CHAPTER XIII

COMPREHENSIVE SCORES AND
SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW RESULTS

Else Frenkel-Brunswik

A. THE DISCRIMINATORY POWERS OF THE MAJOR AREAS STUDIED

1. VERIFICATION OF ANTICIPATED TREND BY CATEGORIES

In the preceding four chapters (IX to XII), the technique of interviewing was described, and specific results of interviews with eighty subjects scoring extremely high or extremely low on the overt anti-Semitism or Ethnocentrism scales were presented and discussed in terms of the approximately ninety rating categories of the Scoring Manual used to classify the records of the subjects.

As shown in the tables of these chapters, a sizable proportion of the categories differentiated high scorers from low scorers to a statistically significant degree in the direction anticipated for either or both sexes. The vast majority of the remaining categories showed at least a trend in the expected direction. For men, there are only three out of the eighty-six categories for which the number of “positive” and “negative” instances is equal, and only one (Category 23c) which shows a slight trend in the direction opposite to the one expected. As can be seen from Tables 3(X), 1(XI), and 2(XI), to which the four exceptions are limited, the absolute number of ratings involved is very small in each case; the items involved deal with certain aspects of attitude toward siblings, sex, and people. For women there are two out of the ninety categories that show equality and four that show reversal, all six exceptions being confined to Tables 1(X), 2(X), and 3(X), and dealing with aspects of the relationships to parents and siblings. In no case does the reversal approach statistical significance; nor does it appear in the case of any category that yielded less than 50 per cent “Neutral” ratings and was thus included in the list of those for which intensive evaluation was undertaken (72 for men and 65 for women, see end of Chapter IX).
### TABLE 1 (XIII)

**COMPOSITE RATINGS (MEANS) FOR MAJOR AREAS OF STUDY FOR "HIGH" AND "LOW" SCORING GROUPS OF INTERVIEWEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Based on categories presented in tables</th>
<th>Dealing with</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Means of High(H) and Low(L) ratings received by 20 men and 25 women &quot;high scorers&quot;</th>
<th></th>
<th>Means of High(H) and Low(L) ratings received by 20 men and 15 women &quot;low scorers&quot;</th>
<th></th>
<th>Sums of Means</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(X), 2(X), 3(X)</td>
<td>Parents and Childhood</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(XI)</td>
<td>Attitude toward Sex</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(XI)</td>
<td>Attitude toward People</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(XI)</td>
<td>Attitude toward Present Self</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>26.11</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(XI)</td>
<td>Attitude toward Childhood Self</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(XII)</td>
<td>Dynamic Character Structure</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>20.87</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(XII)</td>
<td>Cognitive Personality Organization</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>28.67</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>25.67</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All tables</td>
<td>All categories</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>18.48</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus there are no "negative validities" in the evaluation of the interviews. This result is not surprising in view of the fact that the categories of the Scoring Manual were derived from previous empirical evidence, including a preliminary inspection of the interview material; even so, the fact that the subsequent "blind" rating procedure supported most of the hypotheses with which the evaluation began is strong evidence of their validity.

2. COMPOSITE RATINGS FOR SEVEN MAJOR AREAS

Considering the almost universally confirmatory trend of the results just discussed, the computation of average ratings for larger groups of categories seems justified. The results of this procedure are presented in Table 1 (XIII) in the same manner as in the preceding tables except for the fact that indication of statistical significance is here omitted.

As can be seen by an inspection of the last two columns of the table, differentiation between high scorers and low scorers is consistently somewhat less clear-cut for women than for men. This may be due either to the unequal size of the two samples of women interviewees, or to the fact, repeatedly referred to above, that women were in the main interviewed at an earlier stage of the investigation than were men. It may also be that, in our culture at least, patterns of behavior and ideology are more coherent and consistent in men than they are in women.

Among all the areas studied, that of attitudes toward present self yields the most clear-cut differentiation between high scorers and low scorers. The ratio between "positive" (confirmatory) and "negative" instances is among the most favorable. At the same time, the absolute values of the positive instances are among the highest. This indicates, furthermore, that the number of "Neutral" ratings is relatively low for this area.

The categories pertaining to dynamic and, especially, cognitive personality organization likewise show excellent differentiation, a very high proportion of the differences being statistically significant.

Contrariwise, over-all results are least sharply defined in the area of attitude toward parents and siblings, for reasons outlined in Chapter X. This is in line with what was stated above concerning absence of reversal of the expected trend in the case of a few scattered categories pertaining to these topics. Even for this area, however, the ratio of positive to negative instances is, for the men, better than three to one, and thus the differentiation is quite satisfactory.

An explanation of the differences in discriminatory power among the various major areas covered by the ratings of interviews may be in the following. An adequate survey of the early family situation requires a great deal more specific information than could be obtained in our necessarily circumscribed interviews, and this made for the large proportion of "Neutral"
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ratings. Such aspects as cognitive organization and attitude toward self, on the other hand, may be inferred from expressions in a greater variety of fields, and thus the likelihood of insufficient information is reduced. Over and above this, the very nature of such formal variables permits the subject himself to choose from among a variety of "alternate" manifestations, many of them encompassed in a single rating category. This principle of shifting expression of identical motivational tendencies is apt to give an advantage to motivational categories regardless of how complete the specific information on any particular aspect of life may be. It is for the same reason that the value of generalized, synoptic ratings, as contrasted with specific or situationally limited quantification, was so much stressed at the beginning of the discussion of the problems connected with the evaluation of interviews (Chapter IX; see also 31, 32, 34, 36).

B. VALIDITY OF OVER-ALL SCORES AND RATINGS OF THE INTERVIEWS

1. INDIVIDUAL COMPOSITE SCORE BASED ON ALL AREAS OF RATING

Composite ratings, covering the entire range of the areas of rating, were also obtained for each individual interviewee. In a sense, these composite ratings define what may be called the "score" of the subject on the interview. (It was with a view to this final score that the manual was designated as the Interview Scoring Manual in spite of the fact that for each of the constituent categories ratings rather than scores were obtained.) Since, as was pointed out in the preceding section, there were no reversals of the expected discriminatory trend on any of the categories yielding less than 50 per cent "Neutral" ratings, all of these categories were included in the final score. These scores are shown, for all the 80 subjects interviewed, in Tables 1(IX) and 2(IX). The score itself is given in two parts, defined by the sums of the "High" and of the "Low" ratings received by the individual. The difference between the sum of these two parts and the fixed total (72 for men and 65 for women), not shown in the tables, indicates the number of "Neutral" ratings received by the individual on the categories in question.

The column referring to composite standing shows the letter H or L, depending on the preponderance of the High or the Low score in the preceding pair of columns.¹

Means of the quantitative data are shown in the bottom rows of the tables. The ranges of the number of "high" and "low" interview scores for each of the four groups can be read directly from the two tables.

¹ Concerning the use of capital and lower-case symbols and other technical data pertinent to this section see Chapter IX, Section F, 3.
2. OVER-ALL INTUITIVE RATING AND ITS AGREEMENT WITH THE COMPOSITE SCORE

The last column in Tables 1(IX) and 2(IX) adds what was briefly mentioned in Chapter IX as the intuitive rating of the interviewee. This is based on an informal synopsis and estimate after the blind interview-rating procedure had been completed, and it was made without the rater’s making explicit to himself the quantitative results in terms of specific ratings on the single categories.

Composite scores and intuitive ratings agree very highly with one another. There is only one subject, F72, among the 80 interviewees for whom there is a discrepancy between the two values. In her case the composite score (H) is correct; the over-all intuitive rating (L) is incorrect.

3. AGREEMENT WITH THE QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

It will be noted that while there is consistency as to “low” vs. “high” standing in the A-S and E columns of Tables 1(IX) and 2(IX)—this standing having been the very criterion of selection of the interviewees—the subsequent columns show a good deal of inconsistency. This inconsistency reaches major proportions in such cases as F21 or F39, both overt low scorers who nonetheless score among the highest on the interview, with respect to both the composite score and the synoptic over-all ratings. Similar instances of opposition, though not all as striking ones, can be found among the high scorers. Various other kinds of inconsistency of trend may be noted upon inspection of the tables.

The general agreement between various columns in Tables 1(IX) and 2(IX) containing letter indices may be expressed conveniently in terms of percentage. “Percentage agreement” is then defined as the percentage of equal-letter combinations (HH or LL) in any pair of columns considered. The figures on percentage agreement could easily be transformed into tetrachoric correlation coefficients.

The defining criterion of selection, extremely high vs. extremely low standing on the overt anti-Semitism or Ethnocentrism scale, shows a percentage agreement of about 85 with both the over-all intuitive ratings and the composite standing on the interview. (This figure is an average of an agreement of about 95 per cent achieved by the rater whose material happened to include the most complete interviews, and of an agreement of 75 per cent achieved by the other of the two raters whose data were more fragmentary.)

Since composite ratings agree with intuitive ratings almost completely (see above), the figures for the agreement of overt ethnocentrism with the intuitive ratings are practically identical with those mentioned above for composite ratings.
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Intuitive as well as composite interview ratings show slightly less agreement with standing on the F and the PEC scales, but even here the figures are between 75 and 80 per cent.

C. SUMMARY OF THE PERSONALITY PATTERNS DERIVED FROM THE INTERVIEWS

1. INTRODUCTION

The results of the "blind" ratings of the interviews, as discussed in the present and in the preceding four chapters, have shown that individuals extremely high on overt ethnic prejudice tend to differ with respect to a great variety of personality traits from those extremely low on prejudice. Some of the personality traits discussed were also measured by other techniques, especially the questionnaire. The results obtained by the various methods independently are very similar. However, rating by categories describes and substantiates in a more systematic, organized, and controlled way the impressions formed about the personality differences between high scorers and low scorers in the course of intensive study of individual cases.

It has to be emphasized, of course, that these differences are based on an analysis of group trends within statistical samples and do not imply that every individual will exhibit most or even a large proportion of the features belonging to either the "high" or the "low" syndrome, as the case may be. As can be seen from Tables 1 (IX) and 2 (IX), certain individuals seem to possess a relatively large number of either "high" or "low" features while others seem to have features of both patterns, with a relatively slight prevalence of one or the other. It should thus be kept in mind that the summary which follows deals with composite pictures of these patterns, abstracted from the study of groups, rather than with individual cases. Were we to lay greater stress on concrete personalities, the most frequent syndromes or combinations of trends within single individuals would have to be determined as an intermediate step, leading to the definition of subtypes within the prejudiced and the unprejudiced patterns. Some remarks pointing in this direction will be made in the following summary. The typology, as such, of the ethnically prejudiced, will be taken up more systematically in Chapter XIX.

The results are furthermore limited to trends found in individuals with extreme standing on the prejudice scale. How far the relations would hold for those with middle scores on prejudice has to be left open, since such individuals were not included in the present intensive investigation by means of interviews.

Finally, it remains for future investigation to ascertain how far the interrelationships found are interculturally valid or whether they are restricted
to certain specific cultures or subcultures, such as the one from which our sample of subjects has been drawn; namely, an urban and suburban population on the West Coast of the United States.

In an attempt to summarize the social and psychological factors which, within our limited framework, have been found to be related to prejudice, we will proceed in the following manner: First, the aspects and “themes” of the personality structure of the high scorer as differentiated from the low scorer will be described in a synoptic fashion. Next, hypotheses concerning the genetic aspects of these two distinct patterns will be put forward. And finally, an attempt will be made to relate both patterns to the over-all cultural pattern.

2. REPRESSION VS. AWARENESS

In summarizing differences in the personality structure of our two groups, we may best start with the findings discussed in the preceding chapter under the heading of “defense mechanisms.” Regardless of whether the specific topic was that of ambivalence, or aggression, or passivity, or some other related feature of personality dynamics, the outstanding finding was that the extremely unprejudiced individual tends to manifest a greater readiness to become aware of unacceptable tendencies and impulses in himself. The prejudiced individual, on the other hand, is more apt not to face these tendencies openly and thus to fail in integrating them satisfactorily with the conscious image he has of himself. The resultant break between the conscious and the unconscious layers in the personality of the high scorers, as compared with the greater fluidity of transition and of intercommunication between the different personality strata in the low scorers, appears to have the greatest implications for their respective personality patterns.

3. EXTERNALIZATION VS. INTERNALIZATION

Among the tendencies which the typical high scorer attempts to keep in a repressed state (but which nonetheless find indirect expression in the interview) are mainly fear, weakness, passivity, sex impulses, and aggressive feeling against authoritative figures, especially the parents. Among the rigid defenses against these tendencies there is, above all, the mechanism of projection, by which much of what cannot be accepted as part of one’s own ego is externalized. Thus it is not oneself but others that are seen as hostile and threatening. Or else one’s own weakness leads to an exaggerated condemnation of everything that is weak; one’s own weakness is thus fought outside instead of inside. At the same time there is a compensatory—and therefore often compulsive—drive for power, strength, success, and self-determination.

Repression and externalization of the instinctual tendencies mentioned reduces their manageability and the possibility of their control by the individual, since it is now the external world to which the feared qualities of the
unconscious are ascribed. As long as social conditions are conducive to and furnish acceptable outlets for compensatory tendencies, a relative mental balance within the individual may well be achieved in this manner.

Another aspect of externalization may be found in a tendency toward avoidance of introspection and of insight in general, thus rendering the content of consciousness relatively narrow. Since the energy of the person is in this case largely devoted either to keeping instinctual tendencies out of consciousness or to striving for external success and status, there appears to be relatively little left for genuine libidinization of one's interpersonal relationships, or of one's work, as ends in themselves. The comparatively impoverished potentialities for interpersonal relationships may exhibit themselves either in a relatively restricted, conventional, but dependable approach to people, as found primarily in the more conservative subgroup of the high scorers, or in a ruthless, manipulative approach, as found in the more delinquent subgroup.

There also seems to be relatively little enjoyment of sensuality or of passive pleasures such as affection, companionship, or art and music on the part of the typical high scorer. Instead of these internalized pleasures, there is an inclination toward mobility and activity, and a striving for material benefits.

The composite picture of the low scorer, on the other hand, not only reveals greater readiness to accept and to face one's impulses and weaknesses, but also to ruminate about them. While for the high scorer possible loss of energy is connected with his tendency toward rigid repressions, the low scorer is apt to waste energies by indulging in often unfruitful introspection and by placing the blame for mishaps too much upon himself. In contrast to the high scorer's tendency toward externalization, the typical low scorer is prone to internalize in an excessive manner, and this in turn may lead to open anxiety, feelings of guilt, and other neurotic features.

The positive aspects of this latter kind of orientation are a more closely knit integration within the individual and a more internalized and more intensive, though not conflict-free relation to others. The low scorer also tends to be oriented, more than is the high scorer, toward real achievement, toward intellectual or aesthetic goals, and toward the realization of socially productive values. His greater capacity for intensive interpersonal relationships goes hand in hand with greater self-sufficiency. He struggles for the establishment of inner harmony and self-actualization, whereas the high scorer is concentrated on an effort to adjust to the outside world and to gain power and success within it.

One of the results of greater internalization is the generally more creative and imaginative approach of the low scorer both in the cognitive and in the emotional sphere, as compared with a more constricted, conventional, and stereotypical approach in the high scorer.
4. CONVENTIONALISM VS. GENUINENESS

Conformity is one of the major expressions of lack of an internal focus in the high scorer. One of the outstanding characteristics to be found in both the conservatively inclined, as well as in the delinquent subvariety of the high scorer (see Chapter XXI), is the adoption of conventional values and rules. High scorers generally seem to need external support—whether this be offered by authorities or by public opinion—in order to find some assurance concerning what is right and what is wrong.

Conformity to externalized values in the extremely prejudiced can be observed in a variety of spheres of life. One of the earliest expressions of this conventionality is to be found, probably, in the high scorer’s attitude toward his parents. It is one of stereotypical admiration, with little ability to express criticism or resentment. There are many indications that there actually is often considerable underlying hostility toward the parents which—though not always expressed—prevents the development of a truly affectionate relationship.

The greater genuineness of the low scorer is evident in his attitude toward the parents. His is an equalitarian conception of the parent-child relationship. This makes it possible for him to express criticism and resentment openly, and at the same time to have a more positive and affectionate relation with the parents. The descriptions of the parents given by the low scorers have an aspect of spontaneity: they depict real people with all their inherent assets and shortcomings.

External criteria, especially social status, are the yardsticks by which the high scorer tends to appraise people in general and the ground on which he either admires and accepts, or rejects them. Such values form the basis of a hierarchical order in which the powerful are seen at the top and the weak at the bottom. This may well be an over-all tendency in modern culture which, however, the high scorer displays to an exaggerated degree. The typical low scorer, on the other hand, seems to have developed for himself an image of other people which includes congeniality even with outgroups rather than conceiving of them mainly as a threat or danger. Feeling more secure, he searches in his relations with other people primarily for a realization of positive and individualized values rather than being oriented primarily toward getting support and help from the powerful as is the typical high scorer.

The high scorers’ conception of the sex roles is likewise highly conventionalized. The high-scoring man tends to think of himself as active, determined, energetic, independent, rough, and successful in the competitive struggle. There is no room in this ego-ideal for passivity and softness, and thus strong defenses are erected against these attitudes in general, the effect being that only their opposites are established in consciousness. Nonetheless,
inclinations toward dependency and a far-reaching passivity are evident in
the interviews of high-scoring men although these remain unaccepted and
ego-alien.

The role of the woman, as seen by the high-scoring man, is one of pas-
sivity and subservience. She is an object of solicitude on the part of the
man. The hierarchical idea involved corresponds to the well-known conven-
tional cliché and at the same time offers the high-scoring man the much-
needed opportunity of asserting his superiority. There is, however, ample
evidence that the high-scoring man wants to be on the receiving end in his
relation to women; from them he wants material benefits and support more
than he wants pure affection, for it would be difficult for him to accept the
latter. There is relatively little genuine affective involvement in his non-
nuclear sex relations, and of his wife he tends to require the conventional
prerequisites of a good housewife. On the whole, sex is for him in the service
of status, be this masculine status as achieved by pointing toward conquests,
or be it social status as achieved by marrying the “right kind” of woman.

Low-scoring men, on the other hand, tend to look primarily for com-
panionship, friendship, and sensuality in their relations to the other sex. They
are able openly to take and to give nurturance and succorance in their rela-
tions with women. In fact, we often find a rather insatiable search for love
and complete acceptance by the woman in low-scoring men, and this is often
a source of open ambivalence toward her. Passivity and softness is thus an
accepted part of the ego-ideal of the low-scoring man, who at the same time
is often more capable of giving real protection and support in return. All
degrees of expressiveness, ranging from extreme sexual inhibition, due to an
overly developed and powerful superego, to a conscious tendency toward
impulse-riddenness, may be found among low-scoring subjects.

The extremely unprejudiced woman likewise looks primarily for mutual
interests and affection in her choice of a mate. As the low-scoring man shows
greater readiness than does the high scorer to accept feminine features in
himself, so the low-scoring woman tends not to repress but rather to accept
and to sublimate her masculine tendencies by pursuing so-called masculine
interests and activities. Though this often leads to open competition with,
and envy of, men, there is at the same time more understanding and more
genuine liking for them. There is more evidence of an open conflict about
the feminine role, and at the same time evidence of more clearly focused
heterosexuality and of more intensive maternal feelings.

The high-scoring woman, on the other hand, clings to a self-image of con-
ventional femininity defined by subservience to, and adulation of, men. At
the same time there is evidence of an exploitive and hostile attitude toward
men, expressed only indirectly in the interviews and shown quite directly
in the stories of the Thematic Apperception Test (see Chapter XIV). Since
the high-scoring woman tends to renounce inclinations toward interests con-
sidered masculine in our culture, and since the home does not provide her with satisfactory forms of expression, her underlying bitterness often assumes deviously destructive forms. One way in which such a negative attitude is manifested is in her exaggerated demands on men as providers; another is the living out of her thwarted ambitions through the medium of the man. Again it may be that it is the general cultural plight of the woman that finds an exaggerated release in the high-scoring woman; indeed, low-scoring women seem by no means untouched by the difficult situation imposed upon them by our civilization. But whereas the high-scoring woman tends to give preference to the ideal of a restricted rather than a vaguely defined role for women, the low-scoring woman is more apt to take on the conflict and to face it openly.

As was anticipated above, the element of conventionality in the conception of sex roles is only part of a more general conventional self-image found to be characteristic of the high scorers. Good manners, attainment of success and status, self-control, and poise are some of the further requirements. Deviations from this ego-ideal are usually considered as inexplicable “breakthroughs” of forces that lie beyond the responsibility of the individual, such as external stress, heredity, etc.

Low scorers, on the other hand, are worried, in their self-evaluation, about attainment of goals in the realm of achievement, about the realization of socially constructive values, about success or failure in friendship, and about guilt resulting from aggression and ambivalence.

5. POWER VS. LOVE-ORIENTATION

The orientation toward conventional values in the high scorers as compared with orientation toward more intrinsic and basic values in the low scorers was found to extend over different areas of life. Related to conventionalism is the tendency toward admiration of, and search for, power, likewise more pronounced in the typical high scorer.

The comparative lack of ability for affectionate and individualized interpersonal relations, together with the conception of a threatening and dangerous environment, must be seen as underlying the prejudiced individual's striving for the attainment of power, either directly or by having the powerful on his side. In this vein, weakness is considered dangerous since it may lead to being “devoured” by the strong (see Simmel, 111), or at least to deprivation or starvation, dangers only too readily anticipated by the high scorer.

In this context we often find a frame of mind best characterized as “overrealism,” a tendency to utilize everything and everybody as means to an end. Needless to say, such overrealism seems but rarely to lead to a real attainment of the goals involved and thus to ultimate satisfaction; it often involves strained interpersonal relations and possible or actual retaliation, of which
there is much fear. The conflict arising between an unaccepted and un-recognized dependency on others for things and benefits, on the one hand, and the hostility stemming from distrust, envy, and feelings of being thwarted, on the other, cannot be resolved.

It is especially the prejudiced man who—as mentioned before—often considers ruthless opportunism as an essential attribute of masculinity. As a reaction to his fear of his passivity and dependency, he develops a propensity for power and success as the only measures of his value.

Modern authors have repeatedly stressed the fact that status as a measure of one’s worth is a general phenomenon in American civilization. Assuming that this is the case, there still is a difference between the picture of the composite high scorer and of the composite low scorer in this respect. Whereas the striving for status and power, in their purely external aspects, seems to be the major concern of the extremely prejudiced, the unprejudiced individual—though as a rule by no means disinterested in status—still has a greater variety of other resources and pleasures at his disposal.

The search for affection and love in one’s personal relationships is an important determinant of the behavior of the typical low scorer. To develop a satisfactory relation to one’s mate and to friends is considered essential for happiness. In fact, much thought—often of an obsessional intensity—seems to be devoted to the striving for such ideal bonds, and to anxiety over the actual or potential failure of this striving. If successfully established, such intense relations constitute one of the most important sources of gratification. At the same time, the often insatiable wish for being fully accepted and loved leads to frustration and open ambivalence for the object of attachment. Thus it is that low scorers often manifest painful emotional dependence on others; this is a further way in which they may become maladjusted.

Not only contact with other people but also work tends to become more libidinized in the low scorers than in the high scorers. Though far from being indifferent to recognition, low scorers place comparatively little emphasis on their activities as means to an end; rather, these activities tend to become a source of pleasure and satisfaction in their own right, or else the emphasis lies on their social implications. Activity contributing to the realization of what may be called liberal values may also become important to the low scorer. Finally, interest and liking for art, music, literature, and philosophy are more often found in the low scorer. It may be considered that such interests contribute substantially to the greater resourcefulness, and to the comparative diversion from power and status, that is characteristic of the low scorer.

6. RIGIDITY VS. FLEXIBILITY. PROBLEMS OF ADJUSTMENT

One of the most pervasive formal aspects of the personality organization of the extremely prejudiced individual is his rigidity. This must be seen as a
consequence of the features discussed so far. In order to keep unacceptable tendencies and impulses out of consciousness, rigid defenses have to be maintained. Any loosening of the absoluteness of these defenses involves the danger of a breaking through of the repressed tendencies. Impulses and inclinations repressed too severely, too suddenly, or too early in life do not lose their dynamic strength, however. On the contrary, abrupt or unsuccessful repression prevents rather than helps in their control and mastery. An ego thus weakened is more in danger of becoming completely overwhelmed by the repressed forces. Greater rigidity of defenses is necessary to cope with such increased threat. In this vicious circle, impulses are not prevented from breaking out in uncontrolled ways. Basically unmodified instinctual impulses lurk everywhere beneath the surface, narrowing considerably the content of the ego so that it must be kept constantly on the lookout. Rational control extends to a small sector of the personality only. As long as situational conditions of life draw on this sector only, and as long as our culture provides socially acceptable outlets for suppressed impulses, smooth functioning and fair adjustment can be achieved within the given framework.

But it must be kept in mind that the adjustment of the typical high scorer depends on conditions that are comparatively narrowly circumscribed. The idea of a sharp ingroup-outgroup dichotomy provided by our culture makes it possible for the high scorer to suppress the feared awareness of his hostility against the prestige figures, on which he is dependent, by displacing it onto weak outgroups from whom no retaliation need be feared. This mechanism enables him, furthermore, to remain relatively unaware of his own psychological weaknesses, since he now may feel superior to the socially weaker groups. Among other things, fear of one's own immoral tendencies can be alleviated by exaggerating and condemning the immorality of others, particularly outgroups.

As far as positive goals are concerned, the relative lack of individuation is compensated for by taking over conventional clichés and values. Rigid adherence to substitutes and crutches of this kind is found in various spheres of life. However, the tendency toward externalization, if kept within bounds, may often be in harmony with a healthy concern for external goals. Without such a tendency toward externalization, the individual might frequently go down in a competitive society.

In order to keep the balance under these conditions, a simple, firm, often stereotypical, cognitive structure is required. There is no place for ambivalence or ambiguities. Every attempt is made to eliminate them, but they remain as potentials which might interfere at any time. In the course of these attempts a subtle but profound distortion of reality has to take place, precipitated by the fact that stereotypical categorizations can never do justice to all the aspects of reality. As long as such distortions remain part and parcel of the cultural inventory, the removal of prejudice from the potentially
fascist person may well endanger his psychological balance. The social implications of such a step have therefore to be carefully anticipated and preventive measures to be devised in advance.

The avoidance of ambiguities and the rigidity of mental sets in the ethnically prejudiced also becomes evident in the handling of perceptual and other cognitive materials free of immediate social and emotional implications (37; 98). The tendency to impose preconceived and often stereotypical categories upon experience may thus be envisaged as a more general trait in subjects scoring extremely high on Ethnocentrism. It must be reiterated, however, that there is a distinct sub-type among extreme low scorers in whom liberal ideology becomes a cliché that may include an undue glorification of the underdog, and who at the same time shows signs of rigidity in his personality makeup. On the other hand, it is primarily the conservative type of high scorer who displays rigidity, while the skillful manipulator among the high scorers is often characterized by a great deal of flexibility (see Chapter XIX). On the whole, however, it is in the low scorer that we find the more flexible emotional and cognitive adjustment; this is also reflected in his greater reluctance to "reify" concepts, in his more pronounced appreciation of the complexity of social and personal relations, as well as in his more profound sympathy with the psychological and social sciences studying these relations.

Whereas the extremely prejudiced person often exhibits a rigid form of superficial adjustment, interspersed with some measure of psychotic mechanisms stemming from the necessity of distorting reality, the extremely unprejudiced individual gives evidence of a more flexible kind of adjustment, although this goes with neurotic trends in a number of cases. An extreme tendency toward internalization can often be seen in the low scorer's preoccupation with his feelings and impulses, however unpleasant they may turn out to be. Far from escaping his emotional ambivalences and his feelings of inferiority, of guilt, and of anxiety, he even tends to dwell on them. This is not to say that he is free from self-deception. Dwelling on his feelings is often morbid and far removed from real insight. But the conscious consideration and comparative acceptance of instinctual impulses—especially in childhood—may well prevent the development of overly rigid defenses and disguises. Mechanisms of projection and displacement would thus be reduced to manageable proportions as far as cognitive mastery of reality is concerned.

Although the average unprejudiced individual in our culture is perhaps not free of some neurotic tendencies, it is in this same group that the relatively rare case of an individual, very well adjusted and mature, may also be found. It is only when conflicts, shortcomings, and unacceptable impulses are frankly faced that their mastery may be furthered to the point of perfection and the maximum potential for dealing adequately with varying conditions may be achieved. Temporarily, however, such frankness may well
lead to increased anxieties and depressions, and some contestants may, for better or for worse, be left by the way.

7. SOME GENETIC ASPECTS

When we consider the childhood situation of the most prejudiced subjects, we find reports of a tendency toward rigid discipline on the part of the parents, with affection which is conditional rather than unconditional, i.e., dependent upon approved behavior on the part of the child. Related to this is a tendency apparent in families of prejudiced subjects to base interrelationships on rather clearly defined roles of dominance and submission, in contradiction to equitarian policies. Faithful execution of prescribed roles and the exchange of duties and obligations is, in the families of the prejudiced, often given preference over the exchange of free-flowing affection. The hypothesis may be offered that some of the traits of the prejudiced personality are an outcome of this family situation.

These as well as the other results concerning the family situations have been directly substantiated by a study of social discrimination in children which included an investigation of their parents. The remainder of this subsection is a summary taken, with minor modifications, from an advance report on that project (Frenkel-Brunswik, 30):

Forced into a surface submission to parental authority, the child develops hostility and aggression which are poorlychannelized. The displacement of a repressed antagonism toward authority may be one of the sources, and perhaps the principal source, of his antagonism toward outgroups. That is to say, the prejudiced subject’s ambivalence toward his parents, with a repression and externalization of the negative side of this ambivalence, may be a factor in determining his strongly polarized attitudes, such as his uncritical acceptance of the ingroup and violent rejection of the outgroup.

Fear and dependency seem to discourage the ethnocentric child from conscious criticism of the parents. It is especially the prejudiced man who seems intimidated by a threatening father figure. Display of a rough masculine façade seems to be a compensation for such an intimidation and the ensuing passivity and dependency. Rigid repression of hostility against parents may be accompanied by an occasional breaking through of drives in a crude and unsocialized form; under certain circumstances this may become dangerous to the very society to which there seems to be conformity.

The fact that the negative feelings against the parents have to be excluded from consciousness may be considered as contributing to the general lack of insight, rigidity of defense, and narrowness of the ego so characteristic of high scorers. Since the unprejudiced child as a rule does not seem to have to submit to stern authority—a fact supported by interviews with the parents—he can afford in his later life to do without strong authority, and he does not need to assert his strength against those who are weaker. The “anti-
weakness” attitude referred to above as characteristic of the prejudiced child seems thus to be directly related to the fearful submission to authority.

It may be noted that the parents of prejudiced subjects not only seem to have been rigid disciplinarians; they also tended toward preoccupation with problems of status, communicating to their children a set of rigid and externalized rules. Status-concern may well be assumed to be the basis of such a rigid and externalized set of values. What is socially accepted and what is helpful in the climbing of the social ladder is considered good, and what deviates, what is different, and what is socially inferior is considered bad. Quite often, the parents of the ethnocentric subject seem to be socially marginal. The less they were able to accept their marginality, the more urgent must have been the wish to belong to the privileged groups. The feelings of marginality involved do not seem to be related to the gross economic conditions of the families in question but rather to those more subtle factors which determine the relationship between social aspiration and effective social status.

The influence of the parents must be considered at least a contributing factor to the tendency, observed in the ethnocentric child, to be more concerned with status values than are low-scoring subjects. He expects—and gives—social approval on the basis of external moral values including cleanliness, politeness, and the like. He condemns others for their nonconformity to such values, conformity being an all-or-none affair. The functioning of his superego is mainly directed toward punishment, condemnation, and exclusion of others, thus mirroring the type of discipline to which he himself was apparently exposed. There is more moralistic condemnation on the part of the prejudiced and greater permissiveness toward people in general on the part of the unprejudiced. The difficulty which children growing up in such an environment as that pictured by our prejudiced subjects, seem to have in developing close personal relationships may be interpreted as one of the outcomes of the repression of hostile tendencies, which are not integrated or sublimated, but which become diffuse and free-flowing.

As was pointed out above, the low scorer seems more oriented toward love and less toward power than is the high scorer. The former is more capable of giving affection since he has received more real affection. He tends to judge people more on the basis of their intrinsic worth than on the basis of conformity to social mores. He takes internal values and principles more seriously. Since he fears punishment and retaliation less than does the ethnocentric person, he is more able really to incorporate the values of society imposed upon him.

As a child, he seems to have enjoyed the benefit of the help of adults in working out his problems of sex and aggression. He thus can more easily withstand propaganda which defames minorities or glorifies war. By virtue of the greater integration of his instinctual life, he becomes a more creative
and sublimated individual. He is thus more flexible and less likely to form stereotyped opinions about others. He possesses a better developed, more integrated, and more internalized superego. He is able to express disagreement with, and resentment against, the parents more openly, thus achieving a much greater degree of independence from the parent and from authorities in general. At the same time, there is love-oriented dependence on parents and people in general which constitutes an important source of gratification. Possible frustration, however, may result from the exaggerated demand for affection sometimes found in individuals in this group.

8. CULTURAL OUTLOOK

Ethnic prejudice and its opposite have emerged, on the basis of the interviews, as two distinct patterns of life. Other kinds of approach have revealed these same patterns. In asking oneself how these two patterns may be related to general cultural trends, one may point toward the fact that by virtue of our evidence the outlook of the prejudiced individual, with his emphasis on status, power, and conventionality, seems to be the more salient of the two patterns. The outlook of the unprejudiced person, on the other hand, is characterized by relative absence of the undesirable features just listed. There is, furthermore, more basic uniformity in the prejudiced group, differences among them having more aspects of variations on the same theme. The unprejudiced group, on the other hand, shows greater diversity among its members.

It may be ventured that the greater uniformity of the prejudiced sample derives from their greater closeness to the broader cultural pattern of our society. There can be no doubt that our prejudiced group shows a more rigid adherence to existing cultural norms and that its emphasis on status is in line with what has been designated by several authors, such as especially Horney (54), Kardiner (59, 60), R. and H. Lynd (77), and Mead (82), as the general trend of Western civilization. More specifically, a feature especially emphasized by Mead as a characteristic of American culture, namely the “fear of being a sucker,” is also typical of our high-scoring men.

On the other hand, the same author describes “identification with the underdog” as another outstanding characteristic of American culture; it represents one of the many influences of Christian ethics in general. Obviously, however, this is more common among the low scorers. It appears that both trends, as well as the conflict between them, are major characteristics of our civilization, with only relatively few individuals exhibiting the one or the other extreme in pure form.

The political and social ideology of the two personality structures differentiated throughout has been discussed in detail elsewhere in the volume. Here we shall confine ourselves to a summary of some of the consistencies that exist between personality structure and the social and political outlooks as assimilated from the possibilities available in our culture.
Admiration of power and a longing for strong leadership on the social scene as predominant in the high scorer may readily be interpreted as a carry-over from the hierarchical evaluation of interpersonal relations. Extreme personal opportunism is often, though not always, connected with ideological opportunism and indifference toward ideological content. Status anxiety, adherence to external criteria in value judgments, thinking in stereotypes, and the lack of a concept of equality is closely related to a contempt of what is allegedly socially inferior. Fear of one’s own weakness and emasculation prevents the development of pity for the weak.

Rigid adherence to conventional values will render one inaccessible to groups and nations who deviate in some respect from one’s own cultural norms. The striving toward being like the others and the shying away from being “different” lie in the same general direction.

Outside groups, on the other hand, also lend themselves as a projection-screen for wishes and fears, often so strongly repressed in the high scorer. Immoral tendencies are easier perceived in, or ascribed to, groups which seem not fully assimilated or are altogether foreign. Hostility and the fear of being victimized can be expressed against these groups without restraint or expectation of retaliation. Even if such outgroups as the Jews are described as powerful, it is the knowledge of their ultimate weakness which makes them suited for scapegoats. Toward the really powerful groups the ethnically prejudiced will more likely exhibit submission and suppress rather than manifest his hostility.

The high scorer’s feeling of really belonging to the privileged group is highly tenuous. Due to his real or imagined social and psychological marginality he feels persistently threatened of being degraded in one way or another. It is as a defense against the possibility of being grouped with the outcast and underdog that he rigidly has to assert his identification with the privileged groups. This loud and explicit assertion of being on top seems to ensue from his silent and implicit conviction that he really is, or belongs, at the bottom (see the discussion concerning self-contempt, Chapters XI and XII). The obvious function of the mechanism described is in helping to keep existing anxieties and guilt-feelings in a repressed state.

All these repressed but no less turbulent inconsistencies and the conflicts resulting from them contribute to what may be called personalization of social issues which is so typical of the high scorer. Low scorers, on the other hand, tend to take their conflicts up where they originate: with their parents and with themselves. Thus there is less need for carrying them into the social sphere. There is greater accessibility to fact and to rational argument. Although confusion and biases are by no means excluded. they stem from a greater variety of sources and are less rigid than those typical of the high scorer. The greater readiness of the low scorers to face themselves goes with a greater readiness to look more objectively at man and society in general.

It is perhaps mainly the readiness to include, accept, and even love differ-
ences and diversities, as contrasted with the need to set off clear demarcation lines and to ascertain superiorities and inferiorities, which remains as the most basic distinguishing criterion of the two opposite patterns. Members of an outgroup representing deviations from the cultural norms of the in-group are most threatening to one who must conceive of the cultural norms as absolute in order to be able to feel secure.

It would go beyond the scope of this volume to ascertain fully the determinants of this need for homogeneity and simplicity in all the various spheres of life. In some cases concern with the status quo and resistance to change might be a more primary need as determined by various social and psychological factors. In other cases it might be a secondary reaction to a situation that grew too complex for mastery by routine means of adjustment. As was pointed out by Fromm (42), this was probably the case with Nazism in Germany. Thus under certain socioeconomic conditions an entire nation may become inclined to “escape from freedom.”

In our present-day struggle to achieve a strengthening of the tolerant, liberal point of view we may have to avoid presenting the prejudiced individual with more ambiguities than he is able to absorb and offer instead, in some spheres at least, solutions which are constructive and at the same time serve the general need for avoidance of uncertainties. Efforts to modify the “prejudiced” pattern may have to make use of authorities—though by no means necessarily of authoritarian authorities—in order to reach the individual in question. This follows from the fact that it is authority more than anything else that structures or prestructures the world of the prejudiced individual. Where public opinion takes over the function of authority and provides the necessary limitations—and thus certainties—in many walks of daily life, as is the case in this country, there will be some room for the tolerance of national or racial ambiguities.

It must be emphasized, however, that the potentially beneficial aspects of conformity are more than counterbalanced by the inherent seeds of stereotypy and pre-judgment. These latter trends are apt to increase in a culture which has become too complex to be fully mastered by the individual. The inevitability of certain developments toward stereotypy are being pointed out elsewhere in this volume. On the other hand, forces endeavoring to penetrate to the underlying causes of social trends in spite of their confusing manifestations are likewise as strong as never before, and they are rapidly spreading from the ivory tower of science to public opinion at large. The struggle between these opposing forces characterizes not only our culture as a whole, but every single individual as well. How this struggle will end does not hinge on psychological factors alone. As such factors are in the end manifestations of broader cultural influences, it is only by an understanding of the interplay of sociological and psychological phenomena in their entirety that a full appraisal of the relative potentials of the opposing trends can be achieved.