

C H A P T E R X I I

DYNAMIC AND COGNITIVE PERSONALITY ORGANIZATION AS SEEN THROUGH THE INTERVIEWS

Elsa Frenkel-Brunswik

A. DYNAMIC CHARACTER STRUCTURE

1. DEFINITION OF RATING CATEGORIES AND QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

Throughout the preceding discussion of interview material repeated reference was made to a variety of so-called defense mechanisms. Among them were repression of sex and aggression, overemphasis on cleanliness, various forms of defense against one's own passivity, and the like. Again and again it became evident that the difference between the ethnocentric and the non-ethnocentric extremes hinges more on the rejection vs. the acceptance of such depth factors as homosexuality, or aggression, or passivity, or anality than it does on the mere presence or absence of one or another of these tendencies. In other words, it was not primarily the relative strength of such tendencies that seemed to matter, but rather the way in which these tendencies were handled in the motivational dynamics of the subject in question. In the framework of these dynamics, defense mechanisms are the instruments of rejection of those tendencies which the subject is not ready to face and to incorporate.

The categories of the Interview Scoring Manual discussed in the present chapter are centered about such defense mechanisms, per se, along with other dynamic patterns fulfilling a related function. Thus, some of these categories cut across a variety of aspects investigated so far, and offer the possibility of providing synopses of previous observations. By the use of these categories direct support could be found for many assumptions made previously on the basis of more scattered or indirect evidence.

The list of categories related to dynamic character structure is as follows:

INTERVIEW SCORING MANUAL: DYNAMIC CHARACTER STRUCTURE

(to Table 1(XII))

PRESUMABLY "HIGH" VARIANTS

47. *Counter-cathectic rejection of "erotic" orality* (of zone-sensuality and/or its sublimations, i.e., of verbal-emotional-artistic expressiveness)
48. *Rigid-moralistic-anal reaction-formations* as ends-in-themselves; overemphasis on, and preoccupations with, totalitarian-moralistic (positive and negative) typologizing (e.g., two kinds of people, "clean" and "dirty"); emphasis on money and property
49. *Diffuse, ego-alien dependence.* Escapism, dodging responsibility; underlying ego-alien passivity; helplessness-weakness (expressed openly in men only when overwhelmed or victimized—e.g. "foxhole religion"—with all-or-none character). Characterized by affective poverty and exchangeability of object

PRESUMABLY "LOW" VARIANTS

47. *Positive expressions of "erotic" orality* (of zone-sensuality, e.g., food cathexis, oral perversions, and/or sublimations, i.e., verbal-emotional-artistic expressiveness-expansiveness)
48. *Anal reaction-formations functional and nonmoralistic.* Means-end relationship retained; or anal sublimations; or relative absence of anal reaction-formations
49. *Love-oriented succorance-nurturance,* acceptance of dependency and affect, specificity of object cathexis

50. *Aggression:*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>a. <i>Diffuse, impersonalized;</i> sometimes replaced by ingratiation</p> <p>b. <i>Moralistic-authoritarian.</i> Totalitarian; punitive; often persecutory (pogrom frame of mind)</p> <p>c. <i>Destructive-explosive.</i> Tending toward all-or-none, and toward physical expression</p> | <p>a. <i>Focal, personal</i></p> <p>b. (1) <i>Principled - intellectualized</i>
(2) <i>Love-oriented.</i> Especially in response to rejection by a cathected object</p> <p>c. <i>Relatively mild, day-to-day.</i> Tending toward regular release, and toward verbal expression</p> |
|---|--|

51. *Ambivalence:*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>a. <i>Ego-alien</i></p> <p>b. <i>Solved by dichotomies and displacement</i></p> | <p>a. (1) <i>Sometimes admitted openly;</i> ego-accepted
(2) <i>Conscious inhibition of affect</i></p> <p>b. <i>Expressed sometimes openly toward original objects</i> or</p> |
|--|---|

"reality representatives" of original objects (e.g. authority; mother figures)

52. *Identification:*

- | | |
|---|--|
| a. <i>Inverted Oedipal attachment</i> | a. <i>Normal Oedipal attachment</i> |
| b. <i>Underlying ego-alien identification with opposite sex parent's role.</i> Emphasis on dominance-submission conflicts | b. <i>Genuine, ego-integrated identification with either or both parents</i> |
| c/M. <i>Pseudo-masculinity</i> | c. <i>Ego-integrated masculinity and/or femininity.</i> Emphasis is on character traits and internalized values |
| c/W. <i>Pseudo-femininity</i> | |
| 53. <i>Externalized superego, "social anxiety"; or rigid superego, unconscious guilt</i> | 53. <i>Internalized superego, sometimes severe and irrational; conscious guilt</i> |
| 54. <i>Rejection and countercathexis of ego-alien impulses, especially of sex, of aggression against parents and authorities, and of feelings of weakness and passivity</i> | 54. <i>Acceptance and sublimation of id, often with conscious conflict between competing impulses; sometimes conscious inhibition of id</i> |
| 55. <i>Ego weak; often skillful in attaining success and determined in overt action; sometimes combined with opportunistic over-realism</i> | 55. <i>Ego moderate strength, or strong.</i> Criteria: sustained effort, ability to postpone pleasure for sake of internalized values; ability to assume responsibility; emotional maturity, etc. Sometimes drifting into impractical pursuits |

Further mechanisms

- | | |
|--|---|
| 56a. <i>Distortion of "reality"</i> | 56a. <i>Realistic-objective re world generally</i> |
| 56b. <i>Authoritarian moralism</i> | 56b. <i>Intellectualization, sometimes of the type of philosophical rationalization rather than of intellectual penetration</i> |
| 56c. <i>Denial of "negative things" in self, "official optimism"</i> | 56c. <i>Open psychological conflict concerning own adequacy, maturity, or the violation of liberal values, etc.</i> |
| 56d. <i>Concern with physical symptoms</i> | |
| 56e. <i>Concern with physical appearance</i> | |
| 56f. <i>Hysterical conversion symptoms (especially in men)</i> | |

The quantitative results are shown, in the usual manner, in Table 1 (XII).

2. ORALITY AND ANALITY

We turn first to the so-called oral and anal trends, especially their acceptance vs. rejection whenever this occurs in the two groups scoring extremely high or low on the overt Ethnocentrism scale. As in the preceding discussion, the terms "anality" and "orality" do not refer here to the earlier psychogenetic stages but rather to special character syndromes found in the adult personality; these latter have been described, likewise by psychoanalysis, in terms of present symptoms assumed to be connected with their respective counterparts in childhood.

It was first expected that in line with the general tendency toward repression, high-scoring subjects would tend to defend themselves against both the direct oral urge, e.g., indulgence in food, drinking, smoking, etc., as well as against tendencies assumed to be related to this urge—indulgence in talking, artistic interests, etc. The low scorers, on the other hand, were expected to show more acceptance of and more liking for manifestations assumed to be directly or indirectly related to orality. On this basis, *orality* was incorporated in the Interview Scoring Manual in the form defined by Category 47.

Although there actually is within our material a trend in the expected direction, especially for women (see Table 1(XII)), it is far from being statistically significant. This may well be due to the presence of an "oral demandingness" in the high scorers as manifested, for example, in a dependence on getting "things," and a dependence on authorities and supernatural forces as discussed above. These specific manifestations were not fully anticipated at the time the definitions of the category were laid down, although they were given proper consideration throughout by the two raters, both being clinically trained and psychoanalytically oriented.

The original hypothesis proved most valid where rejection of drinking and smoking on the part of the typical high scorer was concerned, and this may well be seen as part of a general conventionalism.

As was expected, indulgence in what may be called direct orality is more often found in the low scorers. An illustration may be found in the following record:

F62: "For a while I wanted to be an actress but I love to eat and, strangely enough, the actresses seem not to eat. Because of not being able to reduce and because of the fact that the job of a teacher is more secure, I decided to become a teacher."

The various behavior forms assumed to be indirectly derived from orality do not show any pronounced differences, however. More detailed distinctions of the various levels and kinds of direct and devious manifestations of orality may well reveal striking differences between the ethnically prejudiced and unprejudiced.

In contrast to orality, the rejection vs. acceptance of tendencies customarily designated as *anal syndrome* (Category 48) proved significantly differentiating (at the 1 per cent level) for both men and women interviewees.

TABLE 1 (XII)
INTERVIEW RATINGS ON DYNAMIC CHARACTER STRUCTURE
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 or surpassed (percentage)
		20 men and 25 women		"low scorers"		"positive"	"negative"	
		H	L	H	L			
47. Rejection(H) vs. positive ex- pression(L) of "erotic" orality	Men	5	7	2	2	12	9	1
	Women	8	3	2	2	13	5	
48. Anal reaction-formations rigid- moralistic (H) vs. functional and nonmoralistic(L)	Men	12	1	3	3	25	4	1
	Women	17	2	3	3	24	3	
49. Diffuse, ego-alien(H) vs. love- oriented(L) dependence	Men	17	3	2	2	31	5	1
	Women	17	2	1	1	24	3	
50. Aggression: a. Diffuse, depersonalized(H) vs. focal, personalized(L)	Men	17	2	2	2	30	4	1
	Women	13	3	0	0	24	3	
b. Moralistic-authoritarian(H) vs. principled-intellectualized or love-oriented(L)	Men	15	2	2	2	27	4	1
	Women	16	1	2	2	26	3	
c. Destructive-explosive(H) vs. relatively mild(L)	Men	9	2	2	2	19	4	5
	Women	6	3	3	3	15	6	
51. Ambivalence: a. Ego-alien(H) vs. sometimes admitted openly(L)	Men	15	2	4	4	27	6	1
	Women	16	4	2	2	25	6	
b. Solved by dichotomies and dis- placement(H) vs. expressed openly toward original object(L)	Men	14	2	5	5	22	7	2
	Women	9	3	2	2	18	5	

52. Oedipus complex: a. Inverted(H) vs. normal(L)	Men	<u>6</u>	4	3	<u>12</u>	<u>18</u>	7	1
	Women	<u>9</u>	11	3	<u>8</u>	<u>17</u>	14	
b. Ego-alien identification with opposite sex parent's role (H) vs. ego-integrated identification with either or both parent(L)	Men	<u>12</u>	1	2	<u>13</u>	<u>25</u>	3	1
	Women	<u>15</u>	1	2	<u>11</u>	<u>26</u>	3	1
cM. Pseudo masculinity(H) vs. ego-integrated masculinity or "femininity"(L)	Men	<u>15</u>	1	2	<u>10</u>	<u>25</u>	3	1
	Women	<u>4</u>	5	2	<u>11</u>	<u>15</u>	7	
cW. Pseudo femininity(H) vs. ego-integrated femininity or "masculinity"(L)	Men	<u>16</u>	3	2	<u>14</u>	<u>30</u>	5	1
	Women	<u>15</u>	5	1	<u>12</u>	<u>27</u>	6	1
53. Externalized(H) vs. internalized superego(L)	Men	<u>14</u>	1	5	<u>10</u>	<u>24</u>	6	1
	Women	<u>21</u>	1	4	<u>7</u>	<u>28</u>	5	1
54. Counterathesis of ego-alien id(H) vs. acceptance and sublimation of id(L)	Men	<u>14</u>	5	7	<u>11</u>	<u>25</u>	12	5
	Women	<u>12</u>	9	3	<u>11</u>	<u>23</u>	12	5
55. Ego weak(H) vs. ego medium strength or strong(L)	Men	<u>8</u>	3	4	<u>10</u>	<u>18</u>	7	5
	Women	<u>8</u>	4	3	<u>10</u>	<u>18</u>	7	5
56a. Distortion of reality(H) vs. realistic-objective(L)	Men	<u>14</u>	3	3	<u>12</u>	<u>26</u>	6	1
	Women	<u>16</u>	1	3	<u>9</u>	<u>25</u>	4	1
b. Authoritarian moralism(H) vs. intellectualization(L)	Men	<u>17</u>	1	2	<u>12</u>	<u>29</u>	3	1
	Women	<u>12</u>	3	1	<u>9</u>	<u>21</u>	4	1
c. Denial of negative things in self(H) vs. open psychological conflict(L)	Men	<u>7</u>	3	3	<u>7</u>	<u>16</u>	3	
	Women	<u>6</u>	0	0	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	0	
d. Concern with physical symptoms(H)	Men	<u>3</u>	5	5	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>	5	
	Women	<u>8</u>	1	1	<u>1</u>	<u>8</u>	1	
e. Concern with physical appearance(H)	Men	<u>3</u>	2	2	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	2	
	Women	<u>7</u>	3	3	<u>3</u>	<u>7</u>	3	
f. Hysterical conversions(H)	Men	<u>3</u>	2	2	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	2	
	Women	<u>7</u>	3	3	<u>3</u>	<u>7</u>	3	

Thus it is that high-scoring subjects tend toward rigid-moralistic patterns of behavior, which are related in appearance to responses technically termed anal reaction-formations, and tend to conceive of them as ends-in-themselves; that they show overemphasis upon, and preoccupation with, such issues as money, neatness, "good clean life and hard work," etc.; and that they are given to totalitarian-moralistic typologizing (e.g., two kinds of people—"clean" and "dirty"), this typologizing being either positive or negative. These preoccupations may be considered as an outcome of a certain type of child training; thus, sociopsychological factors are brought into the picture. The affinity of these dynamic tendencies to the ideological issues in question seems evident on the basis of the above description.

Examples of this complex of attitudes in the records of high-scoring subjects are:

M41: "Lots of advantages . . . pensions. Put in 30 years and you retire. Good salary. Always something to see and learn in the army. Going different places. It's a good life in general. A clean life. . . . It makes a man of you. . . . (Main differences between Christians and others?) The Christian tries to live a Christian life and others go out and rob and steal, drink, carouse around, do a little of everything. . . . (What do you find most offensive in others?) Well, some people are more attractive than others. Some people have no attraction. (Interests, hobbies?) Well, I have no hobbies. I like fishing. I like hunting."

M51: (What is the core of your religious beliefs?) "No, I can't elaborate on that. I did answer that. That right thinking and right living. . . ."

F66: "Mother is a nurse, and I know the profession. I don't like dirty work. I don't like sick people. (About school.) They . . . wore dirty old plaid shirts."

F31: "I can't see a girl working in jeans and around grease and putting themselves on the same level as men."

F38: (What people have you disliked?) "I remember a man when I was 18 years old. I didn't like him because he was dirty and sloppy."

F78: She looks for similar interests, someone who enjoys the same things. "Someone I wouldn't have to make excuses for—someone well brought up, nice appearance, dressed neatly. I'm a very neat person."

Some of these findings corroborate earlier results by Krout and Stagner (65). They found that conservatives show more tendency to digestive disorders, more and an almost compulsive interest in washing and personal cleanliness.

Low scorers, on the other hand, tend toward anal reaction-formations which may be considered functional rather than moralistic, with the proper perspective upon their character as means to an end retained (Category 48, continued). More specifically, the more "central" attitude involved finds its expression on the functional level in a constructive inclination toward such frames of mind as planning, e.g., in scientific work; or else there is an absence of retentiveness altogether, as shown by a rather carefree, relaxed attitude. Examples of this latter subvariety from the records of low-scoring subjects are:

M42: "It may sound funny, but I don't particularly care to work really. . . . I like the independence of that kind of work. . . . I have the ability in such a job to simply go fishing on Saturdays or other days if I don't feel like working." Subject indicates that doing so was not a particularly rare occurrence with him. . . . "And I'm not as economical as my mother. I take after my dad probably in that respect more. In having a good time, I'm more like him. When I start out to have a good time, money doesn't matter. . . ."

M55: "I am inclined to be not very careful about spending money myself . . . my wife says so. . . . If I see something I like, I am inclined to buy it. . . . (About older sister:) However, a delightful person to live with. . . ."

M56: (Importance of money to father?) "Not important; never any money-grubbers in my family. My brother is a doctor who went to Ethiopia to help out as a doctor."

3. DEPENDENCE

Another "central" attitude which is not accepted and faced as such by the high-scoring subjects is "dependence." We made reference to this tendency in discussing the subjects' attitude toward their family, toward people, and toward themselves. Here we deal with dependence as a generalized trait in its various meanings and the ways in which it is handled by the subject. In Category 49, a *diffuse and ego-alien dependence* as manifested by escapism or the dodging of responsibility, a general underlying passivity, helplessness and weakness (in men expressed openly only when they are overwhelmed or victimized, as exemplified by "foxhole religion" and other all-or-none responses), accompanied by affective poverty, is contrasted with what has for the sake of brevity been labeled *love-oriented succorance-nurturance*. The first-named alternative is found significantly more often in high scorers (the difference being at the 1 per cent level of confidence) both in the case of men and women interviewees. Since the two patterns of dependence described have been discussed at length in previous chapters, it may suffice here briefly to remind the reader of the basic difference between affectionate love dependence and self-seeking dependence that is barren of affect.

The dependence on support in high-scoring subjects is furthermore clearly evident in their particular type of attitude toward religion. It is primarily when in need that they turn to the Bible; and it is support in the face of need rather than a system of ethics that they seek in religion. Frequently they become religious whenever "dependence on people" conflicts with suspicion, leading to isolation. Examples of this self-centered attitude toward religion from the records of high-scoring subjects are:

M13: (Under what conditions might you turn to religion?) "Yes, under some conditions I might. I have had a lot of sickness, stomach trouble ever since I was 12. I was in the hospital once for three months. During those periods, I like to turn to the Bible. I like the history and sayings of Christ, principally. . . . (What about your conception of God?) Well, I have none especially. The closest conception I got was when I was in the service, that is, God as strictly man, greater than any on this earth, one that would treat us as a father would his son. I don't think God is terrible in His justice."

M58: "Well, I'm not much on praying, myself, but instinctively . . . when a person needs something, when nothing else will help, the natural thing to do is turn to the Lord for help—whether prayers are answered, I don't know . . . but I believe prayers will be answered to those few who live and believe in religion, but to a person just to pray, no!"

F38: "Everyone should have a definite belief in a deity, instilled in childhood. Something to lean against, if you need it, for instance in case of a death in the family."

4. AGGRESSION

In considering the relationship of central dynamic tendencies to ethnic prejudice, the problem of "aggression" obviously calls for special attention. Indeed, prejudice seems to be but one of a number of manifestations of aggression. Thus a more detailed analysis of the degree and type of aggression found in the high scorer as compared with the low scorer seems appropriate. The subsequent distinctions of various aspects of aggression show a certain amount of overlapping. One of the foremost distinctions concerns whether aggression is an expression of a general and diffuse rage, with a tendency to be suppressed and to break through in an uncontrolled way, or whether there is a more specific reason for aggression, well integrated with the subject's ego, such as the violation of a principle or loss of love, in which case the expression of aggression is apt to be more specific and more channeled. A further distinction is as to whether the aggression tends to become displaced onto someone who is socially weaker or tends to be directed toward the actual source of frustration, even if this source should be found to be connected with those who are authoritative and powerful.

In accordance with these considerations, *three aspects of aggression* have been distinguished in the Scoring Manual for the interviews. In each case, the first of the two alternatives to be mentioned was actually found predominantly in the high scorers, the second predominantly in the low scorers, with the difference highly significant for the first two aspects, Categories 50a and 50b, in both men and women.

In particular, Category 50a distinguishes diffuse forms of aggression that are not integrated and have no personalized goal from an aggression that is both "focal" and personal. Reports about blind rage, temper tantrums, and bad temper in general, often found in the records of high-scoring subjects, are pertinent to the first of these two alternatives. The expression of aggression in low scorers shows, by contrast, greater awareness of the cause of aggression which thus tends to become more specific, and to be directed against a certain person or against violation of a general principle. At the same time there seems to be more open conflict and guilt over expressions or feelings of aggression in the low scorers.

Furthermore, aggression may be, on the one hand, moralistic-authoritarian, or totalitarian, or primitive, or even persecutory as in a pogrom frame-of-

mind; or it may be, on the other hand, principled and intellectualized, or else love-oriented, especially in response to rejection by a sought-after ("cathexed") object (Category 50b). The clearest expressions of these forms of aggression can be found in those passages of the interviews which deal with social and political issues, i.e., those excluded in order to make "blind" scoring of the interviews possible. In addition to these passages, however, there are throughout the interviews, especially those of the high scorers, aggressive references to people who are considered as socially inferior, uneducated, not religious, etc. It is to such references that this subcategory applies. Expressions of generalized tolerance, on the other hand, can be found in many of the records of low scorers.

The distinction between an aggression that is destructive and explosive, tends toward the all-or-none and toward physical expression, and an aggression that is relatively mild, has a day-to-day character and tends toward regular release and toward verbal expression, is incorporated in Category 50c. There is less clear-cut statistical significance for this subcategory, but the trend in the expected direction is nonetheless present.

Statements about differences in the kind of aggression displayed do not imply that low scorers tend on the whole to have successfully overcome the vicissitudes inherent in this crucial aspect of human behavior. It may well be that while they succeed more often than do high scorers in avoiding manifestations of aggression which are destructive of others, they do so at the price of increased self-destruction.

5. AMBIVALENCE

The problem of ambivalence is related to that of aggression. In discussing attitudes toward parents and sex, the comparative inability of high-scoring subjects to verbalize aggression and thus to face ambivalence was pointed out in detail. It was also intimated that it may be precisely the inability to face ambivalence toward the powerful which leads to socially dangerous forms of displacement of aggression. The following *two aspects of ambivalence* seemed especially important and are thus covered in the Scoring Manual:

Category 51a deals with what may be called the degree of awareness of ambivalence. In the typical high-scoring subject ambivalence is not being faced but rather is rendered ego-alien, whereas it is more often openly admitted in the low scorers. The difference is quite significant in both sexes.

Category 51b deals with the mechanisms which help to circumvent ambivalence or to keep it on an unconscious level. The most outstanding of these mechanisms consist in a thinking in terms of dichotomies, i.e., in terms of pairs of diametrical opposites, and in an inclination toward displacement. Thus, glorification of the ingroup and rejection of the outgroup, familiar from the sphere of social and political beliefs, can be found as a general trend

in some of our clinical data, predominantly in those relating to high scorers. Low scorers, on the other hand, tend toward openly expressing their ambivalence toward the original objects, or toward representatives of these objects in reality (e.g., toward authority, or toward mother figures, respectively.) The ability and the readiness to admit and to express aggression where it originates, instead of projecting and displacing it, provides one of the most important cornerstones of democracy, as was pointed out in parts of the previous discussion on the attitude toward the parents (Chapter X). Conscious aggression is apt to be less intensive than repressed aggression.

Quotations of records revealing underlying ambivalence in high scorers were given in one of the preceding chapters. We may repeat here only what seems a rather typical description of the mother, by one of our high-scoring woman interviewees. "Mother was, of course, a very wonderful person. She was very nervous. Irritable only when overdoing." There are, furthermore, indications in the records of high-scoring subjects of ambivalence toward members of professional groups who may be considered as parent substitutes, e.g., toward the priest, the doctor, the teacher, etc. To be sure, low-scoring subjects manifest a great deal of criticism toward such authoritative figures, but it is usually expressed more directly, and is characterized by a lesser degree of that type of anxiety which is not openly faced or admitted.

6. IDENTIFICATION

One of the aims of the present chapter is to take up topics, discussed in previous sections, under the aspects of personality dynamics as assumed by the school of psychoanalysis. In probing into what is called the "Oedipal" situation of the subjects and their "identifications" in general, we are seriously handicapped by the insufficiency of the data from which inferences about the psychogenetic picture could be made. It should be especially acknowledged and kept in mind therefore that in describing identifications in any particular subject we may well be wrong as to the ultimate interpretation. But since we are focusing on group trends, a certain neutralization of these sources of error is likely to be achieved.

The problems approached here in connection with the Oedipal situation coincide with those dealt with primarily in psychoanalysis: (1) the problem of cathexis, that is, of the choice of the parental love object, and (2) the problem of identification with one or the other parent. In Category 52a, the question was whether there is an "inverted" or a "normal" Oedipal situation, i.e., whether the subject has as his or her primary love object the parent of the same or of the opposite sex. Judgment in this respect involves a great deal of inference on the part of the rater. The hypothesis underlying the adoption of this category was that low-scoring subjects will reveal evidence of the normal trend of having more cathexis on the parent of the opposite

sex. This would be in line with his more clear-cut heterosexual attitude as referred to in one of the previous chapters.

Due perhaps to the insufficient material on this score, or to the fact that the crucial difference has to be sought in the way of handling—rather than in the mere presence or absence—of the normal resolution of the Oedipal situation, this anticipated difference did not turn out to be statistically significant. For our women interviewees the difference is altogether negligible. For men, however, it may well reach significance in a somewhat larger sample, since 12 of our extreme low scorers and only 4 of the extreme high scorers report greater attachment to the mother, and since there are totals of 18 “positive” as against only 7 “negative” instances on the category as a whole. Again it must be emphasized that while such results may be interesting as a group trend, in any individual case the relationship to the parents may turn out to be very different, on a deeper level, from what it appears to be on the surface or in overt verbalization. This fact notwithstanding, much in the personality structure of the typical unprejudiced man induces us to believe that his attachment to the mother was indeed close and that it is a source of his favorable attitude toward women and his courage in opposing the father and authorities in general.

The closeness between mother and son is described in the following excerpt from the interview of one of the low-scoring men:

M55: (Which parent closer to?) “Closer to my mother quite a bit, confided more than with father, but mostly just about casual things. I think she made too much of me; told me how bright I was, etc., but I was just better adjusted (than older sister). I think they were awfully thoughtless and cruel to her.”

While preference for the parent of the opposite sex does not differentiate significantly between high and low scorers, there is a significant difference with respect to acceptance of, or defense against, identification with the parent of the opposite sex or with the “weaker” parent (femininity in men and masculinity in women). The respective category, 52b, contrasts an underlying *ego-alien identification with the role of the parent of the opposite sex* (emphasizing the dominance-submission conflict) with a genuine ego-integrated identification with either parent or with both parents. The difference, significant at the 1 per cent level, indicates that high-scoring men tend to repress their “femininity,” high-scoring women their “masculinity.” The following examples show how little resistance, on the other hand, low-scoring men seem to have to discussing their similarities with their mothers and to showing their partial identifications with them:

M48: (Parents’ feelings?) “Of course, my mother I imagine thinks it’s a pretty good idea. My family have always had (artistic talents). Mother married a second time—stepfather would be against it. . . . (How do you take after your mother?) Well, very peculiar thing. I never thought mother was too bright or intellectual and I’m not either.”

M59: (Similarities to mother?) "Well, both of us are a little sensitive in temperament, kind of quiet. I think we both like a certain amount of solitude. I used to like to take her out to dinner, to the theater quite often."

M42: (Which parent did you take after most?) "Well, I don't know. . . . I suppose I take after my mother's side of the family. I have a lot of traits like her father and brother . . . but she, herself, is more like her mother . . . although I have a lot of characteristics of my father. I have quick temper like he does."

Alongside the repression of feminine trends, high-scoring men tend to display what may be called "pseudo-masculinity" whereas low-scoring men tend to develop more ego-integrated masculinity and an acceptance of feminine tendencies in themselves, the emphasis being on character traits and internalized values rather than on a display of masculinity. The difference within this category, 52c.M, is significant at the 1 per cent level. For women, the corresponding difference does not reach statistical significance although there is a trend in the expected direction.

7. SUPEREGO

It seems to be the lack of genuine identification with, and the fear of, the parents which leads in the high scorers to an *externalization of the superego*, with the punishing and rewarding authority seen as being outside rather than inside of oneself. By contrast, low scorers tend toward an *internalized conscience*; their behavior is primarily oriented toward genuine, intrinsic values and standards rather than toward external authorities (Category 53). Rated directly and as such, this difference turns out in a statistically highly satisfactory manner, thus supporting the inferences made so far on the more specific aspects of this basic distinction.

Examples of the leaning on external authorities in the records of high-scoring men are:

M58: "If you don't harm anybody else, it's all right. . . . If you break a man-made law, it's OK if you don't harm someone else—the law is made to protect people. . . . If you harm yourself then also it could be wrong. . . . (Example?) Well, drinking . . . if in your own home, nobody hurt and perfectly all right. . . . Law is broken every day in this respect. Adultery, as long as never found out, is OK—if found out, then it's wrong. Since some of the most respected people do it, it must be all right."

M41: (Views?) "Well, I believe a person should believe in religion. . . . Helps to protect society. (Q) A person that believes in religion, they're not apt to . . . or pull off any kind of crime."

M51: "It's mostly a matter of disciplining yourself. . . . I never was so disgusted in my life (i.e., with Christian Science). . . . (What kind of things do you pray about?) I don't. . . . I ask whatever power there is to guide me—whether that power is divine mind or mortal mind—and I know that I'll be guided rightly."

M57: "Well, I believe . . . there must be a power over us. . . . Always know if a man does something wrong, sooner or later he'll get punished for it, so there must be some power to punish us. . . ."

The orientation toward inner standards can be seen in the following records of low scorers:

M42: (Views?) "Well, I think it's silly. (Laughs) Not silly, I wouldn't say that either. . . . I think they're ignorant people . . . have to be scared into the right kind of living . . . by fear of Hell . . . but I think a man can have his own religion without ever seeing a church . . . the Golden Rule . . . I think people feel that in themselves, but they're not changed by churches, etc. . . . I think religion, as the churches teach it, (is useless)."

M53: "Impulses suggest that you've given it some thought . . . and if you've given it some thought, you're going to control it, if you have any sense at all. . . . I don't think I have any desires that I have any difficulty in controlling."

F75: "About sex—it wasn't discussed. I don't know how we did find out. From friends I guess before we went into training and really learned. I think people should have standards within which they can give themselves leeway. If you don't have for yourself there is nothing to guide you. But it's just as bad to have them so rigid you can't break with them when you feel it is all right for yourself to do so."

The crucial difference between externalization and internalization of moral values has been discussed repeatedly and in various contexts throughout this volume. It may suffice to recall here the self-negating, fearful submission to the parents on the part of the ethnocentric subjects as described in Chapter X. The type of discipline used seems to prevent a genuine incorporation and assimilation of social values. The child had to renounce instinctual and other pleasures for an exchange of love which was given him only sparingly, inconsistently, and conditionally. Since the moral requirements must have appeared to the child overwhelming and unintelligible and the reward small, submission to them had to be reinforced by fear of, and pressure from, external agencies. This need for permanent reinforcement persisted, to become a constant state of affairs in the adult.

According to psychoanalytic theory, the development of ethical principles normally proceeds from outside values, as first represented by standards upheld by adults, to an internalization of these values. High scorers, due apparently to lack of genuine identification with the parents, do not succeed in making the important developmental step from mere "social anxiety" to real conscience. Fear of punishment by external authorities rather than self-chosen and ego-assimilated principles continue to be the primary determinant of their behavior. At the same time there is resentment against these authorities which are mainly experienced as restricting and punishing. Readiness to exchange these authorities mainly in the direction of a better bargain is one of the consequences of these attitudes. The preferred authority is the one who promises most in terms of material goods and backing to some release from restrictions which seem intolerable. Such persons have a longing to overthrow the troublesome moral restraints and to live fully according to the pleasure principle. The repressed, unsublimated, and unmodified tendencies are ready to break through and to flood the tenuously maintained social superstructure.

In contrast to the psychopath, the typical high scorer remains dependent

on the blessing given by external authority. This makes for his accessibility to being manipulated by social forces, primarily those which give license for aggression, although he always stays potentially within reach of the more positively productive influences also, if they are powerful.

The internalization of the superego by the typical low scorer makes for more judicious and responsible citizenship in private and in public life. A certain proportion of the low scorers, however, tend to develop a harsh and irrational superego, with an effect not altogether dissimilar from the punitiveness and moral indignation frequent in high scorers, the difference being that the resulting guilt-feelings tend to be more conscious in the low scorers. Only very few of our subjects—all of them low scorers—seem to have succeeded in avoiding the “impasse” between an unduly severe superego, on the one hand, and an underdeveloped one, on the other.

Nonacceptance and repression of id-tendencies which have been rendered ego-alien, as found significantly more often in high-scoring subjects (Category 54), may be assumed to be the result of fearful submission to external authority. Under such conditions sex and aggression, not being integrated with the rest of the personality, continue to lead an independent existence. Although repressed, they tend to “break through” occasionally in an uncontrolled way.

Low scorers, on the other hand, tend significantly more often toward accepting and sublimating their id-tendencies (Category 54, continued). A greater ability for integrating and expressing aggression, for a successful fusion of sex and affection, for “love” in general, and for creative work seem to be among the many consequences of a not-too-drastic repression of instinctual tendencies as discussed before in this volume. Examples were given primarily in the section dealing with the attitude toward sex.

8. STRENGTH OF THE EGO

Since low scorers often tend toward a more successful integration of the various aspects of their personality, they tend to remain less immature and less infantile. They thus turn out to have more capacity for sustained effort, more ability to postpone pleasure for the sake of internalized values, more ability to assume responsibility, and more emotional maturity. The absence vs. presence of any or all of these characteristics may be summarized as a “*weak*” vs. a “*strong*” ego. Since it was not expected that low scorers would tend to exhibit superlative ego strength, Category 55 contrasts a weak ego with an ego of either moderate or great strength. As anticipated, the latter alternatives were found predominantly in low scorers, the first predominantly in high scorers, the differences between the two groups reaching the 5 per cent level of significance in both men and women. The fact that low scorers manifest relative strength of the rational tendencies as compared with the irrational may well be due to their attempt to master and

sublimate rather than to escape the unconscious. Thus the low scorers' adaptation to reality is more flexible in spite of the more open conflict and anxiety which accompanies the greater awareness of existing problems.

This greater awareness, integration and, therefore, control of impulses is exemplified by the following record, quoted above, of a low-scoring subject:

M53: Subject questions the meaning of desires and impulses. "Impulses suggest that you've given it some thought . . . and if you've given it some thought, you're going to control it, if you have any sense at all. . . . I dont think I have any desires that I have any difficulty in controlling."

On the other hand, instinctual impulses are experienced as something overpowering and evil by the typical high-scoring subject. Repression of certain deeper tendencies on the part of the typical high scorer does not lessen their potential force. On the contrary, these frequently tend to find "projective" and other devious outlets. Excessive repression and counter-cathexis of unacceptable impulses requires inordinate expenditures of energy. This in turn contributes to the weakening of the ego, increasing the danger of a break-through of some of the repressed tendencies.

In spite of these over-all results, a certain type of ego-strength, that connected with the tenacious pursuit of success, is a frequent characteristic of the high scorer. On the other hand, low scorers sometimes dissipate their energies in internal conflicts or daydreaming. The Interview Scoring Manual concentrates on certain aspects of ego-strength; more detailed consideration of such further aspects as energy and determination in overt action may yield a somewhat different picture or even reveal a trend in the opposite direction than that noted in the preceding paragraphs (see also Chapter XI).

9. DISTORTION OF REALITY

One of the outlets for repressed instinctual tendencies is *distortion of outside reality*, as contrasted with a realistic and objective evaluation of reality (Category 56a). The difference between high- and low-scoring interviewees along this dimension is significant at the 5 per cent level for women, and there is a numerically similar trend—18 positive as against 7 negative instances—for men. (This, however, misses statistical significance due to the somewhat different proportion of interviewees in the two extreme groups as shown in the top portion of Table 1(XII)). In those parts of the interview that deal with political and social issues—omitted from the records as handed to the raters—this difference is more striking. It is there that we see most clearly the distortion of social reality, a reality which seems to serve primarily as a projection screen for repressed needs whenever repression transcends certain limits.

Less drastic but still apparent is the distortion manifested in the high scorers' evaluation of other people and of themselves. There also seems to be

a paradoxical connection between distortion of reality and overrealism in the high scorer: The distortion in the conception of other people is built into the framework of an anxiety-ridden, overrealistic idea of a bitter, competitive struggle.

Awareness of the difficulties in judging distortion of reality of such controversial issues as the evaluation of social groups and social events led the author of this chapter to a series of experiments in children on perception and related cognitive problems which were to test distortion on a more neutral ground. Preliminary results indicate that there is more distortion of memory material and of perceptual stimuli in ethnically prejudiced than there is in ethnically unprejudiced children (see 37 and forthcoming reports).

Another expression of repression, this time primarily of sex and aggression, is *authoritarian moralism* (Category 56b). By this is meant a moral indignation about manifestations of what is considered improper behavior especially when it occurs in persons considered socially inferior. This mechanism gives opportunity both for the release of aggression toward someone who cannot very well retaliate, and for projecting repressed sexual needs onto an "alien" group. Since this mechanism, of which ethnic prejudice is but a part, is widespread and socially accepted, a kind of pseudoreality is thus constructed which helps to keep the individual unaware of his distortions.

The fact that the difference between high scorers and low scorers with respect to an authoritarian moralism is statistically highly significant is of course not to be construed as indicating that low scorers tend to have a fully integrated personality without undue repressions. In the preceding chapters the repressions and conflicts characteristic of the low scorers have been pointed out in some detail. But instead of crudely projecting these tendencies onto outgroups, low scorers seem to tend toward what may be called *intellectualization* (not necessarily intellectual penetration) of their conflicts (Category 56b, continued). That is to say, they make a serious attempt at understanding what is going on in themselves by thinking about it and thus getting some clarification and integration, a procedure that may or may not be entirely successful. Their approach in general tends to be cognitively less diffuse and more structured than that of the high scorers.

The further mechanism of *denial of "negative" things in oneself*, predominant in high scorers, is clearly related to what has just been discussed, in the context of repression, as well as repeatedly pointed out elsewhere in this volume. The responsibility for that which is considered bad is shifted away from the subject and from the ingroup in general. The contrasting variant, completing Category 56c, is described as open psychological conflict concerning one's own adequacy, maturity, or the violation of liberal values by oneself. It is significantly more often (1 per cent level) found in the low scorers.

Examples from the interview records illustrating the denial of negative

traits, often manifested in a general, "official" optimism, have been quoted above (Chapter XI); a few further examples, again from the records of subjects scoring extremely high on the Ethnocentrism questionnaire, are:

M51: He does not feel that he has any serious problem except a tendency to get very drunk when discouraged, which he thinks he has conquered, pointing out that his recent drunkenness was purely a good-natured relaxation while he played juke boxes and had a pleasant evening before going to the hospital and that he wasn't arrested for that, but for being struck on the head.

M57: Though he expressed the superficial desire to understand why he had gotten in so much trouble when his brothers have not, and to straighten out, he spontaneously denied "that there is anything the matter with me." He also sought the interviewer's reassurance "that there is nothing the matter with me."

Admission of difficulties by low-scoring subjects is illustrated by the following quotations:

M16: During the interview he referred to himself wistfully "I guess I am a mature person now—or maybe not, otherwise I wouldn't be coming here," and "I guess I am a neurotic. . . . Well, that's just my trouble, I'm not at all aggressive. That's why I'm coming here. . . . I have reached a block in my work—something is hanging over me—always nervous—the sex problem."

M49: (What worry about most?) "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.' . . . Yeah, that's been one of my main problems. . . . I started here once in General Curriculum, and then stopped. I couldn't see any sense in going any further if I didn't know what I wanted to take."

10. PHYSICAL SYMPTOMS

The assumption that further manifestations of the repression tendencies typical of high scorers would be found in the more frequent occurrence of certain physical symptoms, as a type of "*projection onto the body*," did not materialize to a statistically significant degree although there is a trend in this direction (see below). The absence of clear-cut results in this respect may be due to the very high number of "Neutrals" (small total of H and L ratings) on the categories concerned, 56d and 56f.¹ This in turn may have been occasioned by our refraining from making a special inquiry concerning this point, or else by the fact that these symptoms are not general enough. Or, perhaps, both high and low scorers tend to use this mechanism to about the same extent.

More evidence concerning these alternatives might be obtained by further scrutinizing the available data. Six high-scoring but none of the low-scoring women show particular *concern with physical symptoms* (Category 56d). Similarly, 7 high-scoring and 3 low-scoring men show this concern. Furthermore, 7 high-scoring and 3 low-scoring women reported what amounts to

¹ Significant differences were found in a group of psychiatric clinic patients (see Chapter XXII).

hysterical conversions (Category 56f). However, the corresponding difference in men is altogether negligible (3 to 2). In a larger sample such differences might turn out to be significant, especially those for women.

Examples of concern with physical symptoms in high-scoring subjects follow. Whether and how much the complaints have a basis in reality is of course difficult to decide in the individual case; the fact remains that high scorers seem particularly inclined to dwell on their symptoms or disease records.

F71: Wouldn't like to be a nurse or M.D.—admires anyone who does, but "I hate hospitals. . . I've been in so many; two mastoid operations and heart murmur. I have a great fear of doctors' offices. My heart has been giving me trouble so I go to the doctor for checkups but haven't really been sick. Now I'm full of energy but they think its nervous energy. I tire easily. I had scarlet fever when I was 10."

F33: As a child subject had rickets. Later, the whole family with the exception of the mother came down with typhoid fever. Subject's sister caught it first, but it was not recognized at first and the doctor diagnosed it simply as a common cold, so that the subject was allowed to stay in the room with her and caught it from her as a result. In school the subject broke a leg. She suffers from severe menstrual cramps and menstruation has always been highly irregular. Her chief complaint, however, is a nervous stomach resulting in frequent stomach upsets with frightful nausea and vomiting. She is often unable to keep anything on her stomach for days at a time. She has always had a somewhat delicate stomach, but her first severe upset occurred the day after she announced her engagement to be married. Since her marriage she has had frequent severe upsets, some of which have necessitated hospitalization and intravenous injections of glucose. Subject does not smoke or drink but states that she does not mind being in the company of people who do, provided their drinking is moderate. There has been no thumb-sucking, nail-biting, or bed-wetting but there were feeding difficulties in early childhood because she could not take milk.

M13: "He (father) hasn't worked for thirty years. At the time he worked, the wage was around \$75 a month. He had stomach trouble. . . I have had a lot of sickness, stomach trouble ever since I was 12. I was in the hospital once for three months. During those periods I like to turn to the Bible. . . They found I was anemic at the age of 12. I had my first hemorrhage from the stomach when I was 18. It always comes when I start working too hard. . . I found out that she wasn't interested in money, but was interested in me in spite of my discharge from the army, my poor health and possibilities. . . She is a good cook, and that is an asset, what with my stomach condition."

M45: "Always sick, always going to the doctor. (What was wrong with you?) Well, I don't think they ever knew."

M51: "Wasn't it Emily Brontë who wrote so much, with tuberculosis? . . . It's not laziness (with the subject)." Subject goes on about his tuberculosis and its enervating effects upon him and the restriction which this places on what kind of work he can do, etc. (Are you an active tubercular?) "I'm an arrested tubercular, inactive . . . still. . ."

M45: "They thought it might be sugar diabetes. . . In my childhood, something that held me back, my kidneys. . . I wet the bed all the time, consequently couldn't visit other boys, etc. . . Might have given me a kind of complex. . . Though I couldn't help it. But I thought that other people might think that I could help it. . . Finally stopped when I was about 12."

Within the general framework of preoccupation with one's body there is

also some tendency, especially in high-scoring women, to put *exaggerated emphasis on physical appearance* (Category 56e). As many as 8 high-scoring women and only 1 low-scoring woman spontaneously refer to this aspect when describing people (see Chapters X and XI). The difference is, however, not significant, perhaps again due to the large number of "Neutrals." For men there is no trend in the direction indicated; in fact, there is even a slight reversal.

B. COGNITIVE PERSONALITY ORGANIZATION

1. DEFINITION OF RATING CATEGORIES AND QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

The last subsection of our Scoring Manual refers to those of the more general factors in personality orientation which are of a more specifically cognitive, or perceptual, character. Some of their special forms have been discussed repeatedly in the chapters dealing with the clinical aspects of the interviews. As in the preceding sections of this chapter, discussion can therefore again be brief and often will take the form of a summary.

The section of the Scoring Manual referring to cognitive factors follows:

INTERVIEW SCORING MANUAL: COGNITIVE PERSONALITY ORGANIZATION

(to Table 2(XII))

PRESUMABLY "HIGH" VARIANTS

57. *Rigid set and outlook*; pre-conceived categorizations, inaccessible to new experience
58. *Intolerant of ambiguity*
59. *Pseudoscientific or antiscientific*; implicit denial of personality dynamics; ready explanation by accidental factors, heredity, etc.; superstition
60. *Anti-intrceptive*
61. *Suggestible*, gullible
62. *Autistic thinking in goal-behavior*; unrealistic view of means-end relationships

PRESUMABLY "LOW" VARIANTS

57. *Flexible*: more adaptable to changing circumstances, more open to rational argument
58. *Tolerant of ambiguity*
59. *Scientific-naturalistic* orientation toward social and psychological dynamics
60. *Intrceptive*
61. *Autonomous*
62. *Realistic thinking in goal-behavior*

The quantitative results are shown in the usual manner in Table 2(XII).

2. RIGIDITY

The first two categories, *rigidity vs. flexibility* (Category 57), and *intolerance vs. tolerance of ambiguity* (Category 58) cover related personality trends. Most subjects received the same rating on the two variables. Differentiation between low scorers and high scorers in the anticipated direction

TABLE 2 (XII)
 INTERVIEW RATINGS ON COGNITIVE PERSONALITY ORGANIZATION
 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 or surpassed (percentage)
		25 women H	20 men and 15 women L	20 men and 15 women H	15 women L	"positive"	"negative"	
57. Rigid(H) vs. flexible(L)	Men	$\frac{18}{18}$	2	3	$\frac{13}{8}$	$\frac{31}{26}$	5	1
	Women	$\frac{18}{18}$	4	2	$\frac{8}{8}$	$\frac{26}{27}$	6	1
58. Intolerant of ambiguity(H) vs. tolerant of ambiguity(L)	Men	$\frac{16}{19}$	2	2	$\frac{17}{8}$	$\frac{33}{27}$	4	1
	Women	$\frac{19}{19}$	2	4	$\frac{8}{8}$	$\frac{27}{30}$	6	1
59. Pseudo- or anti-scientific(H) vs. scientific-naturalistic(L)	Men	$\frac{12}{10}$	3	1	$\frac{15}{14}$	$\frac{27}{30}$	4	1
	Women	$\frac{10}{10}$	1	0	$\frac{14}{14}$	$\frac{30}{32}$	1	1
60. Anti-intrceptive(H) vs. intrceptive(L)	Men	$\frac{16}{18}$	4	3	$\frac{16}{14}$	$\frac{32}{32}$	7	1
	Women	$\frac{18}{18}$	2	1	$\frac{14}{11}$	$\frac{32}{20}$	3	1
61. Suggestible, gullible(H) vs. autonomous(L)	Men	$\frac{13}{9}$	2	2	$\frac{15}{11}$	$\frac{28}{20}$	4	1
	Women	$\frac{9}{9}$	3	1	$\frac{11}{11}$	$\frac{20}{19}$	4	1
62. Autism(H) vs. realism(L) in goal-behavior	Men	$\frac{13}{8}$	5	7	$\frac{8}{11}$	$\frac{21}{19}$	12	12
	Women	$\frac{8}{8}$	9	3	$\frac{11}{11}$	$\frac{19}{19}$	12	12

is significant at the 1 per cent level throughout. High scorers show more rigidity and avoidance of ambiguity; low scorers tend toward greater flexibility and acceptance of ambiguity. The inability, on the part of typical high scorers, to face "ambivalence"—which is emotional ambiguity—has been discussed previously, mainly in connection with their attitude toward parents and toward the other sex: in these and other areas hostile emotions were found to have been repressed and hidden behind a façade of glorification. A rigid, and in most instances, conventionalized set of rules seems thus to determine the conception the typical high scorer has of his own and of other people's behavior. Values and religion are often taken over in their most dogmatic form. Quotations cited in the previous chapter revealed these rigid conceptions on the part of the high scorers in many a sphere of life.

On the other hand, the openness of conflicts and doubts in the case of low scorers likewise became obvious. Over and above the previous quotations the following records from the interviews of low-scoring subjects show their readiness to think over matters and to come to a solution through their own thinking as well as their unwillingness to take over traditional and fixed concepts and ideals without scrutiny:

M42: He shows much philosophizing about the purpose of it all, involving much questioning of prevailing values about work, success, etc. But, on the other hand, he keeps pulling back and is overcome with doubt and indecision about these things. He emphasizes the basic importance of happiness and the emptiness of "success" without any personal satisfaction.

M44: His speech abounds in qualifying phrases and overintellectualization. He seems repeatedly unable to verbalize a generalization before he is overwhelmed by a rush of qualifications. Further, his thinking is rich in philosophizing, psychologizing, and poetic statement. Moreover, these characteristics are not shallow but have much substance. "... Well, I don't think you should obey anyone or anything without question. I think it's man's unique function to question and when he ceases to question, he ceases to be man. (Have you ever had serious doubts about your religious beliefs?) Oh, not especially serious, I'd say, because I believe there should be changes."

M48: "I'm what they always call an agnostic. Sounds sort of prosaic. . . . I'm skeptical—though I believe Christ was a great man . . . persecuted. . . ."

M53: (How do you account for your growing away from the conventionalism of your background?) "I don't know. It wasn't simply a change of locale. I think, probably, through reading. From 15 to 16 I did a lot of reading and became rather dissatisfied with it (i.e., with conventional ideas with which brought up). (Were there any people who especially influenced you?) No, must have been a hell of a lot of people. (Q) I don't know. I think through reading. I enjoy reading for reading's sake as well as a means of securing information."

There is in the records of the low scorers a tendency to use a great deal of qualifying phrases and other devices characteristic of an approach that is judicious rather than prejudicial through dogma, convention or a fixed set. Impressionistic ratings based on synopsis as employed here are perhaps not

the best means to nail down this difference. More concrete experimental studies on intolerance toward ambiguity now in progress (for an advance report see Frenkel-Brunswik, 37, and forthcoming papers dealing with the relationship between emotional ambivalence and perceptual ambiguity), and on rigidity (Rokeach, 98) point toward the relative prominence in ethnically prejudiced as compared with unprejudiced children of a tendency to impose, in a rigid manner, certain preconceived sets upon ambiguous perceptual data or upon the solving of reasoning problems.

There seems to be a general tendency on the part of low scorers to expose themselves to broad experience—emotional, cognitive, perceptual—even at the risk of having to modify one's preconceived notions and of having to sustain conflicts. Thus all the evidence seems to point toward a greater overall rigidity in the high scorers as compared with the low scorers. These results however, as many others, may well be valid only for the extreme groups. In the medium range, on the other hand, rigidity may be neither pervasive nor relatively absent throughout the personality as a whole, but may be differentially distributed over some areas of personality whereas other areas retain their flexibility.

Although low scorers seem in general to accept more realities even if complex and unstructured, there is a distinct sub-variety of the ethnically extremely unprejudiced who cling to the liberal ideology in a rigid and stereotyped manner. This often goes with a personality structure not dissimilar to that of the typical high scorer. (See also the characterization of the "rigid low" in Chapter XIX.)

Intolerance of emotional and cognitive ambiguity seems not only to be a characteristic of the personality of the ethnically prejudiced; it also appears as part of the explicitly stated ego-ideal of exponents of the Nazi ideology in professional psychology. The most notable case is that of E. R. Jaensch with his programmatic glorification of a personality type characterized by fixed relationships between stimuli and perceptual responses, and with his rejection of the school of Gestalt psychology mainly on the ground of its stress on the concept of ambiguity. (For a summary on Jaensch see the paper by Boder, in Harriman, 47; see also 37.)

3. NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD SCIENCE. SUPERSTITION

The inability to "question" matters and the need for definite and dogmatic answers, as frequently found in high scorers, leads either to an easy acceptance of stereotyped, *pseudoscientific* answers, of which escape into ready-made hereditarian explanations is but one manifestation, or else to an explicitly *antiscientific* attitude. Explanations by accidental factors are likewise included under this general heading. Its opposite is a *scientific-naturalistic attitude*, found predominantly in the low scorers. The entire Category 59 encompassing these alternatives differentiates significantly (at the 1 per

cent level) for both men and women. The difference in attitudes involved has been described previously, primarily in discussing the subjects' concepts of their "selves." It will be remembered that it was the low scorers who showed a tendency toward explanations in terms of sociopsychological dynamics.

The antiscientific thinking of the typical high scorer is closely connected with his tendency toward *superstition*, as discussed in Chapter VII. The tendency toward superstition is illustrated by the following records of high-scoring women:

F31: "I am not superstitious. Mother is a little bit superstitious. She believes in old-world customs and palmistry. I'm not a fatalist, either; what I do will control my life, what I make of it. But I don't know about that—there are the boys on the battlefield, for instance. They say a bullet has your name on it."

F36: Subject does not believe in formal religion; this is why she likes the Unitarians. She does not think the churches should have a narrow, strict creed and tell you exactly what you should believe. She has read a great deal of theosophy, Madame Blavatsky, etc. She believes in reincarnation and divine will: reincarnation in the sense that the soul goes from one body to another and that you will be subjected to those experiences that are necessary to learning, to enable the soul to reach a higher state.

F60: (Why did you come to _____?) "Why, I don't know! It just happened. Don't you think some things just happen to us?" (Superstition?) She was just "called" to do it. Once she was out walking in the early morning—the birds were singing—she raised her hands and her face to the sky, and they were wet. (What was it?) She considered it a supernatural phenomenon.

Along the same line Lentz (67) reports that conservatives are more antagonistic to science, especially with regard to its future activities, and, conversely, are more superstitious. They feel much more favorable toward the conventional, the traditional, and the routine. They are less tolerant and sympathetic towards the underdog, less aesthetic and less imaginative.

The fact that high scorers on ethnocentrism are more often given to stereotyping, pre-judgments and ready generalizations, or else to overconcreteness, should not blind us to the fact that there also are tendencies of this kind in the low scorers. The increasing complexity of the social realities and their partial unintelligibility to the individual sometimes may necessitate a falling back on stereotypes so that opaque events appear more comprehensible (see Chapter XVII). Ethnic prejudice is but one of many possible media for this tendency. It must be held in favor of the ethnically unprejudiced, however, that they make a serious effort to counteract such stereotyping in one of the areas of paramount social significance.

4. ANTI-INTRACEPTIVENESS AND AUTISM

Likewise previously discussed but rated here directly and in its own right is the tendency, found primarily in the high scorer, toward what may be

called *anti-intracptiveness* as contrasted with a greater readiness toward intraception in the low scorer (Category 60). The difference is significant at the 1 per cent level. The concept of intraception covers the tendency toward introspection, as well as a readiness toward gaining insights into psychological and social mechanisms. It is contrasted primarily with externalizations of various kinds as referred to above. The greater creativity, imagination, and ability for empathy of the low scorers just discussed is likewise related to their greater intracptiveness.

It may suffice to cite here in addition to previous quotations only one record of a low-scoring woman and one of a low-scoring man in which the tendency toward reflection becomes apparent.

F70: Always wanted to work with people. . . . (What does religion give you?) "I suppose going to church takes a load off of me of thinking about things I should think about. I think it covers my social ideas, and it causes me to think about things I must think about for some reason. (What about?) Moral values, the relative value between peace and liberty in wartime, for instance. Pacifism and its ins and outs, interpersonal relationship as moral values. I don't think of those values as right or wrong, except as it has social implications."

M50: (Future?) "I don't know. I just recently came of the opinion that it is not necessary for me to be a commercial artist. Important to do whatever I do well. Not important what I do any more (Q) Well, I was the prima donna type . . . built up myself into an idea that not suited for the work . . . now it doesn't matter any more . . . it began when I was here about a month . . . the child guidance center psychologist gave a speech . . . he gave the idea that (deviation in behavior has a cause). . . . It may go back to infancy. . . . I play around with it (leading to nothing) . . . until a friend also interested made a startling remark. . . . Then I thought a lot about it . . . put down reasons on both sides, on two sheets of paper and decided he was right. 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. . . ."

The absence of proper orientation toward social and psychological dynamics in the typical high scorer may be linked to a general tendency toward *autistic thinking in goal behavior* as contrasted with the somewhat more realistic attitude that might be expected to be present in the typical low scorer (Category 62). Though not significantly differentiating between the two extreme groups of interviewees, this category shows a distinct trend in the direction that we expected (21 positive as compared with 12 negative instances in men, and 19 positive as compared with 12 negative instances in women). The trend is particularly evident in the vocational choices and economic expectations of our subjects.

The somewhat adolescent and fantastic, glamour-seeking character of the vocational ambitions of high-scoring subjects is illustrated by the following records:

F66: "If you're good, you can get up to ambassador. I think there have been

some women ambassadors. Or maybe there were only women ministers. I made the choice about three years ago. I just heard some friends of mine talking about it, and it sounded interesting. (Why vocational choice?) Well, salary had a little to do with it. I think if I could really put myself to it, I could do it. If I really wanted to and had nothing else to stand in the way. The times have much to do with my choice. I would like to know why they do what they do."

F34: Subject wants to be a journalist. This is purely utilitarian. She likes journalism, but her real desire is to do creative writing. She has imagined herself as a great actress. "But my acting is purely amateur stuff. I was always active in school dramatics as well as high school journalism. The family used to laugh because I was always play-acting. I always said I'd earn my living at either acting or writing. . . ."

5. SUGGESTIBILITY

Submission to authority and lack of independence and of critical judgment tend to lead the high scorer toward being *suggestible and gullible*, as contrasted with the greater *autonomy* of the low scorer (Category 61). Again, the difference is significant at the 1 per cent level for both men and women. The social implications of a tendency on the part of the gullible person to fall easy prey to unsound and destructive political propaganda are obvious. The high scorer's dependence, in his personal life, upon authority, conventionalized values, church dogma, public opinion, and prestige figures, and the low scorer's relative independence of, and occasional rebellion against, these authorities have been pointed out so often throughout this volume that no further comment seems necessary.

The present chapter will be summarized together with a general synopsis of the interview results at the conclusion of the chapter which follows.