean, however, that in most of the cases their problems in

this field are readily solved. On the contrary, some of the records of low-scoring subjects quoted above reveal a great deal of conflict in this area. Such subjects refer rather frankly to their inadequacies, inhibitions, and failures in sex adjustment. There also is evidence of ambivalence toward one's own sex role and toward the opposite sex although this ambivalence is of a different, more internalized kind from the combination of overt admiration and underlying disrespect characteristic of high scorers. Its clearest representation is the conflict of the man about his passivity and of the woman about her tendency to follow masculine interests. Ambivalence toward the other sex seems in low scorers often to be the consequence of an overly intense search for love that is not easily satisfied.

Low-scoring men sometimes seem to long for a restoration, in a close relationship with a woman, of the type of love they received from the mother, and this may become a source of dissatisfaction. As Krout and Stagner (65) have shown, male liberals claim less difficulty in expressing their affection for women and show preference for women of equal status. At the same time they experience more frustration in their love relations.

Low-scoring women, on the other hand, sometimes develop a conflict between the satisfactions derived from emotional dependence on the man and a striving for independence that leads to competition with men.

However, in spite of these conflicts, retardations, and ambivalences, there seems to be more actual or potential heterosexuality in low scorers. The interview material reveals a more genuine and more personalized relationship to members of the other sex, more fondness and ability to love in sexual relationships, more ego-accepted sensuality. Conflicts and inadequacies, being faced more openly, have a greater chance of being worked out successfully.

Since the typical low-scoring man more readily accepts his own femininity than the high scorer, and the low-scoring woman her masculine strivings, one important source of hidden aggression toward the opposite sex—and toward other people generally, as it seems—is reduced.

## B. ATTITUDE TOWARD PEOPLE

### 1. DEFINITION OF RATING CATEGORIES AND QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

The part of the Scoring Manual covering social attitudes toward people in general is as follows:

#### INTERVIEW SCORING MANUAL: ATTITUDE TOWARD PEOPLE (to Table 2(XI))

##### PRESUMABLY "HIGH" VARIANTS

28. *Moralistic condemnation*

##### PRESUMABLY "LOW" VARIANTS

28. *Permissiveness* toward individuals; rejections rationalized by reference to principles.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 29a. <i>Extrapunitiveness</i>   | 29a. <i>Impunitiveness</i>  |
|   | 29b. <i>Intrapunitiveness</i> ; excessive guilt - feelings and self-reproach  |
| 30. <i>Distrust-suspicion</i> , people as threatening; <i>victimization</i> ; survival of fittest idea, world as jungle | 30. <i>Trustingness</i> . Openness; people essentially "good" until proved otherwise  |
| 31a. <i>Hierarchical conception</i> of human relations  | 31a. <i>Equalitarianism-mutuality</i>   |
| 31b. <i>Hero worship</i> of acquaintances   |   |
| 32a. <i>Diffuse, ego-alien dependence</i> ; non-love-seeking  | 32a. <i>Focal, love-seeking succorance</i>  |
| 32b. <i>Exploitive - manipulative opportunism</i>   | 32b. <i>Personalized nurturance</i>   |
|   | 32c. <i>Genuine object-cathexis</i>   |
|   | 33. <i>Traits desired in friends</i> :  |
| a. <i>Status</i> acceptable or admirable (economic or social)   | a. Acceptable on grounds of <i>intrinsic worth</i> ; companionship and common interests; intellectual-aesthetic approach; "easy-going" traits; social awareness and insight; liberal values |
| b. <i>Moral-conventional</i> : clean-cut, good manners, emphasis on honesty, poise, control                             |   |

As can be seen from Table 2 (XI), the eleven categories in this area differentiate satisfactorily, on the whole, the two extreme groups that make up our sample of interviewees.

## 2. MORALISTIC CONDEMNATION VS. PERMISSIVENESS

High-scoring individuals were found to tend toward a *moralistic condemnation* of other people while *permissiveness toward individuals* is more common in our low scorers (Category 28). For both men and women this difference is quite significant (1 per cent level). For men there are 30 positive instances as contrasted with only 4 negative ones ("positive" and "negative" in the sense defined in the last section of Chapter IX); for women, the proportion is 24 to 6.

It is easy to understand why condemnation of people, based on an external and conventional set of values, should be closely connected with prejudice; in fact, such an attitude seems close to being the very essence of prejudice.

The records, quoted below, of subjects scoring high on overt ethnocentrism illustrate a readiness to condemn others on such external bases as absence of good manners, uncleanness, "twitching the shoulders," saying "inappropriate" things (inappropriate, as will be seen, on a superficial level only), and so forth.

The statements show a great deal of indulgence in what is seen as "righteous indignation" about people considered as inferior. This indignation seems to serve the double purpose of externalizing what is unacceptable in oneself,

TABLE 2 (XI)  
INTERVIEW RATINGS ON ATTITUDE TOWARD PEOPLE  
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 20 men and 15 women "high scorers"		Sums of instances "positive" "negative"		Level of statistical significance reached (percentage)
		H	L	H	L	
28. Moralistic condemnation(H) vs. permissiveness(L)	Men	14	1	3	30	4
	Women	14	3	3	24	6
29 a. Extrapunitive(H) vs. impunitiveness(L)	Men	17	1	1	26	2
	Women	15	2	2	18	4
29 b. Intropunitiveness(L)	Men		1	7	7	1
	Women		2	6	6	2
30. Distrust-suspicion(H) vs. trustingness	Men	14	2	3	28	5
	Women	19	4	3	20	7
31 a. Hierarchical conception(H) vs. egalitarianism-mutuality(L)	Men	12	1	2	23	3
	Women	13	2	1	24	3
31 b. Hero worship of acquaintances(H)	Men	1	1	1	1	1
	Women		0	0	0	0
32 a. Dependence, diffuse, ego-alien (H) vs. focal, love-seeking(L)	Men	14	3	3	24	6
	Women	10	3	1	17	4
32 b. Exploitive-manipulation(H) vs. personalized nurturance(L)	Men	6	3	1	15	4
	Women	3	3	0	11	3
32 c. Genuine object-cathexis(L)	Men		1	13	13	1
	Women		3	8	8	3
Traits desired in friends:						
33 a. Status(H) vs. intrinsic worth(L)	Men	7	2	2	23	4
	Women	10	3	0	20	3
33 b. Moral-conventional(H)	Men	11	4	4	11	4
	Women	11	3	3	11	3

and of displacing one's hostility which otherwise might turn against powerful "ingroups," e.g., the parents.

Furthermore, the subsequent records presented in the following contain statements referring to a positive ideal of how one should behave, the essence of which is expressed by one of the subjects in this group who demands that everybody should have a "set of rules"; these rules turn out to be determined either by convention or by a shallow interpretation of church dogma. The emphasis on conventional values is found in the respectable as well as in the delinquent high scorer (prison inmate; see also Chapter XXI).

Examples, for the various aspects listed, from the records of high-scoring male prison inmates follow:

*M40:* (What things offend you most in other people?) "Just that they're people. (Meaning?) Oh, the majority are ignorant, close to animals as anything else. I mean *dumb* animals. (Q) They haven't got sense enough to see things as they are; they are easily swayed, crude, uncouth; they are like a pack. Show 'em a leader and they will go anywhere. (Are most people like this?) Records show it. (What records?) Statistics. (Q) Like in here (prison). The average IQ is something around 50 or 60. Very, very low. . . . They carry a knife and cut some poor son-of-a-bitch, and think they're tough. . . ."

*M41:* (What do you find most offensive in others?) "Well, some people are more attractive than others. Some people have no attraction. Don't take care of themselves. Don't keep *clean*. Don't have *manners*. . . ."

*M45:* (What do you find most irritating in others?) "Petty habits. (What do you mean?) I've noticed some people have a habit of snorting or as if their nose is always running or twitching their shoulders or my wife's habit of picking at things with her fingernails. (Others?) Not being able to tend to their own business, not having sense enough to understand, to know when they're imposing on you. . . . It's changed around here (in prison) now, getting so many of these young kids, zootsuiters, don't have any tact at all. . . . (What else?) Greed, I can't stand anyone who will take something without thinking about the other person . . . without any politeness. . . . You'd be surprised. You can find some of the politest people in the world right in here. . . . I believe in helping your fellow man regardless."

A positive ideal of behavior as derived primarily from religious convention is stated in the following records of high scorers:

*M52:* (Main differences between Christians and other people?) "Christians are people that at all times strive to do what is right and abide by God's word."

*M58:* ". . . and the person who has lived according to Christianity will live forever—those who have not will perish at that time."

*M4:* (Importance of religion?) "It's very important. It gives people an opportunity to utilize some of their extra energy, also helps to set a standard for behavior and conduct. Without religion, there would be a lot more crime and delinquency in the world. (Is the world getting better or worse?) It's getting worse—the younger generation is wilder, 17-year-old boys go out and get drunk; and science is responsible for all this, that is, provides motor cars for them to get out in, they start drinking."

In the records of high-scoring women there is a similar condemnation of people on moralistic and conventional grounds. Sometimes we find a general condemnation and contempt for an assumed inferiority of people which is quite similar to the statement of one of the high-scoring men, quoted above, to the effect that the "majority (of people) are ignorant, close to animals. . . I mean dumb animals." While rejection of other people is more common in high scorers, low scorers tend more toward self-rejection.

Illustrations from records of high-scoring women follow.

F66: (Why not social welfare?) "Well, some of the people you see—I just don't like them. I don't think I'd have enough patience to help them. . . . (Why not social activities?) I didn't like the people. We had just moved there and they just weren't my kind. (Q) They were too cliquish and infantile. They were silly, always giggling, wore jeans and dirty old plaid shirts. . . ."

F24: (Low income group?) "They don't think fast enough—can't make it. They haven't educated themselves for any line. Most people are like that all their lives. (Maybe they haven't had opportunities?) There's a way—there's always a way if they care enough. Maybe it's tough, but eventually you can get there."

F22: "I don't go in for petting; I can't see necking for hours either. (Q) I've been shocked by the conduct of my girl friends. I didn't think they were that type of girl."

By contrast, low-scoring subjects tend to be permissive and tolerant toward individuals (although not necessarily toward institutions). Or at least they make an attempt to understand behavior from a common sense (if not professional) psychological or sociological point of view; and they show generally more empathy. Whenever rejection of individuals occurs, an attempt is usually made to explain or to rationalize this rejection on the basis of violation of fundamental principles and social values rather than for surface reasons.

### 3. EXTRAPUNITIVENESS

Another attitude, quite directly akin to prejudice, is that of *extrapunitiveness*, to use Rosenzweig's term (16), i.e., a tendency to blame other people rather than oneself. As has been repeatedly pointed out in this volume, lack of insight into one's own shortcomings and the projection of one's own weaknesses and faults onto others is often found in high-scoring subjects. It probably represents the essential aspect of the mechanism of scapegoating.

An opposite variant to extrapunitiveness is *impunitiveness*, i.e., the tendency to refrain from blaming altogether, be it others or oneself.

The differential distribution of this pair of opposites (Category 29a) with respect to overt ethnocentrism is quite significant for men (1 per cent level)—26 positive and only 2 negative instances. For women there is a distinct trend in the same direction—18 positive as contrasted with 4 negative instances—but it is not statistically significant.

An "extrapunitive" attitude is manifested in the descriptions given by the following high-scoring women about their co-workers, fellow students or teachers:

*F60*: Subject just doesn't care for her fellow workers. "Some have all the PDQ's (degrees) but no common sense." She wouldn't like to mention names, but she'd like to tell me what goes on. "Some just spend their time gossiping together." She doesn't believe she should do more than just speak to her fellow workers. Very scornful of them, feels superior and aloof. They don't know her at all—no, indeed—implies she's a very special somebody and could reveal her gifts to them, but doesn't. She describes how she treated masturbation. The others were afraid to stop the children. But she just "popped" the little boys' and girls' hands and said, "Now, don't do that. It isn't good for you."

*F71*: Sister president of sorority in high school and of interclub council; thinks high school sororities "stupid and silly—dirty rushing, girls misplaced in clubs. Nothing as selfish and cruel as a little high school girl growing up. Noisy—no attention to business—it was just too much." Talks about high school teacher—thinks her aspiration level too high. "Too much screaming and yelling—has theateritis—polished and professional—too many students broke down—you have to be *stone* to take it."

*F77*, although talking about her mother, reveals her general attitude toward people in the following quotation: "This wouldn't have happened if I hadn't gone down. She's mean and inconsiderate and doesn't give a darn about anyone else but herself. I helped her with so many things. She hasn't helped me with one little thing—I can't stand it."

The foregoing statements illustrate the tendency of high scorers to blame others for difficulties that arise in their contact with other people or their work.

As was pointed out above, low-scoring subjects tend either not to blame at all (impunitiveness); or they may show exaggerated self-blame, *intrapunitiveness* (Category 29b). The latter tendency was found in 7 low-scoring men and 6 low-scoring women, while only 1 high-scoring man and 2 high-scoring women manifested this attitude. The tendency toward exaggerated self-blame in the low-scoring subjects must be interpreted as an expression of an internalized, and rather strict, superego of the sort that often leads to neurotic symptoms.

The following is a good example of a low scorer with good work adjustment who does not blame others for the difficulties which arise in cooperative work situations:

*F63*: "Money has never meant much to me. . . . Maybe it is stupid and unrealistic. But it is the work itself that gives me satisfaction. I work best by myself—have difficulty working with other people. I get along with them all right, but it's a strain on me. I'm rather shy and don't like competition, at least not directly with the people you work with."

The following 2 low-scoring men are described by their interviewer as suffering from excessive guilt feelings.

*M42*: He verbalized readily and spontaneously, and shows no reluctance to discuss any given topic. At the same time, however, he repeatedly deprecates himself, particularly as to his ability to express himself. He is quite abusive and appears to have no little moral masochism. His thinking and actions seem to be pervaded by doubt, hesitation, and indecision.

*M55*: Subject has a rather pervasive sense of humor which is often directed against himself. He seems to have a great deal of conscious feelings of inadequacy and inferiority and guilt.

The record of another low scorer gives evidence, over and above the absence of conventional moralism, and a stressing of intrinsic values, of a tendency not to think very highly of oneself:

*M3*: (Ideal wife?) "Attractive, at least average. I can't ask for too much there, with my looks. At least as much intelligence as I have. Fairly intelligent, in other words. I don't care about religion and morals, as long as they are not too bad. Her own damn business whether she is a virgin or not. . . . Essential that she be a good companion, keep me well amused; companionship includes everything from conversation to sex, with emphasis on congeniality."

Some of the low scorers come close to a tendency toward obsessional rumination about their faults and the mistakes they have made. The exaggerated feelings of guilt and self-deprecation constitute some of the major neurotic features common in low scorers. They are frequently accompanied by depressions. Instead of aggressive self-assertion, there is often an unhealthy trend toward withdrawal in the face of difficulties.

#### 4. WORLD AS JUNGLE

Projection of one's inner impulses, particularly of aggression, onto others will naturally lead to a conception of a dangerous and hostile world and consequently to a general suspiciousness of others. Thus, it was found that typical high-scoring subjects tend to manifest *distrust and suspicion* of others. Theirs is a conception of people as threatening in the sense of an oversimplified survival-of-the-fittest idea. Feelings of victimization are often connected with such notions. The opposite variant was defined as *trustingness and openness*, as manifested by seeing people as essentially "good" until proved otherwise; it was expected to be found predominantly in the low-scoring subjects.

For both men and women, differentiation in terms of this pair of opposites (Category 30) was found to be highly significant (1 per cent level of confidence).

Emphasis on the "jungle-character" of the world<sup>1</sup> as just described, a world in which one has to destroy others to prevent them from destroying oneself, is best expressed by a quotation from *M41*, a high scorer: "Nowadays it's 'get the other fellow before he gets you.'"

<sup>1</sup> This, as well as many other findings reported in this chapter, is in perfect agreement with the description of the authoritarian character given by Fromm (42) and Maslow (79).

Another high-scoring man, *M57*, says: "Hell, you can't have real friends in here (prison), stab you in the back. Can't trust any of them."

Distrust in, and dislike of, other people is further manifested in the following records of high-scoring men.

*M45*: "Not being able to attend to their own business, not having sense enough to understand to know when they're imposing on you. . . ."

*M47*: (What dislike in others?) "Well, their actions, the way they talk. (How do you mean?) I don't know how to explain it. . . . Maybe a fellow comes up and gives me a couple of knick-knacks just to make up to me. I don't go for that. Some of these guys shove up in lines, go to the show and holler like little kids. (What do you find most offensive?) A guy trying to butt into my business."

*M51*: (You mentioned once before that as a child you didn't accept your father as a shining example which he was held up to you as. Tell me about your feelings towards your father as a child.) "Well, I resented a lot of things. I loved him. I always said I did. I used to have a kind of fit if I was ever taken away from him. . . . I always accused him of being harsh. . . . I never understood him. . . . And apparently this all falls in with Darwin's theory too."

The fact that the high-scoring subjects, more often than the low scorers, made inquiries as to the purpose of the interviews, as to the basis of selection of the subjects, and as to the publication of the material seemed to reflect the greater suspiciousness of the former. The general resistance to "being questioned" is clearly expressed in the records of the following high-scoring woman:

*F72*: (What kinds of things make you mad?) "Well, for instance, my sister. When I come home and she starts asking me questions about what happened and what did you do, I don't want to have to give accounts. Not that I've anything to hide. I don't have anything to hide, but I don't like being questioned. I don't like prying."

By comparison, the records of low-scoring subjects frequently reveal genuine liking of, and warm interest and concern for, people, along with belief in their essential "goodness." Examples are:

*M42*: (How did you come to be a service station operator?) "Just by accident. . . . I worked part time in school . . . another thing, I like to meet people . . . most people as a rule are pretty nice to me. . . ."

*F30*: "I would even be content to call 'evolution' my religion. When it comes to attending or working in a church I prefer the Methodist. However, that is not important. What is important is that people believe in humanity, in each other, and that the force of goodness, of progress, is the strongest force in the world."

*F34*: "I always made it a point to sit next to different people on the bus and get into conversation with them. Lots of people think that everybody is getting along fine now and making lots of money. Actually, people have a very hard time. And they are worried about the future. Everyone is under a terrible strain."

As may be suspected from the last of these records, many of the low-scoring individuals tend to be "worriers." Thus they assume that other

people suffer too. However, such feelings tend to be rather structured and specific (e.g., worry about the father) when compared with the vague and diffuse anxieties about a generally threatening environment or a lack of support which are typical of high scorers.

##### 5. HIERARCHICAL VS. EQUALITARIAN CONCEPTION OF HUMAN RELATIONS

As mentioned above, the distrust of others displayed by the typical high-scoring subject may probably be ascribed to his conception of people as seeking only power and material benefits, and his assumption that, in this struggle and competition, the more ruthless must necessarily win out. His orientation in interpersonal relationships is thus toward getting power by associating with the powerful and influential, or at least toward participating in the power of those who have it. Admiration for the strong and contempt for the weak accompany this attitude. Thus, high-scoring subjects show predominantly what may be called *hierarchical conception of human relationships* whereas those who score low conceive of an *equalitarian mutuality* in such relationships (Category 31a).

There is a highly significant difference (at the 1 per cent level) for both men and women with respect to this pair of opposites. Examples of a hierarchical conception of human relationships are found in the following reports of high-scoring subjects:

*M52:* (How important is money really?) "I don't think the best things in life are free. I don't believe people would be happy if they worked for nothing. . . . Every man has a certain ego that he has to satisfy. You like to be on top. If you're anybody at all, you don't like to be on the bottom. . . . I believe in the Bible. I believe there is someone a lot bigger and stronger than anyone on this earth."

*M51:* "Well, there are the weak and the strong. I can't elaborate on it. (What about you?) I suppose I'm one of the weak ones (said somewhat hesitantly and reluctantly)."

*M58:* (What would money make possible?) "Would raise our standard of living; probably buy better or higher priced automobile; move into better residential section; associations with business and fraternal groups to be raised. . . . To those in a bracket higher, except for a few staunch friends which you keep always; naturally associate with people on a higher level—with more education and more experience. After you get there, and associate with those people . . . that fires you on to the next step higher, etc."

*M4:* Subject likes to mingle with people, likes big parties, used to have an inferiority complex, but now is at ease. Likes to associate and talk with famous people, to be in the "upper crust." "Well, I've met a lot of people since I've been up here; it certainly made a difference to me. I've set my goal, and I want to be one of them (mentions army and navy people, a lot of wealthy and socially prominent people)."

*M13:* "There are great possibilities there (in Alaska) in the future. If a person studies it carefully and locates properly, he goes up with a town."

*F79:* "In the SPARS I liked the training and the discipline and I would make a good officer. But the girls of my type had college educations and I was thrown with

waitresses, etc. I wanted to apply for officership. I admired the officers although all the other girls were interested only in boys. . . . It made me furious to see the great advantage of those who had had college education. Those I associated with were not my type."

F22: "In the first place, there have to be the ditch diggers. They can get what they want out of life. Certain people were cut out for certain things. People who are unhappy are the ones who have wasted their chances or are held back by lack of finances."

The foregoing records show how preoccupied these subjects are with social mobility, with the dichotomy of the "weak and the strong," "the bottom and the top," and with the idea of "moving upwards" through the help of the powerful and the influential. There is evidence of an almost compulsive acquisitiveness and striving for success. All this is in line with the picture of Western civilization generally presented by its students (e.g., Kardiner, 60; Mead, 82; Fromm, 43), although it appears here in a grossly exaggerated manner.

Fromm (42) states that the most important feature of the authoritarian character is its attitude toward power and its division of people into two groups: the strong and the weak. Love, admiration, and readiness for submission are automatically aroused by power of persons or institutions, while contempt is equally aroused by powerless persons or institutions. The very sight of a powerless person may lead to the urge to attack, dominate, or humiliate him.

Hero worship of acquaintances (Category 31b) which was expected to be a characteristic primarily of high scorers, yielded only a negligible number of ratings and is thus omitted from consideration as far as our material is concerned. As in other doubtful cases, one may also question the validity of our hypothesis underlying the definition of the category.

## 6. DEPENDENCE FOR THINGS

The orientation toward getting material benefits, predominant in the high scorers, tends to make for dependence on people, since they are used as a means for advancement. In the discussion of attitudes toward parents a distinction was made between "dependence for things"—found primarily in the high scorers—as contrasted with a "love-oriented dependence" found in the typical low scorers. A similar distinction has also been made in the case of the attitude toward people in general, setting off a *diffuse, ego-alien dependence* which is not really love-seeking against a *focal, love-seeking succorance* (Category 32a). The difference between high and low scorers with respect to this category is highly significant (1 per cent level) for men, and satisfactorily significant (5 per cent level) for women.

The examples given above for the hierarchical conception of human relationships illustrate one aspect of the utilitarian approach of the typical high-

scoring subjects toward other people. Here we are dealing with another aspect of utilitarianism, namely their orientation toward getting things and help in general. In the quotations from high-scoring subjects which follow we find friendship conceived of as a means of getting things rather than as a relationship based on mutuality in giving and taking.

*M43:* "Oh, help in lots of needs, sickness, money, well, a friend can just help in most any way."

*M45:* (What do you look for in friends?) "... even though there is no conversation between you, know that he's there at all times and if you need any help at any time...."

In line with this, high scorers tend to be oriented toward persons in positions of authority or power, or toward support; low scorers tend to be longing for someone who will really love them without reservation the way they happen to be and "in spite of shortcomings." Low-scorers also tend to place emphasis more on expectations of receiving love, understanding, and companionship from their friends. Examples from the interview protocols of men scoring extremely low on the ethnocentrism questionnaire follow:

*M48:* (What do friends offer a person?) "Well, offer you an understanding—they understand you and make allowances for your shortcomings . . . and like you in spite of it."

*M56:* (What do friends offer us?) "That's another thing—I have always been so discriminating in choice that haven't had many friends . . . my friends have always been people I could confide in—faith, companionship."

*M59:* "... A person has very few friends in a lifetime. A friend will overlook your faults . . . and stand by you."

The longing for intensive, personalized relations, in which there is complete mutual acceptance and overlooking of faults is evident in these records. At the same time, however, one gets the impression that a tendency to preoccupation with oneself, sometimes expressed in overcriticism, is characteristic of low scorers.

#### 7. MANIPULATION VS. LIBIDINIZATION OF PEOPLE AND GENUINE WORK ADJUSTMENT

A similar differentiation was made between an *exploitive-manipulative-opportunistic attitude* as opposed to one of *personalized nurturance* (Category 32b). Differences between high scorers and low scorers here show the expected trend without being statistically significant. Nonetheless, there are 15 positive instances but only 4 negative ones for men, and 11 positive as compared with 3 negative for women.

An extreme example of a manipulative orientation toward people in general, and toward sex partners in particular, is given in the record of a high-scoring prison inmate:

*M51:* (Why pick on an older woman?) "Well, I forgot. She had money and I didn't. . . . I never had any relations with anyone that didn't have money connected with it, even those homosexual affairs. . . . I ran away from home and that's mainly the way I supported myself." Subject quotes Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ as saying that he was only interested in men for their pocketbooks and he didn't know if he would be safe with a mule. (Preference in type of homosexual partner?) "Yes, I always had preferences, but I never let the preference stand in the way of—only thing I was ever interested in was the rent. I wasn't faithful, in other words, I wasn't expected to be. I was alone so much, I got bored. (Did any men attract you aside from the money aspect?) Oh, yes, but I never let love, so called, stand in the way. . . ." Subject emphasizes that if he were a woman, he would not let any love aspect stand in the way of marrying for as much money as possible and getting all he could in the way of money out of the sex relationship.

This statement not only shows a particularly drastic form of opportunistic attitude but also the view that affect should not be allowed to interfere with one's advantage: "I never let love, so called, stand in the way."

A narrowly opportunistic, externalized attitude toward work and the persons connected with it is illustrated in the records of the following high scorers:

*M40:* (Advantages of designing?) "Fairly decent, remunerative enough, and contacts are better than that of an ordinary worker. (Else?) You got a better chance to get what you want. (How do you mean?) You're constantly being thrown in with people who are up there . . . if can't get anything in theater work, legitimate stage, voice, I'll go in for that."

*M58:* "They come to me and say, 'Can you do this and that for me?' To keep good will, you'll do a lot of things. And then I go to work—and that's a source of dissatisfaction, to think that I help those people who can hardly read or write . . . kinda gets me down—doing their work, and then I've got to go out and do shift work—something wrong there . . . it's disheartening. Wife says to get out of the ration board work, but I feel eventually it might give me the push I need to get into something different. . . . I don't know how to go out and look for work. . . . I've just done this kind of work, no education, can't offer anything definite other than oil. . . ."

*F68:* "This is a nine-to-five job and when I am through I am through. You don't have to worry about personal things on this kind of a job."

Fromm (42) emphasizes that for the authoritarian character the relationship with his fellow men has lost its direct, human character and has assumed a spirit of manipulation and instrumentality.

By contrast, the following records of low-scoring subjects illustrate their need to do something for people, to help them, to give, and to receive affection in return. They also show their tendency to libidinize their relations with people and to view their work from the standpoint of its social value rather than merely from that of external success.

*M42:* (Advantages of scouting?) "I like to work with young people . . . satisfaction of helping someone. . . . It doesn't pay financially, but . . . you are happier . . . makes good friends. . . ."

M49: "Yes, and I've always been impressed by articles I've read in magazines . . . about a small company built up by the manager from himself and a helper . . . and just got in people that were very agreeable . . . and the ideal was lots of benefits and fellows felt they had a share in things, and each worker wasn't a machine, but an individual. . . ." Subject emphasizes personal relationship in this example of employer-employee setup, with a strong personal nurturance by the former, and gratefulness and cooperation of workers. "I think I'd be happy if I could find that kind of a company, and it wouldn't really matter too much what the actual job was, that is, within reason. I've always thought those (personal relationships) were the most important thing in a job."

M54: "At 17, wanted to be a doctor, but it didn't materialize because joined the service." Subject can't remember the origin of this interest. Perhaps some friends whose parents were doctors and subject liked to help bandage up other kids, minor scratches, etc.

M55: (What would a lot of money make possible for you?) "Do some charitable work, though not in established patterns, for example help some of my friends. Contribute to the March of Dimes, to end cancer, etc."

M56: "Security and a chance to do something for others. Seems to me now I have been helping others all my life."

M59: "To treat others as a person would wish to be treated himself and to help those less fortunate than oneself, and to be a part of the community or society that one is in, to take an active part in it, and being kind and generous and to more or less have a high regard for your fellow man. . . . The only happiness that we really know of is . . . here on earth, so why not try to enjoy the people and things on this earth, rather than a life somewhere else. . . . (What attracts you in a friend?) A person on the same intellectual level and one who has common ideas. You enjoy going out with him. You enjoy conversation and you like to do things for a friend."

F70: "If I had a lot of money I didn't know what to do with, I might run a small private hospital. For instance, for rheumatic fever patients. There are so many children with certain diseases that can't get the proper medical care, because their parents can't afford to have them hospitalized sufficiently long—like rheumatic fever patients. I wish to do a few altruistic things like my own private charity or something. I don't think I'd buy expensive objects of art; well, maybe I would. I might buy quite a few material things, go to a lot of concerts and plays. One seems to be able to spend a lot of money on those."

F75: (What do you like about public health nursing?) "You get to know people. You have to. You go into their homes and see them when they are well, help them prevent sickness instead of just seeing them in bed sick. I think it is a more useful occupation than bedside nursing, but that is important too."

The foregoing records also illustrate the ability, characteristic of low scorers to form *genuine object cathexis* (Category 32c), an ability probably due to the fact that they formed better identifications in early childhood. Thirteen low-scoring and only 1 of the high-scoring men show evidence in their interviews of this ability to form genuine, nonopportunistic object relationships. It is also found in the records of 8 low-scoring and 3 high-scoring women. Here, as in the case of most other ratings, it is very difficult to evaluate sex differences since—as was mentioned before—the ratings of the sample of women show considerably higher numbers of "Neutrals."

## 8. SOCIAL STATUS VS. INTRINSIC WORTH IN FRIENDSHIP

In line with all this, the traits which high-scoring subjects tend to desire most in their friends are that their *social or economic status* be prominent or at least "acceptable." Low scorers, on the other hand, tend to accept a friend more often on the basis of *intrinsic worth* or the companionship and common interests he offers. Theirs is an intellectual-aesthetic approach, and they appreciate in their friends "easy-going" traits, social awareness and insight, and generally "low" values (i.e., values in esteem with low scorers as defined in this volume). The difference is significant at the 1 per cent level for both men and women.

Examples of emphasis on status in high scorers follow.

*M52*: (How do you choose your friends?) "Well, I have a standard based along my own expectations in life. Somebody's got to have a goal in life, got to have manners, don't have to be a big shot, but I like 'em to have some position. I don't like these fly-by-nights. . . . A lot of my friends are social people."

*M58*: (What would more money make possible?) "Would raise our standard of living; probably buy better, or higher-priced automobile; move into better residential section; associations . . . to those in a bracket higher . . . with people on a higher level."

*M4*: "Picked a chum—usually one close chum." In high school he got into the ruling clique because he worked on the other boys' cars and radios. Apparently going into this "ruling clique" has made a great impression on him. Before, he felt uneasy around many people, uncertain of his appearance. The girls he asked out hadn't accepted him; he felt much more secure after he got into this clique—he felt that he amounted to something; it helped him get over his inferiority complex.

*F31*: "When I was a child, I was brighter than I am now. Moving up here may have retarded me. I was very unhappy when we first moved up here. I cried and cried. It was about a year and a half before I got in with the right crowd and joined a high school sorority."

*F60* tells the interviewer that she has "been a 'governess' in the home of \_\_\_\_\_ and in \_\_\_\_\_'s family—first in the home of the older son, and then the younger. Talked to \_\_\_\_\_ on the phone when she was \_\_\_\_\_ at the time of the birth of the third child. Also worked for \_\_\_\_\_ (Southern California)." And her sister worked for \_\_\_\_\_, who later was \_\_\_\_\_.

*F78* reports that she has "no really close girl friends." She looks for someone "I wouldn't have to make excuses for—someone well brought up, nice appearance, who dresses neatly."

The foregoing records manifest once more the desire of many high-scoring subjects to associate with the "right kind of people" and their tendency to judge people on the basis of such external criteria as "position" and "nice appearance."

Low-scoring subjects, on the other hand, not only tend to emphasize the intrinsic worth in their friends but tend explicitly to deny the importance of status. There may be, in some of these cases, an underlying concern with

status, but the fact that they disclaim it shows that they have at least some inclination to resist conventionalism. There are, furthermore, other goals which take the place of conventional ones. There is more acceptance of passivity and relaxation, more emphasis on enjoyment and "fun." At the same time, there is active pursuing of intellectual goals. Examples follow.

*M49*: "There was one Chinese fellow, and we used to go swimming and play ping-pong . . . and he was married just after I got there and . . . his home was in an alley with no street address; just plain, simple people; and they could be serious, but if you wanted to have a lot of fun . . . and they seemed to be more understanding . . . more appreciative of little things and more sympathetic."

*M42*: "I like a person who doesn't think money is the most important thing . . . but wants to better himself and have a better education; who likes to get along with people . . . my friends are all kinds of people. . . . I have a friend who is a Catholic . . . who knows the criticisms of the Catholic Church better than I do . . . but who can argue intelligently for the Catholic Church. . . ."

*M53*: "People you cultivate are usually people you want to be with. (What do you like to do together?) Well, depends on the friend. My own friends seem to have a variety of interests. I guess . . . talk. Takes up more time than anything else . . . and sometimes drinking parties with a group of friends who are fun to see once in a while."

*F62*: "We four girls have many discussions about ideas. We had a professor who taught us to think about education and social conditions. We talk about all those things, and we hope to be socially-minded individuals. We try to think. My closest girl friend and I don't go out with boys, but the other two girls do, and we enjoy their experiences, about which they tell us. I was made to be a follower and not a leader. My girl friends are more dominant."

*F65*: "My best girl friend I still have from high school days. . . . We have the same interests. . . . Now my close friend is a Chinese girl." The interviewer senses a protective attitude on the part of the subject toward this friend. "In general I like intellectual girls who are nice and who have the same ideas."

Just as the high scorers frequently desire to have friends with "accepted" or even "admired" social status, they also tend to emphasize *conventional values* in their choice of friends. Their requirements for friends are that they be moral-conventional, "clean-cut," honest, have good manners, poise, and control (Category 33b). The predominance of such requirements in the records of high-scoring as contrasted with low-scoring subjects was found to be in the proportion of 11 to 4 in men and of 11 to 3 in women. Illustrations from the records of high-scoring subjects follow.

*M41*: (What attracts you in a friend?) "Well, their manner and behavior."

*M11*: (What do you like best in your boy friends?) "I like them clean-cut. . . . They're all swell fellows and they come from marvelous families."

*F71*: "Never stuck close to one—like girls who like a lot of clean fun—high ideals and morals, no drinking."

The emphasis, in the foregoing references, on "clean fun," "swell fellows,"

and the like, carries the connotation of an almost moral pride in the fact of having a good time. This type of exhibited or "official" optimism has been described previously in this book; it is entirely compatible, and often concomitant, with an underlying sense of despair and futility.

#### 9. SUMMARY

The prejudiced thus seem to tend toward an externalized relation to other people, appreciating those who are higher up in the social hierarchy and who conform to conventional standards, and unrealistically condemning deviations from these standards. It seems likely that this moral condemnation serves the purpose of externalization of, and defense against, temptations toward immoral and unconventional behavior.

Hostile feelings are likewise externalized and projected by conceiving of others as threatening and dangerous. The persecutory ideas about threats in the environment apparently reinforce the wish to be strong; such power is to be obtained by falling in line with what is seen as the general pattern of social relationships, that is, by associating with those who have power. Fear of failure and of being overwhelmed by outside forces leads to an exaggerated preoccupation with such dichotomies as power vs. weakness, top vs. bottom.

The choice of friends is almost exclusively determined by the wish to get support in the compulsive striving for success. Often little attempt is made to disguise the resulting crude form of opportunism. As in the attitude toward parents, the focus seems to be on "getting things," on utilizing people for obtaining the necessary supplies and the help to overcome obstacles. The inclination to conceive of the world as a "jungle" seems to reveal a panic lest supply may run short and one may be helpless in view of dangers which are all too readily anticipated. It is easy to understand that in persons possessed by such fearfulness, the approach to people will tend to be manipulative and exploitive.

Similarly externalized is the relationship to work, as manifested in indifference toward its content and in the emphasis on work as a mere means to success and power. To succeed in the struggle of competition by roughness and by "outsmarting" the competitor seems often an important component of the ego-ideal of the prejudiced men (see the next section).

Since unprejudiced individuals are less apt to be anxiety-ridden than are the prejudiced, they are free to search in their friendships for affectionate companionship, enjoyment, and common interests such as intellectuality, social values, appreciation of art. As they did with their parents, they tend to form comparatively internalized and affectionate relations with people in general, focusing more on the specific characteristics of the other person. The greater capacity for such libidization is closely related to a permissive

and trusting attitude toward others. There is a tendency to conceive of the environment as congenial rather than as dangerous. Dependence on people thus tends to become focal and love-seeking rather than diffuse and ego-alien.

Often this search seems to be unrealistic and insatiable. This can be seen in the expression of longings for total acceptance and forgiveness for all one's faults as found in some of the low scorers. Such a high level of aspiration seems often the source of dissatisfactions with, and ambivalence toward, the object of love or of friendship.

Work seems likewise more libidized in the low scorer than it is in the high scorer. There is often a persistent striving for intellectual achievement or for realization of productive social values. There is often concern with, and depression about, the possibility of failure along those lines rather than with respect to personal success. This is far from saying that the typical low scorer is indifferent toward success. But in him these tendencies are more often in conflict with, and partly inhibited by, a longing to be loved—a longing frequently crippled in the high scorer during early childhood.

At the same time there is more capacity for relaxation, passive enjoyment, and pleasure in general, as apparently due to the less rigid character of the defenses. Such values take the place of the external, conventional standards of the high scorers.

The tendency to focus on internal and intrinsic values of the individual must be seen as being directly connected with lack of prejudice. Rather than taking a stereotyped view of people and judging them on the basis of their place in the social hierarchy, low scorers are, in the manner described, more open to immediate experience and to an evaluation of people on the basis of individual and intrinsic merits.

## C. ATTITUDE TOWARD PRESENT SELF

### 1. DEFINITION OF RATING CATEGORIES AND QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

The attitudes prejudiced and unprejudiced subjects assume toward themselves seem to be consistent with their attitudes toward family, sex, and people, as discussed in the foregoing pages. Thus the prejudiced tend toward self-glorification, conventionality of ego-ideal, and lack of insight; and at the same time they exhibit self-contempt which is not faced as such and which they try to deny. First, attitudes toward the "present self" will be discussed, followed by the conceptions of our subjects concerning their childhood personalities. The categories dealing with the first of these topics were defined as follows:

INTERVIEW SCORING MANUAL: ATTITUDE TOWARD PRESENT  
SELF  
(to Table 3(XI))

- | PRESUMABLY "HIGH" VARIANT   | PRESUMABLY "LOW" VARIANT  |
|---|---|
| 34a. <i>Self-glorification.</i> Positive traits mentioned, negative traits rationalized; has overcome weakness, handicaps, victimization, persecution; self-estimate and ego-ideal tend to be the same          | 34a. <i>Critical self-appraisal.</i> Self-estimate and ego-ideal separate; occasional morbid self-accusations     |
| 34b. <i>Ego-alien self-contempt</i> which is moralistic-authoritarian and semi-externalized. (Do not score unless there are some specific signs of self-rejection beyond compensatory self-glorification, etc.) |   |
| 35M. <i>Self-estimate traits, Men:</i>  |   |
| a. <i>Pseudo-masculinity.</i> Determination, energy, industry, independence, decisiveness, will power. No admission of passivity  | a. <i>Ego-accepted admission of passivity,</i> softness, weakness, etc.   |
| b. <i>Conventionally moralistic.</i> Ideal of honesty, self-control; any violations regarded as essentially unexplained "break-through"   | b. <i>Admitted fallibility of control,</i> not merely unexplained "break-through"                                 |
| 35W. <i>Self-estimate traits, Women:</i>  |   |
| a. <i>Pseudo-femininity</i>   | a. <i>Ego-accepted admission of nonfemininity</i>   |
| b. <i>Conventionally moralistic.</i> Propriety, poise, self-control, unselfishness  | b. <i>Admitted fallibility of control,</i> not merely unexplained "break-through." Admission of selfishness, etc. |
| 36a. <i>Self as "average"</i> and therefore all right. Attempted denial or "forgetting" of deviations, past and present   | 36a. <i>Self as "different,"</i> individualized, or unconventional  |
|   | 36b. <i>"World identification,"</i> equalitarian - brotherhood ideal  |

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 37M-W. <i>Ego-ideal</i> : Same as self-estimate traits   | 37M-W. <i>Ego-ideal</i> : Liberal values. Achievement, understanding, nurturance, affiliation; work for humanitarian values, to improve social relations, to improve self, etc. |
| 38. <i>Denial of psychological causes</i> : Explanations of self in terms of heredity, physical factors, accidental factors, etc.; or denial in effect of any casualty (e.g., of symptoms) | 38. <i>Sociopsychological explanations of self</i>  |
| 39. <i>Property as extension of self</i>   | 39. <i>Property as means to end</i>   |

Quantitative results concerning these categories are shown in Table 3(XI).

## 2. SELF-GLORIFICATION VS. OBJECTIVE APPRAISAL

The trend toward *self-glorification* in the prejudiced becomes evident in their tendency to ascribe to themselves predominantly positive traits and to rationalize whatever negative traits they are unable to deny. They are given to emphasizing that they have successfully overcome weakness, obstacles, and victimization. The opposite alternative, namely *objective self-appraisal*, is more common in low scorers. The difference between high- and low-scoring subjects, both men and women, is statistically significant at the 1 per cent level (Category 34a). Results already presented have indicated that prejudiced subjects tend to repress what may be unpleasant to face, and thus to narrow the scope of consciousness. One cause of these repressions may lie in the type of discipline to which these subjects were exposed, a discipline which required immediate submission. Apparently in a fearful attempt to please the parents, a "good" façade was presented and anything which did not fit in with this façade, such as, especially, resentment against the parents, was repressed and denied. This process very probably leads to self-deception, which may be of such crudeness that it seems obvious to anyone but the subject himself.

The following example illustrates the self-deception of a prejudiced man with respect to his will power and independence. He takes pride in certain decisions and actions of self-control which are obviously engineered by the father (see also Chapter II).

*M13*: "I grew up quickly. My father has allowed me to do as I pleased, although he forced some decisions upon me. About smoking, he said I must do it in front of him, if I must. He also provided wines and liquors in the ice chest. I soon tired of smoking and never took much to drinking. I have a stubborn nature, and if he had

TABLE 3 (XI)  
 INTERVIEW RATINGS ON ATTITUDE TOWARD PRESENT SELF  
 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)
		25 men "high scorers" H	25 women L	20 men and 15 women "low scorers" H	20 men and 15 women L		
34a. Self-glorification(H) vs. ob- jective self-appraisal(L)	Men	12	3	3	15	27	6
	Women	13	4	1	12	25	5
34b. Ego-alien self-contempt(H)	Men	10	1	1	10	10	1
	Women	10	2	2	10	10	2
35. Self-estimates of traits: aM. Pseudo-masculinity(H) vs. admission of passivity(L)	Men	13	1	2	14	27	3
	Women	7	2	1	7	14	3
aW. Pseudo-femininity(H) vs. ad- mission of nonfemininity(L)	Men	13	1	2	13	26	3
	Women	19	2	3	9	26	5
b. Conventional moralism(H) vs. admitted fallibility of of control(L)	Men	14	5	2	14	28	7
	Women	2	5	0	9	11	5
36a. Self as "average"(H) vs. self as "different"(L)	Men	14	2	2	5	5	0
	Women	2	0	4	4	4	0
36b. "World identification," equali- tarian-brotherhood ideal(L)	Men	16	1	4	13	29	5
	Women	8	5	1	11	19	6
37. Ego-ideal: aM. Pseudo-masculinity(H) vs. achievement(L)	Men	14	3	4	15	29	7
	Women	16	5	2	11	27	7
aW. Pseudo-femininity(H) vs. achievement(L)	Men	11	4	1	14	25	5
	Women	14	2	0	11	25	2
b. Conventional morality(H) vs. humanitarianism(L)	Men	14	2	3	15	29	7
	Women	16	5	2	11	27	7
38. Denial of genuine causality(H)vs.socio- psychological explanations of self(L)	Men	11	4	1	14	25	5
	Women	14	2	0	11	25	2
39. Property as: extension of self(H) vs. means to end(L)	Men	14	2	3	15	29	5
	Women	13	7	0	13	26	7

tried to stop me, I probably would have taken it up. . . . I have always tried to live according to His Ten Commandments. . . . (What disagreements have you had with your father?) There haven't been any to any great extent. I had a mind of my own at a very early age. He has too. We've had arguments but I can't remember any lickings by him. . . ."

A general satisfaction with one's self is expressed by the following high scorer:

*M58*: "Well, I'm the head operator—shift foreman—rotating schedules . . . (subject emphasizes 'head' position)—small department . . . five in department . . . five in shift . . . I get personal satisfaction that I have five people working for me, who come to me for advice in handling the production that we make, and that the ultimate decision is mine, and in fact that in that ultimate decision, I should be *right*—and am usually, and the knowledge that I am correct gives me personal satisfaction."

As previously mentioned, high-scoring subjects; especially men, tend to succumb to the temptation of displaying independence, ability for decisions, and leadership qualities, probably as a defense against a possible "break-through" of their underlying passivity and anxiety. In general, prejudiced subjects, in pointing out how well they overcame handicaps, sickness, and calamities, are prone to emphasize the use of will power. The tendency to cling to the belief that "will power and cheerfulness" can solve all problems seems of special importance.

Examples from the records of high-scoring women follow:

*F71*: "Child—nervous because of mastoid operations . . . terrible time getting started in school . . . afraid of kids . . . this in first half of kindergarten . . . by second half I was a leader. Think one of my best assets is my poise—learned from moving around so much. Remember hospital clearly at 3 years old."

*F38*, in telling how she conquered infantile paralysis by will power, continues: "I've always had a happy disposition, and I've always been honest with my family. I appreciate what they did for me. I've always tried to find a way so that I wouldn't be a burden to them. I've never wanted to be a cripple. I was always dependable in a pinch. I've always been cheerful and I'm sure I've never made anyone feel bad because of my handicap. Maybe one of the reasons I have been cheerful is because of my handicap. I wore a cast on my leg until I was 4 years old. . . . He (husband) compares me with his first wife. She was unfaithful to him. I'm not like that. She was a drinker. I've never done that. I've never done things behind people's backs. I've always done things in the open. . . . (Habits?) I didn't have any bad habits as a child, no nightmares. I rarely dream even now, night or day. (Q) My mother was the chief disciplinarian. I always got along well with my brothers and sisters. I was always honest with them and let them know where I stood. I believe that all the relations between my brothers and sisters and myself were better than average. I think I'm the favorite of the whole family. I know I'm the favorite niece of all my aunts and uncles. . . ."

Similar is this passage in the record of a high-scoring man who had been told, after having gone through infantile paralysis, that he would never walk again:

*M4*: "But you see, I can get around, because I made up my mind to. If I made up my mind, I can be in the upper crust too."

Low-scoring subjects, on the other hand, do not as a rule attempt to hide their feelings of insecurity, their shyness, and their dependence. For example:

*M49* says about himself: "Well, I think social contact bothers me most. I could always talk with one person, but where there are several persons, I'll just stand there and not say 'boo.' I think that might have been due to our not having enough social contacts."

Or a low-scoring woman, *F63*: "I work best by myself—have difficulty working with other people. I get along with them all right, but it's a strain on me. I'm rather shy, don't like competition."

The fact that low-scoring men tend more often to admit their softness and their dependence on their mother is exemplified by the following quotation:

*M50*: "I don't mean I am in love with my mother, but I have a dependency complex . . . married a woman older than myself . . . and always depend on others . . . leave responsibility to others. . . . It seems on looking back that I have always done that . . . simply transferred my dependency on my mother and my wife and onto the (prison) authorities . . . now and in the future. . . ."

As was pointed out above, the dual phenomenon of surface admiration and underlying contempt revealed by the high scorers in their attitude toward the other sex, can sometimes be found in their attitude toward themselves as well. Statements of self-glorification are then followed by statements of self-contempt not faced as such. Such combinations indicate the profound doubt these subjects have about themselves, a doubt which they seem able to bear only by disclaiming responsibility for their own failures, projectively blaming instead other people, external circumstances, uncontrollable forces within oneself, or heredity. The trend of high scorers toward such an *ego-alien self-contempt* which is moralistic-authoritarian and semi-externalized (Category 34b) is distinct in both men (10 positive instances as compared with 1 negative) and women (10 positive vs. 2 negative instances). The difference between high scorers and low scorers, however, does not reach statistical significance on account of the large number of Neutral classifications in this category.

From ego-alien self-contempt there is a gradual transition to the self-condemnation of the typical low scorer. The latter is often characterized by a sober appraisal of intrinsic personality dynamics whereas the former is often warded off in thinly disguised attempts at self-justification in terms of factors beyond the control of the individual which are sometimes real, more often imaginary.

Examples of the type of self-rejection characteristic of high-scoring men follow. Although there is self-criticism in terms of conventional standards, the blame is being put on such factors outside of personality proper as heredity, other people, or external circumstances:

*M40*: "All the inheritance is all from the male side of the family for some reason or other. Except for my industriousness. That just doesn't exist. (Q) I guess I just got that from the other side of the family . . . just a black horse. . . . The whole trouble with me is I didn't grow up. I thought it was a big game of cops and robbers. I don't think any of . . . were malicious about it. We heard about others getting caught, but couldn't believe we would."

*M57*: "I'm kind of ashamed, I'm the only black sheep in the family . . . and I've made more money than all the others put together. Yes, a man of my intelligence let some damn broad put me behind bars."

In the following examples a weak ego is seen as possessed by alien forces within the personality, such as the "carnal self" or "weak flesh":

*M52*: "I've often stopped and more or less took an inventory of myself. I have let myself slip, let my carnal self get away from me. . . ."

*M58*: "Well, I'm a bad example—I don't live what I believe, possibly because the flesh is weak—don't have the stamina to stand up and live it—try not to harm somebody else. . . ."

Examples from the records of high-scoring women are:

*F71*: "I'm inclined to be nervous; haven't the confidence in myself. . . . I'm the clinging vine type and my sister is. My parents have always felt that I'm the backward one—need guidance. They gave me dancing lessons in grade school—knew I needed it. I made all B's in high school."

*F77* says about the girl to whom she has a sexual attachment: "She is always the boss; although she's younger, she's mean, hurts my feelings awfully bad. I can't understand why I love a wicked girl so much."

The foregoing record of an otherwise conventional girl reflects rejection of an ego-alien part of herself, a part she is prone to link with an external temptation (see also Chapter XXII).

*F79* is a good example of how derogatory the opinion about oneself can become: "I wanted to finish school after I got out of the SPARS, and I went to \_\_\_\_\_ Junior College although mother and father couldn't afford it. I didn't do much. I just ate and got fat and mother and father hit the ceiling. I was already neurotic, I guess. I didn't go out. I was in a rut and I got fatter. Mother and father made me do calisthenics by force. Then I went to \_\_\_\_\_ College summer school and was scared of the boys. Then I went to business school. I hated it; it was so boring just to sit and type. I could go to the University of \_\_\_\_\_ if I lost weight. My brother was going. I couldn't because I was too heavy. I felt out of place working in a jewelry store. I hated it and was awfully uncomfortable. I kept on eating; it was the only thing I could turn to, and mother and father got furious. Mother would get these terrific anger spurts. She would yell and I would yell, and then I would feel disgusted."

This is the same girl who at another place in her interview reported that she could get a sense of personal worth by reminding herself of her family background. The existing cleavage between pretense and reality is also revealed by her finding it a matter "of course" that her mother is "wonder-

ful" (see the passages, quoted in Chapter X, concerning idealization of parents and other contexts).

### 3. MASCULINITY AND FEMININITY

We turn now to the more specific aspects of the self-image of the high-scoring subjects as contrasted with that of the low scorers. In line with previous discussion, especially in Section A of this chapter, one might expect high-scoring men to think of themselves as very masculine, and that this claim would be the more insistent the greater the underlying feelings of weakness. Low-scoring men, on the other hand, having actually more personal and masculine identity—perhaps by virtue of having had less threatening parental figures—can afford to admit failures and doubts along these lines.

In fact, there seems to be, in the high-scoring men, more of what may be called *pseudo-masculinity*—as defined by boastfulness about such traits as determination, energy, industry, independence, decisiveness, and will power—and less admission of passivity. An ego-accepted admission of passivity, softness, and weakness, on the other hand, is found predominantly in low-scoring men. The difference is significant at the 1 per cent level (Category 35a). Examples of these two different attitudes in the realm of sex have been quoted in Section A of this chapter.

Similar attitudes can be found in the vocational sphere and in the approach to life in general. Thus, one high-scoring man discussed his successful techniques of "driving sharp bargains." "Certain ordinary ways of doing business," he said, "are too damn slow for me." Being successful by outsmarting others in the competitive struggle is part of the ego-ideal of the prejudiced man. Low-scoring men, on the other hand, more often refer to their dependence, to their liking of cooking and to other tastes usually considered as feminine. They are, furthermore, more often described by the interviewer as "gentle," "mild," "soft-spoken."

An analogous trend—although statistically not significant—toward what may be called *pseudo-femininity* is found in evaluating the self-estimates given by high-scoring women. These women tend to think of themselves as feminine and soft; no masculine trends are being admitted ("being a housewife is definitely my career"). As is not surprising, a rather crude aggression, directed especially against men, seems to go with this attitude, as revealed indirectly in the interviews and directly in the Thematic Apperception Test stories.

Low-scoring women, on the other hand—as was mentioned in Section A—often profess to have a real conflict over their femininity. They sometimes show envy of men rather directly and often engage in so-called masculine activities. At the same time a certain real fondness for men and the wish to be with them and to participate in their activities is revealed. Extreme exam-

ples of openly expressed rejection of the feminine role in low-scoring women are:

F62: "My mother always said that I would make a better boy than a girl. I was always hammering, building, and constructing something. In my adolescence, I was always wearing overalls. Today still when I am in despair, I build things—work it out physically."

F23: Subject wished very much that she were a boy and elaborated on the prejudice against women in her profession. She does not like to cook or sew. "If I were a man I could have a wife—that's what I really need, someone to cook and sew and take care of me." She feels that she is really quite dependent in this respect. Therefore, she will either not marry, or else will continue to work after she is married. Even if she had children she would want to go back to work and get someone else to bring them up after the first year. "I don't think I could bring children up very well anyway. . . . I liked everything the boys did and disliked everything the girls did. I wanted to play baseball with the boys and I did go out and play baseball with them. (What do girls do?) They sit around and talk about boys—and nothing bores me more."

#### 4. CONVENTIONALISM AND MORALISM

Likewise in line with some of the findings reported earlier is the tendency of high-scoring men and women to think of themselves as basically highly moral and controlled and to consider any conduct which contradicts this norm as a "break-through" of tendencies which cannot be explained or influenced. The above quotations illustrate the tendency these individuals have to describe themselves as honest and as possessing high ideals and self-control in the sense of a *conventional moralism*. Low-scoring subjects, on the other hand, more readily admit *fallibility of self-control* without trying to explain it away as a break-through of something foreign to their basic nature. This difference is significant at the 1 per cent level for both men and women (Category 35b). In the case of high-scoring women, the more detailed definition of the category, as given in the passages of the Scoring Manual accompanying the table, indicates special emphasis on such traits as propriety, poise, self-control, and unselfishness; these are contrasted with admission of selfishness in low-scoring women.

The importance of conventional traits in the self-image of high-scoring subjects may be considered as one of the aspects of their strong desire to belong to the powerful majority. There is reason to believe that a certain lack of personal identity is compensated for by a wish to "belong," and to conceive of oneself as *average and therefore all right*, with attempted denial or "forgetting" of deviations, may these deviations be past or present (Category 36a). A great deal of protection and security must be assumed to derive from the feeling of being, in this sense, part of a group. However, as has been mentioned before, this kind of belonging to a group is something quite different from genuine identification with other individuals and society. For prejudiced subjects, then, the greater the deviation, the more stress must be

laid on denying its existence. This is especially marked in our prison sample, from which the following quotations are taken.

*M51:* Subject says he robbed just once and blamed this on drinking. "I still don't consider myself antisocial. . . ." He emphasizes that he doesn't consider himself perverted. He remarks that a while back he took some glandular treatments and feels that these have made him more masculine.

*M57:* Subject expresses the superficial desire to understand why he had gotten in so much trouble when his brothers have not, and to straighten out. He spontaneously denies "that there is anything the matter with me."

These passages from the interviews of high-scoring deviates illustrate at the same time the tendency of high-scoring subjects in general to see their deviations and lack of control as a break-through in the sense defined in the discussion of the preceding category.

In contrast to this, low-scoring subjects tend to see themselves as *different, individualized, or unconventional* (Category 36a, continued). This can be seen from records quoted in previous sections. The difference for the entire category is significant for men at the 1 per cent level; for women there is a trend in the same direction (11 positive vs. 5 negative instances).

Apparently, the greater "personal identity" of the low scorers facilitates establishment of genuine object relationships. In the few cases in which low scorers referred to identification in the present sense of "belonging" it tended to be in terms of mankind in general, that is, as a form of "*world identification*" with the stress on an equalitarian brotherhood ideal (Category 36b; for "humanitarianism" see the next subsection).

##### 5. CONFORMITY OF SELF AND IDEAL

Lack of insight and of self-criticism on the part of the typical high scorers is revealed in their tendency to mention as the type of person they would wish to be, as their *self-ideal, the same set of traits which they actually ascribe to themselves*. There is hardly any discrepancy between their image of what they ought to be and their conception of what they really are.

Thus, high-scoring men tend to mention as their ego-ideal the combination of traits characterized above as "pseudo-masculine" (determination, energy, industry, independence, decisiveness, will power, no passivity) as well as the syndrome of "moralistic conventionalism," likewise mentioned above.

An example of a more worrisome adoption of this type of ego-ideal in a high-scoring man is the following:

*M52:* (Worries?) "Well, I had worries, I remember that. I think my greatest desire was to be somebody in life. I did a lot of reading as a kid. . . . I was sort of a hero worshipper—nobody particularly—I wanted to be a success in business. I used to plan, and sometimes worried about whether I would."

The following quotations illustrate the admiration high-scoring men have

for men of action and success, such as MacArthur and Andrew Carnegie who "amounted to so much":

*M47*: "And then another one I like real well . . . this Patton. I like him for the same reason I like MacArthur. He went right up to the front. . . . He wouldn't send his men anywhere he wouldn't go himself."

*M51*: "Andrew Carnegie, I guess, I got from some of my relatives. . . . His coming over here with so little and amounting to so much. . . ."

High-scoring women likewise tend to list as the ideal the same traits which they mentioned in their self-description and which were summarized under the heading "pseudo-femininity" and "conventional moralism."

Low-scoring subjects, on the other hand, tend to mention, as their ideal, traits which are different from, or at least differently conceived from those which they ascribe to themselves. Being basically more secure, it seems, they can more easily afford to see a discrepancy between ego-ideal and actual reality. Seeing this discrepancy enables them to strive toward a better fulfillment of the ego-ideal. A study dealing with mechanisms of self-deception seems to indicate that the more aware subjects are of falling short of their ideals, the nearer they actually are to the realization of these ideals (see 33).

Specifically, the values listed as ideals by low-scoring men and women may best be summarized as *real achievement*. There is also an emphasis on humanitarian values such as understanding, *nurturance* (the latter especially emphasized by women), affiliation, or work for liberal values such as the improvement of social relations or self-improvement.

The difference between the two types of ego-ideal (as covered by the ratings on Categories 37a and 37b) is statistically highly significant for both men and women.

Since the ego-ideal of the low-scoring subjects is closely related to their tolerance, several illustrations of this point will here be given from their records. Their emphasis on achievement as a value in its own right rather than as a mere means for some ulterior end is shown in the following examples:

*M55*: (I see you would like to be a Congressman?) Subject laughs. He indicates this is not a realistic choice, but that he would like to be a Congressman. He emphasizes what he calls the "in-values" here, "not working just for money, etc. . . . but for what you accomplish . . . and though are likely to be defeated, you have the satisfaction of trying." (Attractions?) Not adept at personal relations, but enjoys this more than statistics or research, but would rather be out in contact with people . . . one war job at Bethlehem Steel involved some personal relations work. . . . "I may be aiming too high. . . . I might be an interviewer at an employment agency."

*F62*: "I would like to teach drama in high school. The reason for this seems perhaps sort of queer. I have always enjoyed drama very much and I thought the world should know more about the theater. I want people to know about good entertainment, high-class art."

*F63*: "In my art work I have been very interested in abstract forms, not so much

in representational forms. I have been very influenced by the Bauhaus kind of design." Now interested in writing. (Q) "I was at the \_\_\_\_\_ Art Gallery (school) and at that time there was a job open \_\_\_\_\_ art critic for the \_\_\_\_\_ which I took. I have also had other jobs for newspapers." Interested in experimental forms of writing.

*F23:* Subject has been employed as a junior chemist at \_\_\_\_\_. Development for a year and a half. She is disappointed in her job because she had hoped to do research, instead of which she is doing routine work such as could be done by a lab assistant. "You are not allowed to do things your own way, nor are you given any responsibility at \_\_\_\_\_ unless you have a Ph.D." Subject is also annoyed by the lack of honesty in her fellow workers: they practice what is known as "pencil chemistry"; i.e., if a reading fails to give the expected result, they will fake the result. She went and told the boss about this, but he did not do anything about it. "They won't do anything on your say-so, and he didn't even check the results for himself." In response to a question as to whether she had ever wished that she were a boy, subject replied: "Yes, I do very much because then I could do what I liked. When I first came here they asked me what I would like to do and I told them organic chemistry; so they asked me whether I would like to do organic analysis and I said, yes, without thinking very much about it. The work turned out to be simple filtrations which were interesting at first, but very easy to learn. . . . I want to quit next summer and get my Ph.D. because perhaps then I might have a better chance to do what I want."

*M44:* "One thing that I think was important, I always liked school and took pride in it. I was always afraid that I might lose out there."

Emphasis on humanitarian values is exemplified by the following records of interviewees scoring extremely low on the ethnocentrism questionnaire. Some of them refer to specific and concrete plans for help in the execution of a program with humanitarian implications, while others may do no more than pay lip-service in terms of vague generalities.

*M53:* (Satisfactions?) "Well, this is a little obscure . . . a certain justification of one's own existence . . . stocks and bonds never convinced me, because it didn't seem to me to make a damn bit of difference (to the public welfare). This work . . . I can see results quickly . . . and honest-to-goodness results."

*M59:* "To help those less fortunate than oneself, and to be a part of the community or society that one is in, to take an active part in it, and being kind and generous and to more or less have a high regard for your fellow human being. . . ."

*M15:* "Started out in college with a strong interest in social studies, history. This interest is still strong, but now it is combined with a desire to work with people. Counseling appears to be my present choice. (Idea behind it?) Well, in our church I have observed how many people have problems. I think I would like to help them. (What kinds of problems?) Personal. . . . (Your religious point of view at present?) You might call it something like Social Religion. (Q) It is a sin to be indifferent to progress."

The statements just quoted are good examples of values important to low-scoring subjects: real achievement often accompanied by anxiety over possible failure, intellectuality, and socially constructive goals.

## 6. DENIAL OF SOCIOPSYCHOLOGICAL CAUSATION

In high-scoring subjects the general lack of insight and the unrealistic view of oneself seem to be connected with a tendency toward a certain

wishful *denial of genuine causality*—as revealed by easy explanations of one's own shortcomings in terms of heredity, physical or accidental factors, etc.—or the denial of the symptomatic character of one's behavioral manifestations. Thus, as will be discussed more fully in Chapter XXII, high-scoring subjects in the sample drawn from a psychiatric clinic tend to refer to their symptoms as something merely physical, or as caused by a "hereditary taint," or as otherwise alien to the ego of the subject.

On the other hand, low-scoring subjects tend in general toward *socio-psychological explanations*, conceiving of the present self in the context of its development under the influence of social and psychological factors. Thus, while talking about themselves, these subjects spontaneously refer back to their childhood, using explicitly such phrases as "it may go back to infancy" in describing the cause of behavioral deviations. One low-scoring subject relates his not having many fears to the fact that his "sister had a lot of fears." "I used that as a technique not to have any," he said. To be sure, all this should not be taken to imply that the low-scoring subjects in question necessarily possess the correct or full insight into themselves; it means only that there is a greater inclination to think in psychodynamic terms and to seek explanation of one's own behavior in these terms.

The difference between the two attitudes (encompassed in Category 38) is statistically highly significant (at the 1 per cent level) for both men and women.

## 7. PROPERTY AS EXTENSION OF SELF

The basic insecurity that lies beneath the overt denials and overconfidence of the high-scoring subjects may be a chief contributing factor in their exaggerated wish for property, in the sense of a conception of *property as an extension of the self*. There is an overlibidinizaton of money and property, per se. Low-scoring subjects, on the other hand, tend to have a more realistic attitude toward money, knowing fully its value as a means, yet not overestimating it by making it an end in itself. They generally conceive of *property as means to an end*.

Differentiation between prejudiced and unprejudiced groups under this aspect (as covered by Category 39) is statistically highly significant.

The following quotations from high-scoring subjects are examples of their search for "basic security and independence" through money or through the accumulation of goods. It often seems that the need has become functionally autonomous, to use a term by Allport (9), and is as such insatiable.

*F24:* (How much is enough?) "Quite a bit—I have to make good—get lots of it and get it fast."

*F32:* The desire for \$1000 a month or "all I could get" represents a wish for security. The more one earns, the more one can put aside.

*M57:* (What might a lot of money make possible for you?) "Buy more cattle, more land, that's my greatest ambition."

Records of low-scoring subjects, on the other hand, more often show emphasis on money as a means of obtaining some of the desirable things in life or else of achieving some socially constructive goal. They furthermore illustrate the greater casualness, passivity, and more pleasure-seeking attitude of the low scorers with respect to money and possessions. Enjoyment of music and books is often mentioned; and there is generally more emphasis on specific things to be obtained rather than on the more vague and perhaps imaginary goal of "security" as stressed by high scorers.

Examples are found in the following records of low-scoring subjects:

*M42*: "I think the best things are free, but lots of times . . . let's see . . . it takes a certain amount of money . . . to do a few things with friends, etc. (Saving vs. spending?) I don't believe in saving money to the point of a mania . . . but planning for the future is something. . . . I don't make a point of saving a certain amount of money every month . . . no use pinching pennies now, so that you can live better later. . . ."

*M44*: (What do you miss most that your present income doesn't permit?) "A good radio with a record player on it, but that's just an immediate thing. . . ."

*M48*: (What might a lot of money make possible for you?) "Mean just a good living. I like to go to plays, concerts, etc., to have a nice home, etc."

*M49*: (What do with \$7500?) "Well, of course, it would give us a comfortable home, to begin with, and a good living, and my wife has always wanted to write, and she's started on several ideas, and that would give her enough to get materials and go ahead with her writing, and—if she did go into writing—we could hire the people to do the house cleaning and laundry, so as to give her more time . . . and she always likes to go to plays and concerts . . . and we could indulge in those things without jeopardizing. . . ."

*F63*: "Money has never meant much to me. Maybe it is stupid and unrealistic. But it is the work itself that gives me satisfaction."

*F70*: (If you had more, what would you do?) "I would probably spend it. (On what?) Well, maybe I would buy some more dishes and silver, although I have more than I can use now; probably not material things. If I had a lot of money I didn't know what to do with, I might run a small private hospital. . . . I don't think I'd buy expensive objects of art. Well, maybe I would. I might buy quite a few material things, go to a lot of concerts and plays. One seems to be able to spend a lot of money on those."

*F27*: "That isn't much, I guess. Neither of us wants much. (Is it enough for a family of six?) Well, what I meant was that we want a comfortable home without any worry, plenty of books, and a good record player with lots of records. We could be happy."

## D. CONCEPTION OF CHILDHOOD SELF

### 1. DEFINITION OF RATING CATEGORIES AND QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

The discussion of attitudes toward oneself thus far has concerned traits which our interviewed subjects ascribed to themselves as of the present. As a regular feature of the interview, subjects were further asked the question: "What were you like as a child?" Obviously, answers to this question must not necessarily be taken to reflect the actual nature of the subjects as chil-

dren. The answers may well refer in part or predominantly to the subject's image of himself as a child. The two alternative interpretations of the material will have to be kept in mind throughout the discussion which follows. The results of a study on social discrimination in children, including interviews with their parents (30), give support to the assumption that the descriptions which our subjects give of themselves show at least a certain degree of correspondence with the actual facts.

The rating categories used in the evaluation of this part of the interview material are as follows:

## INTERVIEW SCORING MANUAL: CONCEPTION OF CHILDHOOD SELF

(to Table 4(XI))

### PRESUMABLY "HIGH" VARIANTS

### PRESUMABLY "LOW" VARIANTS

#### 40M. *Traits ascribed to childhood self by Men:*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>a. <i>Unmanageable, difficult</i>, stubborn, aggressive, spoiled, sensitive, etc.</p> <p>b. <i>Bland childhood</i>. Happy, active, no worries, no shyness, etc.</p> <p>c. "<i>Gang</i>"-oriented</p> | <p>a. <i>Quiet</i>, shy, self-conscious</p> <p>b. <i>Adult-oriented, internalized standards</i>. Read a lot; interest in school and teachers; achievement striving</p> <p>c. <i>Isolated</i> or sociable with few</p> |
|---|---|

#### 40W. *Traits ascribed to childhood self by Women:*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>a. <i>Difficult child</i>. Nervous, frail, etc.</p> <p>b. <i>Bland childhood</i></p> | <p>a. (1) <i>Quiet</i>, shy, self-conscious<br/>(2) <i>Tomboy</i>, independent</p> <p>b. <i>Adult-oriented, internalized standards</i></p> |
|---|--|
41. *Discontinuity* between childhood self and now
41. *Continuity* between childhood self and now
42. *Childhood habits* (Write in each habit mentioned, e.g., nail-biting, thumb-sucking, bed-wetting, nightmares, fear of dark, fear of animals, etc.)
43. *Time of earliest sex experience remembered* (Write in: *Childhood* [1-6]; *Prepuberty* [7-12]; *Adolescence* [13-19]; *Adult life* [20- ])
44. *Nature of earliest sex experience remembered* (Write in: e.g., homosexual or heterosexual sex play; dates; kissing; heterosexual or homosexual intercourse, masturbation)
45. *Source of early sex information* (Write in: e.g., mother; father; male or female sib; other relative; other adult; books; the gang; etc.)
- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>46. <i>Little spontaneous comment</i></p> | <p>46. <i>Considerable spontaneous comment</i></p> |
|--|--|

TABLE 4 (XI)  
 INTERVIEW RATINGS ON ATTITUDE TOWARD CHILDHOOD SELF  
 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		Level of statistical significance reached (percentage)	
		20 men and 15 women		"positive"	"negative"		
		H	L				
40. Traits ascribed to childhood self:							
aM. Unmanageable, difficult(H) vs. Men quiet, shy(L)	Men	10	1	3	6	16	4
aW. Difficult child(H) vs. quiet, shy, or tomboy; independent(L)	Women	9	5	2	7	16	7
b. Bland childhood(H) vs. adult-oriented internalized standards(L)	Men	4	7	1	16	20	8
	Women	6	5	0	7	13	5
41. Discontinuity(H) vs. continuity(L) between childhood self and now	Men	9	3	1	16	25	4
	Women	7	8	1	11	18	9
46. Little(H) vs. considerable (L) spontaneous comment	Men	11	4	4	13	24	8
	Women	10	5	1	10	20	6

Table 4(XI) presents the quantitative results of the analysis of the interviews. Categories 42 to 45 have been omitted from consideration since we gained the impression that there was a certain reluctance on the part of some subjects to talk freely about the topics concerned.

## 2. "DIFFICULT" CHILD

There is a tendency, though not a statistically significant one, for both high-scoring men and women to report more frequently than low scorers that they were "difficult" as children. Among the male interviewees, 10 high scorers as contrasted with only 1 low scorer describe themselves as *unmanageable, difficult, stubborn, aggressive, spoiled and/or sensitive* in childhood (Category 40a.M).

Aside from the possibility of this having actually been the case, it seems that some of the high-scoring subjects may seek in this way to justify the harsh discipline exerted by their parents by taking the blame themselves for any clashes that may have occurred. A further motive for this type of description may be the wish, known to be present in high-scoring men (see above, Chapter VII, to conceive of oneself as possessing "rugged masculinity." The following examples from the records of high-scoring men seem to support both of the latter alternatives offered here as explanations.

*M40*: (What were you like as a child?) "Rowdy, I guess. Typical fresh Irish kid. . . . Snot-nosed, they used to call it. (Q) Oh, steal Joe Blow's apples (and similar pranks). If there was any trouble, I was in it. (Q) Oh, just a kid—I mean, nothing serious."

*M20*: "I had a pretty mean streak in me, especially around ten, pretty mischievous. My grandparents tried to hold me back. See that I'd play with the right kind of children. When I was around 12, I began to be pretty snotty to them and run around any time I wanted to. Sometimes I didn't do my work. At times, I'd feel ashamed of myself. . . . Makes me feel bad now. . . . (Q) No money. I couldn't run around much without money. Always tried to make it some way. . . . Three or four of us ran around together. Pretty snotty. . . . Maybe they tried to hold me down too much when I was younger. Wouldn't let me play, only with certain children."

There is a corresponding though less pronounced trend in high-scoring women; they report that as children they were *difficult, nervous, frail* (Category 40a.W). Examples are:

*F22*: "All I can remember is that mother said I was very fussy and finicky especially about what I ate."

*F31*: "I used to cry all the time. I don't know why, but people hurt my feelings. My brother took that out of me. I fought with him, and it got to the point where I could dish it out."

*F66*: "I cried an awful lot when he died. Mother says I cried and ran out of rooms for years after he died because I didn't like to see her with any other man. She says I ruined her chances."

Low-scoring subjects, on the other hand, show a tendency to describe

themselves as *quiet, shy, self-conscious*, or as *unpopular* in childhood. Low-scoring women, furthermore, relate somewhat more readily than do the high-scoring to have been "*tomboys*" and *independent* as children (Category 40a, continued). Examples from the records of low-scoring subjects follow:

*M48*: (What sort of a person were you?) "Hard for me to say—you mean, was I quiet? Well, would like to have been noisier, was always somewhat repressed by the other kids . . . shunned by (the leading cliques in school) . . . though I finally got in with my own gang about my own level. . . ."

*M53*: (What sort of person were you?) "Hard to evaluate. . . . I think I was fairly quiet. . . . I was supposed to be pretty well behaved. Don't think I was remarkable in any respect."

*M55*: "Timid about dancing, afraid to dance; afraid to go out for sports for fear of being not a good player."

*F27* "I was an awful drip really. I was a very unhappy child. I think it was because I was so fat. And I was abnormally shy. It used to make me mad when teachers would point me out as a model child for being so quiet. I knew I was only quiet because I was scared of everybody there. At home I was a noisy madcap. Of course, at home I was the center of the stage. Everyone thought I was wonderful. At school I guess I didn't feel appreciated. I knew I was very superior intellectually and was sort of a snob about that—but I didn't really care about that. I wanted to be liked and nobody liked me. So I just hurried home. All through grammar school I only had two friends—both girls. I never knew a boy well enough to really talk to. I guess those girls must have really tried to be friends with me because I never could have made any effort."

Floyd Allport and D. A. Hartmann (8) found similar results when they administered a scale to measure political attitudes as well as several personality schedules. They found that the liberals—to use our terminology—exceeded the conservatives in "tender-mindedness," awareness of inner motives and conflicts, touchiness in personal matters, sensitiveness to the opinions of others, and a retiring nature. They are less expansive and self-assertive.

### 3. BLANDNESS VS. ADULT-ORIENTATION

It was assumed, in line with their general tendency toward denial and toward reluctance to face difficulties, that high-scoring subjects would be inclined further to describe their childhood as *bland, happy, active*, and *without worries or shyness* (Category 40b). We were aware of the fact that this assumption is in apparent contradiction to the trend just referred to, namely that high scorers lean toward describing themselves as having been difficult children. However, it is quite common to find denial of difficulties in such subjects side by side with revelation of difficulties. In descriptions of the childhood self there seem to be on the whole fewer manifestations of denial than in any other field with which we have dealt so far. This might be due to the fact that childhood is a possible projection screen for undesirable traits, offering another possibility of rendering these traits "ego-alien." Obviously, there is comparatively little necessity to glorify one's childhood, a period so far away in time. On the contrary, some of our high-scoring sub-

jects seem to find satisfaction in stressing handicaps, such as bad constitution, as something they had to overcome, thus making their success appear the more impressive.

Another aspect of childhood (referred to in the opposite variant of Category 40b) is found with considerable frequency in the reports of low-scoring subjects. It may be summarized as *orientation toward the adult and the espousal of internalized standards*, as manifested in reading a lot, an interest in school and teachers, and in achievement striving. This trend is especially typical of the group of low-scoring men, in which 16 interviewees give a picture of themselves as having been adult-oriented in childhood, as compared with only 1 high-scoring man who does so. In women the corresponding figures are 7 and 0.

This picture is substantiated in the direct study by the present author, referred to above (30), of children scoring low on a prejudice scale especially designed for them. Though such children show less submission to authority, they tend to be genuinely more oriented toward adult values, such as interest in work.

Examples from both low-scoring men and women follow:

M53: (Especially remarkable?) "I don't know. I don't think so. I was a pretty good student in school. Seemed to have a lot of friends. I don't remember any outstanding disappointments. (Worries as a child?) Oh, let's see, that's difficult. I don't know. I can't remember any recurring worries as a child. (What about little things?) Well, let me think. Shortly after my father's death, I worried about that for a while. Growing up without a father. . . . In high school I think I worried a lot about future occupation and how to earn a living."

M56: (What were you like as a child?) "Oh, very serious . . . read Rippants' 'History of the World' at nine. My grandfather, when I was nine or ten, gave me Washington Irving's 'Conquest of Granada,' which meant a great deal to me—gave me a sense of objectivity in history . . . he sometimes gave me temperance books."

F27: "I was reading Dickens and Thackeray when other children were on Brer Rabbit, and knew all about the symphonies and operas while they were on nursery rhymes."

Along the same line is a certain tendency on the part of the low-scoring subjects to report relative *isolation* in childhood, while high scorers refer to what may be defined as *gang-sociability* (Category 40c), including such aspects as popularity and the holding of offices in clubs and high school fraternities and sororities. No figures for this trend are given in Table 4(XI), but examples from records of low-scoring subjects describing shyness and relative isolation in childhood are given here:

M59: (What were you like as a child?) "Always shy and when I was around a large group it was quite a while before I would enter into the spirit of things."

F27: "I knew I was quiet because I was scared of everybody there. . . . I wanted to be liked and nobody liked me. So I just hurried home."

F75: "In a way we are all alike in our family—shy and afraid of people. We don't discuss it but I have noticed it in all of us, even my sister who doesn't act like it often."

My mother has always pushed us and wanted us to be different—go-getters—but she isn't. I was the worst—the sort who would cross the street rather than say hello to a friend. . . . I remember wishing my mother would leave me alone to do what I wanted. That would have been bad though. I guess, because I would have grown up a hermit. Even now, I prefer to curl up with a book or go for a walk by myself."

*M49*: "Well, when we were small, we spent all the time we possibly could out-of-doors, and when we came out here, we never associated with . . . never had any contact with other children outside of school time (worked, helping at home) . . . just played together at home. . . . Neither of us ever went out for any sports . . ."

#### 4. CONTRASTING PICTURE OF CHILDHOOD AND PRESENT

The last two categories to be discussed under attitude toward one's childhood help to support and to round out the impression gained so far. It was pointed out above that high-scoring subjects seem to use their childhood as a projection screen for traits now considered as undesirable. This should make for *discontinuity* between childhood and present self (Category 41). Actually, such is the case, significantly more often in the high scorers (at the 1 per cent level for men and at the 5 per cent level for women) than in the low scorers, the latter tending to show *continuity* between childhood and adult self. High scorers even may give the impression of an actual break by glorifying the present self and by finding fault with the past.

On the whole, finally, high scorers tend to make *little spontaneous comment* while the low scorers offer *considerable spontaneous comment* about their childhood (Category 46), the difference being significant at the 2 per cent level for both men and women. This is but one more among several manifestations of the greater intraceptiveness of the low scorers, and of their greater inclination to explain human behavior in psychological and social terms.

#### 5. SUMMARY OF ATTITUDE TOWARD PRESENT SELF AND CHILDHOOD SELF

As in the evaluation of their parents and of the other sex, high scorers tend in their self-evaluation to stress the positive and desirable aspects; or at least this is so on the surface level. They are prone to point to their "will power" and determination in overcoming the handicaps and vicissitudes of life. Energy, decisiveness, aggressiveness in competition tend to be particularly prominent in the ego-ideal of high-scoring men.

However, there is evidence that the repeated assertions of independence are a defense against strong feelings of dependence, passivity, helplessness, and sometimes even self-contempt. These feelings are but rarely recognized or accepted as such without making an attempt at self-justification.

What is not acceptable to the ego tends in the further course of events to become externalized, thus rendering the ego narrow and constricted. In further consequence, prejudiced subjects tend to regard themselves as conventional, not different, and therefore "all right," and their descriptions of themselves have a definitely moralistic tone. Deviations from the commonly accepted pattern of conduct, if admitted at all, are regarded as a "break-

through" of tendencies which are either beyond explanation or which are explained away by external factors and incidents over which the subject could not possibly have had control. Judicious explanations of the socio-psychological kind are avoided in this type of approach to the self. This makes for a comparative lack of experienced continuity between childhood self and present self. In line with this, high scorers are generally somewhat reluctant to make spontaneous reference to their childhood, thus trying further to disclaim for themselves and for their parents the responsibility for the outcome.

Unprejudiced individuals, on the other hand, seem to be on better terms with themselves, due perhaps to the fact that they have been more loved and accepted by their parents. Thus they are more ready to admit falling short of their ideals and of the roles they are expected to play by our culture. Impulses and tendencies which seem less desirable are nonetheless accepted as a part of the self, making for a richer, more complex, and more intraceptive content of the ego. Thus, as was pointed out in the first section of this chapter, low-scoring men prove themselves more able to afford frank admission of passivity and weakness without having to resort—to the same degree as high-scoring men may have to—to the use of rigid and counterphobic defenses against these feelings. In accordance with this, there is comparatively frequent evidence of open admission of conflict about the feminine role in low-scoring women, as well as of their genuine fondness of men.

Furthermore, low scorers tend to derive their security from recourse to their personal identity in addition to such external factors as group membership or property. Hence they tend to present themselves in their interviews as individualized and unconventional. Instead of trying to live up to conventionally defined rules and values, they tend to strive toward real achievement, toward understanding and affiliation, and toward the realization of humanitarian and liberal values such as the improvement of social relations or self-improvement. They seem to be interested in explanations of their present self in terms of their entire development. They make considerable spontaneous reference to their childhood. Their descriptions of themselves as children are often far from the picture of what would be generally called a well adjusted child. They report having been withdrawn, shy, and self-conscious; oriented toward work, reading, and an adult set of values. These reports are in accordance with direct findings, in an independent study, on the personality of extremely unprejudiced children.

As adults, low scorers often continue to manifest open anxieties and feelings of depression, due perhaps at least in part to their greater capacity of facing insecurity and conflict. Their greater readiness to introspect may be considered as an attempt to master these problems and to achieve a dependable and flexible form of adjustment. Sometimes it appears that they may succeed; in other cases it seems that there is but a morbid dwelling on psychological topics.