

## CHAPTER XV

# PROJECTIVE QUESTIONS IN THE STUDY OF PERSONALITY AND IDEOLOGY

*Daniel J. Levinson*

---

### A. INTRODUCTION

The Projective Question technique is an application of the general principles of projective techniques to the questionnaire method and to the study of the dynamics of ideology. A Projective Question is an open-ended question which is answered in a few words or lines and which deals with unusual events or experiences likely to have emotional significance for the individual. Care is taken to give the question a "homey," even humorous wording; also, an emphasis on the universal nature of certain emotional experiences (e.g., moods, embarrassment) may make the subject feel freer in giving an answer. The following eight questions were used in the present research:<sup>1</sup>

1. We all have times when we feel below par. What moods or feelings are the most unpleasant or disturbing to you?
2. We all have impulses and desires which are at times hard to control but which we try to keep in check. What desires do you often have difficulty in controlling?
3. What great people, living or dead, do you admire most?

<sup>1</sup> These questions were selected from among an original set of some thirty questions given to several groups of college students. The criteria for selection included statistical differentiation, theoretical significance, and nonduplication of content. It was necessary, for practical reasons, to eliminate many items which showed much promise. For example: What are your greatest weaknesses? Your greatest assets? What would you most like people to say of you after you have lived your life? What do you find most disgusting? Most annoying? As a parent, what would you try most to instill in your child? What would you protect your child against? What makes you lose your temper? What do you most admire in a person? Most dislike? Worst thing that could happen to anyone? Ingenious ways of committing murder? Why might a person commit suicide?

The instructions in all cases were as follows: The following questions give you a chance to express your ideas and opinions in your own way. *Please answer them all as fully as possible.*

We wish to thank the Graduate School of Western Reserve University for a grant-in-aid to cover certain phases of the analysis of data in this chapter.

4. There is hardly a person who hasn't said to himself, "If this keeps up, I'll go nuts!" What might drive a person nuts?
5. What do you consider the worst crimes a person could commit?
6. It seems that no matter how careful we are, we all sometimes have embarrassing moments. What experiences make you feel like sinking through the floor?
7. If you knew you had only six months to live, but could do just as you pleased during that period, how would you spend your time?
8. We get a feeling of awe when something seems to us wonderful, or impressive, or really important. What things would give you the greatest feeling of awe?

These items, considered as a technique, are similar in principle to the most intensive clinically used projective techniques such as the Thematic Apperception Test and the Rorschach, and to the various paper and pencil techniques. In general, all such techniques involve a standardized test situation uniform for all subjects, and a set of materials which (a) present a problem to be worked out, (b) are designed to bring out wide individual differences in response (that is, in the way the problem is worked out), and (c) elicit responses that are rich in meaning and in implications for deep-lying personality dynamics. The Projective Questions are sometimes called "indirect questions" because the subject is seldom aware of the implications of his responses and because the interpretations do not take the answers at face value, but rather go beyond the literal meaning of the response to look for deeper dynamic sources. The justification for such interpretation lies in the very nature of the technique; when the many psychologically important aspects of the situation and the problem-material are held uniform for all subjects, individual differences are attributed to *characteristics in the subject*, and the materials are so selected that the main difference-producing variables are likely to be personality trends of considerable importance in the individual's psychological functioning.

The various projective techniques differ in at least the following important respects: in the intensity of the relation of subject to tester, in the degree of structuring of the material as presented to the subject, and, as a result of these, in the interindividual variability of response and the intraindividual richness of response (expression of inner affect, impulses, deep-lying trends and conflicts). In traditional psychoanalytic therapy which is, in a sense, the model for all projective techniques, the relation of subject to therapist is the most intense and plays the greatest role in eliciting emotionally significant behavior. In the psychoanalytic technique, furthermore, the materials are as unstructured as possible; they include only the standardized situation and instructions, designed to produce a maximum of spontaneity, and the person of the analyst, who might also be considered an unstructured material on whom the

subject can project whatever he wishes. Since transference and resistance are so crucial in psychoanalysis, the course of therapy might be regarded as a series of manipulations of the therapist by the subject, in much the same way as other projective materials are manipulated.

The use of the standardized play situation as a therapeutic projective technique probably comes closest to psychoanalysis with respect to the role of the therapist in eliciting and handling transference and resistance, and with respect to the range of self-expression stimulated by the relatively unstructured but behavior-inducing materials. It is possible here not only to elicit but also to record many aspects of the verbal and motor behavior of the subject. The major projective techniques used clinically for diagnostic rather than for therapeutic purposes, such as the T.A.T. and Rorschach, are more limited with regard to the role of the tester and the range of expression observed and recorded, but they have been of considerable value in clinical practice and personality research.

While the Projective Question technique involves almost none of the "relation between subject and tester" aspects of the therapeutic techniques, and while it is less intensive and more structured than the diagnostic clinical techniques, it has nevertheless a number of important advantages for large-scale sociopsychological research. The items are easily understood, they can be filled out quickly (8 items require only 10 to 15 minutes), and they require no "props" or detailed instructions. For these and other reasons they are ideally suited for questionnaire use.

One great value of the Projective Questions is that the variables derived from the scoring, as shown in the Scoring Manual which follows, are directly related to the variables expressed by many of the scale items in the questionnaire, especially those in the F scale. Thus, this technique not only adds important material about the individual, but it also partially validates the scale results, since the undirected, spontaneously given responses to the Projective Questions reflect trends similar to those involved in the channeled, agree-disagree responses to the scale items.

The Projective Questions were included in each form of the questionnaire (see Chapter IV). They contributed to the study of relationships between personality and ethnocentrism, and they were an important source of ideas for F-scale items. The high and low quartiles on the E scale were the groups compared. (The middle scorers constitute an important group for future study; preliminary perusal of their responses suggests that their intermediate position is more a matter of conflicting high and low trends than of simple neutrality or indifference.) The term "highs" or "high scorers" will be used to refer to the *high quartile as measured on the Ethnocentrism scale*, and conversely for the "lows," who constitute the *low quartile on E*.

As far as the writer is aware, this is the first attempt at systematic, "quantitative" analysis of Projective Questions as a formal technique. They were

used previously in a nonquantitative manner on the Harvard Growth Study of School Children (106), and their use in the present research was suggested by R. N. Sanford, a member of that Study. Some of the questions as used here are taken directly from the Harvard Growth Study of School Children. Some of them were used subsequently by the United States Office of Strategic Services in their assessment program (116).<sup>2</sup> The content of the questions is, of course, hardly new; they have been asked, in one form or another, by clinical psychologists and others for some time.

## B. QUANTIFICATION BY MEANS OF SCORING CATEGORIES

The problem of quantification has plagued everyone who works with projective tests, personal documents or other qualitative clinical material. Attempts at precise measurement and complex statistical treatment have usually resulted in quantification at the expense of meaning, in reliability without validity. Any quantitative mode of analysis, focusing as it does on aspects of response that occur with some frequency in larger groups, can hardly help but overlook those aspects which are more idiosyncratic, even though the latter may be crucial for understanding a given individual. Moreover, the more subtle and abstract qualities of response are difficult to formulate in a concrete, specific manner. These difficulties are particularly great when, as in the present case, one is interested in the primary *psychological content* of the response—in what the individual strives for or feels or values or experiences.

It seemed, however, that some middle ground between precise quantification and the total clinical gestalt might be found. The compromise chosen was scoring by means of *qualitative categories*. While each category is scored only in terms of present-absent—scoring in terms of quantitative degrees may yet be attempted—a measure of quantification is obtained by summing an individual's (or group's) scores on the several items. This method, while lacking a high degree of precision,<sup>3</sup> can, at the least, attempt to meet necessary standards of rigorous definition, controlled scoring, and scoring reliability. And, while neglecting much that the clinician may see intuitively in any single response, the categories can include numerous major trends

<sup>2</sup> See also Sanford and Conrad (108, 109), and Franck, K. (29) for other uses of the Projective Questions. A similar technique is that of Incomplete Sentences, as described by Rohde (97), Rotter (100) and Stein (114). For an example of the use of a slightly modified Projective Question technique in the study of antidemocratic personality trends—with results similar to those obtained here—see McGranahan (78).

<sup>3</sup> By "precision" is meant merely "the number of significant figures" in a score, e.g., the value 2.3689 is more precise than 2.4. However, a scoring system can be relatively imprecise, e.g., a wall clock as compared with a stop-watch, and yet be accurate and valid. Personality researchers may have to tolerate a low degree of precision until we are beyond the initial stage where significance and validity present the greatest methodological problems.

that define the dynamic framework within which further clinical differentiation is possible.

Thus the scoring of Projective Questions, like the scoring of interviews (see Chapter IX), requires a set of qualitative categories that meet various theoretical and technical standards. The categories should be carefully defined and illustrated to facilitate communication and interpretation. They should be literal enough to permit highly reliable scoring, yet sufficiently interpretive to have clinical significance and theoretical implications. A limited number of categories per item, preferably between two and six, is desirable and a minimum of responses should be ambiguous (unscorable) in terms of these categories. The degree to which these standards have been met can better be judged at the end of this chapter. Since the main personality trends of concern in the present research were those differentiating highs and lows on ethnocentrism, *high categories* and *low categories* were sought. The high categories incorporated those psychological qualities which were found to characterize the responses of the ethnocentric subjects, while the low categories appeared to characterize the anti-ethnocentric subjects.

The procedure in determining the specific categories for each item was as follows. The responses of the low scorers to that item were transposed by typing onto one or a few sheets, thus permitting easy inspection of group material; and similarly for the high scorers. Closer examination of the responses of each quartile as a whole revealed a few major trends characteristic of each group and differentiating it from the other group. These trends were formalized into categories which seemed both empirically differentiating and theoretically meaningful. The final step involved the preparation of a Scoring Manual (see below) in which each category is defined, discussed briefly, and illustrated with examples from the groups on which the Manual is based. The Manual, formed through examination of the first few groups studied, and on the basis of our over-all theory and results, was used with only minor modifications on all subsequent groups.

It should be noted that the determination and use of categories is not a purely mechanical and atheoretical procedure. The importance of an over-all personality theory, especially as applied to the understanding of differences between highs and lows, can hardly be overestimated as an aid in dealing with projective items. With regard to category determination, the general theory provides hypotheses before one sees the Projective Question material, and it is crucial in the selection of aspects of response which differentiate lows from highs. Furthermore, it gives the categories deeper and broader meaning by relating them to a larger theoretical frame and to results gained by other techniques. With regard to scoring, the general personality theory acts as a background factor making it easier for the scorer to decide

on the appropriate category for a given response; it also facilitates the scoring of some idiosyncratic responses which do not directly fit any of the scoring categories used but which express low or high personality trends. Finally, by means of the over-all personality theory the categories of several items can be integrated into a single pattern involving several trends, thus permitting a more complex description of the high or low groups or of any individual subject. It is therefore of great value for the scorer to be familiar with the general personality theory involved, as a basis for competent scoring as well as for contributions to new theory, categories, and procedures.

### C. SCORING MANUAL: CATEGORIES OF PROJECTIVE QUESTION RESPONSE

There are three types of scores: *low* (L), *high* (H), and *neutral* (N). A neutral score is given when the question is left blank (Nb),<sup>4</sup> when the response is ambiguous with respect to the high and low categories (Na), or when high and low trends are present to equal degrees (Nhl). For the groups studied thus far there were relatively few Na and Nhl scores (8.8 per cent); the presence of many Na scores in future groups would necessitate modification or expansion of the present Manual. Each scorer assigns one of the above scores to each response. The scoring procedure will be discussed below (Section D). We may turn now to the Scoring Manual. It should be noted that the Scoring Manual has not only a *methodological* function but also a *descriptive* function, since it presents and even helps to interpret the differences between the responses of the ethnocentric and nonethnocentric groups.

#### QUESTION 1. WHAT MOODS ARE UNPLEASANT OR DISTURBING?

##### *Low Categories*

1. *Conscious conflict and guilt.* Feelings of self-criticism, depression, frustration, insecurity, inadequacy, hopelessness, despair, lack of self-worth, remorse. The main conflict or sense of remorse is over violation of values referring to achievement, love-giving (nurturance), understanding, friendship, self-expression, and social contribution. This system of values, which the lows express in various forms in several of the projective questions, will be called *achievement values*. Important underlying variables are intrapunitiveness (the tendency to blame oneself rather than the world when things go wrong) and a well-internalized set of ethical standards. There is an inner orientation, an emphasis on the needs, strivings, and inner state of the individual; related to this is an intrceptive approach, a concern with self-understanding, and an acceptance of personal moral responsibility for one's actions.

<sup>4</sup> As it turned out, omissions on certain items, while recorded as Nb, were converted to scores of H in the statistical treatment. This was based on the discovery that the highs made appreciably more omissions than the lows (see below, Section D).

Examples: "Those times when I would like to give myself a swift kick in the pants." "A feeling of futility and pessimism." "When I don't do as well as I know I am capable of doing." "So much to do, so little time."

A response is scored here when external factors such as "lack of housing" or "lack of economic opportunity" are mentioned, as long as these external forces are represented as frustrating inner needs or achievement values. Thus, the lows refer to external difficulties as obstacles to self-expression and security, whereas the highs refer to external difficulties in themselves merely as a sign of general dissatisfaction, without indicating what inner needs or values are frustrated (see below).

2. *Focal dependency and love-seeking.* These responses reflect a desire for close personal relationships involving emotional warmth and exchange. The sense of lack of love and of focal relationships, often found in love (cf. Chapter XI), must be distinguished from the highs' feeling of aloneness and isolation in a generally barren world (see below). The loneliness of the highs represents, as it seems, underlying dependency which must remain ego-alien and which finds little or no positive, ego-satisfying expression.

Examples: "Moods where you feel like pouring out your soul to a person." "To love someone and not be loved back." "To feel alone when in the company of others; this can occur even after a period of congeniality." *Feelings of rejection* are scored low: "to appear ridiculous"; "to love but not be loved"; "to be laughed at unjustly." (However, a response is scored high if it involves a sense of active threat—rather than merely loss or lack of love—as well as extrapunitive and feelings of persecution. For example: "to be made a fool of"; "when a friend turns against me.") The dependency, self-blame, and depressive affect in lows may also take a more "cosmic" form (*Weltschmerz*): "When I feel what fools all we humans are." The highs are disturbed by the supposed stupidity or immorality of others rather than by any ideas of these trends in themselves; nor do they have a "world-identification."

3. *Open hostility, by self or others, toward love objects.* The lows are upset by feelings of hostility in themselves and by hostility and exploitiveness in others. The disturbing hostility may take two forms, *ideological* and *interpersonal*.

Ideologically, we find references to faults in our social system and social authority: discrimination, exploitation, insecurity, violations of democratic values.

Examples: "Thinking of the rotten, ruthless practices that go on under the name of rugged individualism and unrestricted initiative in the U.S.A." "Concern over the shortcomings of Americans and thus the nation." "The slowness of social progress; the stupidity of the powers that be." "Unemployment and lack of security for the average man or veterans."

In the sphere of interpersonal relations, hostile impulses or acts directed toward friends and love objects are a source of disturbing moods in low scorers.

Examples: "When I feel I have hurt a friend." "Envy, hatred, revenge, resentment." "When I feel a general dislike towards friends and the world in general." "Intolerance; cruelty to people." "Resentment toward parents." (It is characteristically low that *ambivalence* toward parents is more accessible to consciousness, though often conflict-producing.) "*Anger*" when it is the total response is scored Na. In connection with the thesis, presented in earlier chapters, that psychological themes can be found in the specific content of the individual's ideology, it is interesting to note that similar psychological content characterizes both the "ideological" and the "interpersonal" responses to this question.

In summary, the main trends expressed in the above categories are: violation of achievement values, resulting in conscious conflict, remorse, and self-criticism; intrapunitiveness; intraception; libidized interpersonal relationships; focal, ego-assimilated dependency strivings; depressive affect focused on lack of achievement and on rejection by love objects; open ambivalence toward love objects and family members.

### *High Categories (Question 1)*

1. *Violations of conventional values.* This category is the high equivalent to the "conscious conflict and guilt" category for the lows. These values are concerned with activity, success, upward mobility, and rugged masculinity in men, and with "sweetness and light" femininity in women. They also involve certain behavior formulae regarding etiquette and interpersonal relations, and an emphasis on conformity *per se*.

Examples: "Not making a success of life." "Not advancing in life." "Not doing something useful." "Lack of purpose" (i.e., not having aims, in contrast to the frustration of aims in lows). It is sometimes difficult to distinguish the high masculinity-status values, with their external criterion of success, from the low achievement values, with their inner orientation and their emphasis on self-expression. The difference in the examples above is in the use of the word "advancing" rather than "accomplishing," or "useful" rather than "contributing to the welfare of others." Another characteristic of certain high responses is their concern with *externally imposed tasks* or duties rather than with inner strivings. For example: "Not meeting expected requirements." What is implied here is shame over being caught and social anxiety over nonconformity, rather than guilt over value violations (violations that are felt internally whether or not they are observed by others).

Violations of conventional values (immorality) *by others* are included here. For example: "Seeing crude sexual behavior." "Drinking, breaking the law." "Anyone who displays bad habits publicly irritates all." "Disgust over filth and smut." "Disgust with human nature and people." These responses reflect trends mentioned previously: moral punitiveness, cynicism, the tendency to seek out, and to find, immorality in the world (especially in out-groups) rather than in oneself.

Finally, we find responses in which *hostility* toward friends and morality figures (parents, relatives, social authority, and the like) is implied though not explicitly stated or recognized.

Examples: "Little frictions with parents." "When my husband doesn't act right toward me." "Lack of harmony with friends." The emphasis is on the behavior or the situation in itself, without reference to motives or specific affect. Compare these responses with those of lows: "Resentment toward parents"; "When I feel I have hurt a friend." When an individual who is shown to be consistently high on other measures gives a response like "Worry over family members" or "Death of relatives" it is not difficult to infer that he or she feels hostility towards these people, hostility which is projected in the form of the idea that family members may be harmed by other people or by bad luck. Suffice it to say that responses of this sort are given predominantly by highs, and are scored H. The response "Fighting in Germany" is scored high because of its reference to motor aggression *per se* without specific psychological content (needs, affect, values); similarly in the case of "Long labor disputes."

2. *Threatening or nonsupporting environment*: focus on external obstacles, lacks, and threats, with an (implied) unconscious sense of helplessness and dependency. Theoretical discussion must be deferred until later; however, in order clearly to differentiate the high and low categories the following theoretical point must be made. As we know from the interviews and the T.A.T., highs and lows do not seem to differ in the amount of their underlying dependency (or other deep trends); the difference lies, rather, in the way such impulses are handled and integrated in the personality. Dependency is implied in the responses of many lows and many highs, but the form of expression differs systematically in the two groups. The emotional intensity, active sorrow, and focal conflict of the lows, as well as the intellectual and ideological strivings and the search for close relationship, are not difficult to distinguish from the emotionally shallow, ego-alien loneliness, and objectless passivity of the highs. The responses in the high categories for this question reveal an inner poverty, an external orientation, and a nonfocalized dependency on the outer world; these individuals are, so to say, glad when the world supports them and sad when their supports leave, with a minimum of self-determination and self-awareness.

One common type of response among the highs involves feelings of doubt, uncertainty, and momentary *lack of self-confidence*. These individuals are in doubt as to which is the more correct-or success-producing act, whereas the lows feel intense inner conflicts between two impulses or between an impulse, e.g., hostility, and inner moral standards. The focus in the high responses is on the act itself or on the undependability of the environment. Interpretively, the lack of self-confidence seems primarily to be anxiety in a social situation which is unconsciously apperceived as threatening.

Examples: "The feeling that regardless of prearranged plans and ideas it is never possible to be sure of what a new day will bring." "The uncertainty of the future." "The feeling of people and places having changed so much that one feels lonely and loses self-confidence." "Unsure of taking the right step in business."

The highs are most disturbed by *lack of support* rather than lack of love,

by isolation or threat rather than rejection. Their frustrations in regard to interpersonal relations seem to be experienced as a sort of undifferentiated "aloneness" without an aspect of active affection-seeking or focal relationship.

Examples: "To feel that I am not liked or wanted where I am." "To feel out of place in the company I am in and not be sure of my next move." "Being alone without company" (fear of solitude in this context is high). "When I feel alone and no one to turn to." These responses may also involve a sense of being persecuted or *victimized*, as well as a marked extrapunitive quality and feelings of self-pity. For example: "To feel cast aside." "The 'don't give a darn' feeling when you think nobody cares what happens to you." "When a friend turns against you." "Someone convicts you of something you never did." "Feeling the world is against me."

The affect of the highs is less clear-cut and focalized than that of the lows. It often takes the form of vague, *undifferentiated worry*, or of generalized dissatisfaction.

Examples: "Worry about the future." "Realization of impending danger." "Emotional moods." "When everything goes wrong." The single word "worry" is commonly given by highs. "Feeling absolutely lost." Responses such as "worry about the future" and "lack of money" are clearly high. However, the response "financial insecurity," with no clarifying context, should be scored Na, since its external orientation seems high, while its reference to insecurity as an inner state is low; not frequently given, it occurs almost equally in highs and lows.

While *fear* is implied by a number of the responses above, it is almost never given explicitly by highs, and evidence from other chapters suggests that they do not recognize these as fear experiences. Responses such as "fear" and "apprehension," though rare, are usually given by lows and should be scored L.

3. "*Rumblings from below.*" These responses refer to situations or bodily conditions which, by inference though not explicitly, tend to bring out ego-alien trends such as passivity, anxiety, and hostility.

Examples: "Quietness, boredom, inactivity." "When at a party everything is quiet and dead as a morgue." "Lack of work or anything to do, causing restlessness and lack of self-confidence." The reference to *lack of work* is interesting in connection with the compulsive value for work commonly found in highs; work and "keeping busy" would appear, for some individuals at least, to have the psychological function of reducing anxiety and of aiding in the inhibition of unaccepted impulses. Perhaps this is the dynamic meaning of the slogan, "Keeping busy is the best way of staying out of mischief"; the mischievous impulses are conceived as "rumblings from below," as waiting only for an idle moment to force themselves through. Also evident in these responses are the anti-intracception and the opposition to leisure discussed in earlier chapters.

Another common source of disturbance is *poor bodily condition*: fatigue, hangover, sickness, headache, and the like. There may also be references to strain, external pressure, and overwork, that is, conditions which threaten

the mind by harming the body. Once again there is no reference to inner needs, values, or emotions as such, but only a vague sense of threat, restlessness, or dissatisfaction. The underlying but unrecognized fear of body harm seems to be a major cause of anxiety. In addition, being "fatigued" or overworked is a condition in which defenses are lowered and unaccepted trends may break through. The person then has a "nervous breakdown"—something conceived as having a physiological rather than a psychological origin. It is of some interest that the highs are threatened by both lack of work and overwork; inactivity will turn one's mind to the wrong things, but overactivity—being too good for too long, so to speak—may intensify the bad impulses and weaken the defenses beyond the threshold of control. Work appears, therefore, to be a form of punishment as well as a value and a defense for these individuals.

4. *Omissions* are recorded as Nb but are considered as H in computing individual or group scores (agreement with E). While the total number of omissions is small (about 8 per cent), most of the omitters were highs; this is consistent with the greater anti-intracception and fear of "prying" in highs.

#### QUESTION 2. WHAT DESIRES ARE MOST DIFFICULT TO CONTROL?

##### *Low Categories*

All low categories for this question are bound up with violations of achievement values by oneself or others.

1. *Focal (usually verbal) hostility directed against violators of achievement values.* In the ideological sphere we find opposition to fascism, militarism, discrimination, suppression, exploitation, autocracy, and the like. In the sphere of interpersonal relations similar basic values are expressed in the form of opposition to hypocrisy, intellectual dishonesty, pompousness, narrowness, unfairness, and the like.

Examples: "To lash out at those people who voice an attitude of racial discrimination or an attitude of a dishonest intellect." "Getting mad at native fascists." "To walk out on people who are unmitigated boors or fools—usually I'm too curious to see everyone else's reaction to do so" (note also the psychological curiosity). "Upbraiding individuals having a 'don't give a damn' attitude in matters that are important; and those that fail to consider relative values." "The desire to devalue men" (this is scored low for the focal hostility and competition with men). "The desire to deflate pompous, loud-mouthed people."

The response may also involve inner conflict over being hostile and rebellious (against oppressive convention or authority) as opposed to being tactful or submissive.

For example: "To express an opinion when it is more tactful to remain subordinate, as in the navy when you feel anything but subordinate; to accept militarism." "To disregard conventions and speak out of turn when I encounter hypocrisy." "Telling people about fallacies in our economic system and the impossibility of

returning to prewar times; not to carry out the patriotic ballyhoo thrust on service men." "To express my feelings with people who wouldn't understand." (The last response should be distinguished from the high response, "Talk about my emotions"; in the latter there is a generalized, objectless need and inhibition, whereas in the former we find the desire for personal relationship as the basis for sharing of emotions.)

2. *The tendency to violate achievement values oneself.* These responses are concerned with interpersonal relations rather than ideology. They usually involve some degree of *inner conflict* between achievement values and pleasurable impulses (play, ego-satisfying passivity, intellectuality, sensuality). The main values involved are for nurturance and love-giving, as when one fails to realize an accepted obligation toward a friend, or for achievement, as when the individual does not actively strive toward serious goals but rather allows himself to be side-tracked into immediately pleasurable pursuits. That this is an *inner* conflict must be stressed: the conflict involves moral standards or obligations which the individual accepts as his own and which take the form of promptings from within, in contrast to the high's reference to externally imposed tasks and duties. A further difference is that the passivity is ego-assimilated and satisfying for the lows, diffuse and ego-alien for the high scorers (see below).

Examples: "The desire to listen to music when I have work to do." "Self-indulgence" (note also the explicit self-criticism). "Being true to myself." "An impulse to procrastinate; to take the obvious easy course when a more direct facing of obstacles could enable me to obtain what I desire." "The wanderlust to see what the other part of the country is doing, or on a nice day, the desire to be enjoying it by fishing or hunting." "To be indifferent." "Be lazy and sleep." "Running away from trouble" (this is not the same as "forget my troubles," which is repressive rather than escapist and is scored H). Also scored here are responses involving guilt as a consequence of *hurting others* (emphatic focus on their feelings) or of violating other values. For example: "To blame rather than to understand." "Use the wrong means to achieve desirable aims."

3. *Miscellaneous.* Several relatively infrequent responses may be considered here. "Fear" is, as on Question 1, a low response. Most *sex* responses by *men* are scored H (see below). They are scored L when they are more personalized and subtle, or when they show some signs of surface inhibition. For example: "In my admiration of feminine beauty I find it hard at times to keep from staring." For *women*, however, most sex references are scored L, even when only the single word is given. Example: "Being too affectionate with the 'man in my life.'" "Amorous desires." "Falling in love." Conventionalized sex responses by women, e.g., "Going out on too many dates," are scored H.

*Denial* of hard-to-control impulses, e.g., the response "None," is more common in lows than in highs and is scored L. This empirical result was not anticipated; it is consistent with the apparently greater impulsivity of lows

and their emphasis on independence and self-expression. (If high contextual features, e.g., anti-intracception, are present, a score of H is given.)

### *High Categories (Question 2)*

1. *Nonfocal and/or motor aggression.* One of the most unequivocally high forms of response involves concrete, impersonal, aggressive acts, usually directed against "irritating" people.

Examples: "Spanking a very fresh or mean child." "Deliberately smashing into a foolish driver, the majority being women" (this response by a man who on other items shows a surface idealization of women). "The desire to slug the guy that talks for hours about the rough time he had in the service when you know he has been a U.S.O. Commando most of the time."

The high aggressive impulse tends to be cognitively blind and undifferentiated, and to have a symptomatic quality.

Examples: "The desire to beat my way out of a crowded place just to see how many persons I could overcome before I would be stopped." "The desire to keep moving so as not to slug somebody." "Temper." "The desire to blow my top when I get angry."

Verbal aggression in a context of low values is, as noted above, scored L. However, *undifferentiated verbal aggression*, without reference to values or to the nature of the object, is scored H.

For example: "Speaking my mind." "Tell people what I think of them." "Telling people off." Aggression against unconventional people or against liberal ideas may be included here; e.g., "To rebel against unionism." There is often an extrapunitive and projective element in the aggression of the highs; the idea of "being taken advantage of" is sometimes used to justify the hostile impulses. *Neutral scores (Na)*: verbal aggression in which the values or context are unclear; "anger" alone without a qualifying context.

Responses which seem to represent more disguised forms of hostility, particularly in high women, may be mentioned here. These refer mainly to "impatience," to "stubbornness," or to domineering tendencies, usually without further qualification. They are occasionally given in a low context; for example: "The desire to 'lecture' and be too sure I am right." This is scored L because of the implicit self-criticism, the recognition of her own fallibility, and the recognition that the desire to help or teach may be tied up with dominance.

2. *Ego-alien passivity.* In contrast to the lows, the highs give relatively few responses involving passivity. Moreover, these responses do not refer to escapist enjoyment or to self-criticism and inner conflict. High passivity seems, rather, to involve mainly the idea of *task-avoidance*, of shirking an externally imposed duty (cf. also Chapter XIII).

Examples: "To procrastinate." "Not carry out what is expected of me." (Score

Na when the response involves the idea of running away from responsibilities and there is no indication as to whether the responsibilities have an internal or external origin.)

What seems also to express a primitive passive trend is the desire to "*forget everything*," to blot out the world and focus on cheerful things (as in Item 9, F scale, Form 45). Again we find a sense of threat from an overwhelming environment and an external orientation rather than an inner conflict and a conscious moral dilemma.

Examples: "Forgetting everything and traveling and looking for something more interesting." "The urge to run away and forget everything." "Going out on a real high bender and forget my troubles." (Note: "drink to forget" is high but "drink" alone is neutral.)

3. *Impersonal sex.* As noted above, most sex responses (even relatively crude ones) by women are scored L. More conventionalized responses, e.g., "Going out on dates," "Flirting," or "Getting married" are scored H. In men, on the other hand, most sex responses are given by highs. The most common response is simply "Sex" or "Sex matters." There is also a tendency to assume that sex impulses would "naturally" cause the most difficulty, e.g., "Desires relating to sex, *of course*." It would appear that some high men emphasize sex as part of their general emphasis on rugged masculinity, while some low women bring in sex as part of their rebellion against traditional nonsensual femininity. The sex responses of the high men have an impersonal, undifferentiated quality similar to that found in their aggression responses. For example: "Keeping my emotions in check when out with a beautiful blonde." "The desire to accompany women of the world." The lows tend to refer either to a love object with whom there is some psychological relationship, or to a love affair involving ego-accepted sensuality. It is certainly of theoretical interest that the latter form of response is more common in unprejudiced women than in unprejudiced men.

4. *Incidental pleasures and violations of conventional values.* The main qualities of these responses are their emotional diluteness, their lack of strong object-relationship, their concreteness (reference to specific acts), and their concern with minor conventions.

Examples: "Sweet tooth." "Overeating." "Use slang." "Travel." "Talking at the wrong time." "Break light bulbs in church." "Scream in church; scream when annoyed." "Have too much fun." References to "Too much activity" or to "Over-indulging in sports" are sometimes given by high men; these desires appear to be related to concern with masculinity and may in some cases represent a defense against underlying passive impulses—impulses which find indirect expression on other items or techniques.

One of the more common forms of response in this category involves concern with *money*, particularly with spending it too freely rather than retaining it.

Examples: "Be extravagant." "Spending money wantonly and spending time wantonly." "Gambling." "I like to buy novels but I try not to as it costs so much money." There is sometimes self-idealization and/or self-pity. For example: "Desire to spend for others' benefits." "Help others at own expense." The highs' concern with money may well be related to their accusations of "money-mindedness" in outgroups.

There are several responses which are marginal to this category. While simple denial is scored L, denial in a context of "*will power*" or of anti-intra-reception is H. For example: "I don't have any difficulty controlling any desire if I make up my mind to a thing." Emphasis on will power is seen in the response, "Walking straight ahead when passing a cocktail bar." The idea of not planning or giving thought to decisions is also H; for example: "Jumping into something new without thinking of the consequences beforehand."

5. *Omissions* are recorded as Nb but are considered as H in the final scoring. The frequency of omissions was about 19 per cent—more than on any other item (see Table 2(XV)).

### QUESTION 3. WHAT GREAT PEOPLE DO YOU ADMIRE MOST?

#### *Low Categories*

Once again the concept of achievement values provides a unifying context for understanding the low responses. The several low categories represent various forms of expression of values for intellectual, aesthetic, and scientific achievement, for social contribution and for democratic social change. Usually the responses contain specific names of individuals representing these values. Occasionally, however—and this is more common in lows than in highs—a general abstract definition of admirable qualities is given.

Examples of general description: "Those people that I admire most are perhaps those that have at great personal risk and danger fought unstintingly against fascism—perfectly aware of all the implications of fascism." "Men who have had the courage to stand up against public opinion in order that some good might come of their position." "Those who have contributed most to the spiritual and social improvement of mankind." "Musicians and artists, any person with real creativeness." "I admire great writers, great thinkers, and people who really left mankind something of value."

Specific names fall into the following broad categories:

1. *The arts and philosophy.* Artists included here are writers, musicians, intellectuals, painters, architects, and so on. Examples: Shakespeare, Steinbeck, Robeson, Whitman, Pushkin, Beethoven, da Vinci, Bach, Voltaire. The writers tend to be liberal-radical and to write works of social and psychological significance, though this is not always so. There are a few high writers (see below).

The philosophers named include: Bertrand Russell, Comte, Mill, Dewey,

Spencer, Socrates, Maimonides. The lows occasionally—the highs almost never—admire individuals who are members of various minority groups (Jewish, Negro, Chinese, etc.). Certain *religious* figures are included in this category: Confucius, Buddha, St. Francis (see the neutral category below). Highs more than lows tend to mention Plato. Perhaps the reason for this is indicated by one high man who wrote: "Plato—the original personnel man." There are, so to speak, both low and high aspects to Plato's philosophy. If his name is given with others, one scores by context; if given alone, it is scored H.

2. *Physical and biological scientists.* (This does *not* include inventors or applied scientists or technologists, most of whom are scored H.) Sir William Osler, Newton, Washington Carver, Darwin, Einstein, Galileo, Pasteur, Madame Curie (particularly by men).

3. *Social scientists, liberal-radical political figures.* Jefferson, Marx, Tom Paine, Benjamin Franklin, Henry Wallace, Frances Perkins, Freud, Pestalozzi, Norman Thomas.

4. *Active denial of admiration.* For example: "I'm beholden to no man." "No one person stands out." However, omissions of this item are scored neutral.

*Neutral Category.* Several names seem to be given equally often by highs and lows; they may apparently be admired for high reasons or for low reasons.

The most common examples are Lincoln, F. D. Roosevelt, and Christ. (Roosevelt's popularity with highs was probably limited to the war period.) Any of these names, alone or in combination with each other, are scored Na; if additional names are given, one scores by context. For example, the response, "Washington, Lincoln, F.D.R." is scored H because of the context of patriotism (see below). The response, "Jefferson, Paine, Lincoln, Roosevelt" is scored L. Ernie Pyle is given mainly by highs, but without a context is scored Na. Will Rogers, Woodrow Wilson, and Willkie are Na.

*Omissions* are scored Neutral.

### *High Categories (Question 3)*

The main trends underlying the high responses are ones which recur throughout the projective questions as well as in the several other techniques of the study: authoritarianism, anti-intracception, "toughness"-power, militarism, and ultraconservatism. These are exemplified in the following categories.

1. *Power and control.* Emphasis here is on the strong, rugged, masculine leader.

One favorite source is the *military*: Halsey, Patton, Marshall, Byrd, Doolittle, Rickenbacker, Bismarck, Caesar, MacArthur, Lindbergh, Napoleon. A corollary of the emphasis on strength is an emphasis on *suffering*: being victimized, martyred,

alone in a cruel world. For example: "The boys who died in the war for people who do not even appreciate it, as they show many times; being an ex-serviceman myself."

Among the high women *royalty* and nobility, particularly from past centuries, are quite popular. Certain *religious* leaders such as the Pope and Mary Baker Eddy are given predominantly by highs. Churchill seemed to have captured the imagination of many highs. A major source of names, particularly for the high men, is the area of practical invention, business, and technology, *industrial giants* being the most popular. Examples: Ford, Carnegie, Edison, leading manufacturers.

2. *Conservative Americana*. Men whose main distinction comes from being strong national leaders, usually in a military or politically conservative context. This category overlaps somewhat with the first.

Examples: Washington, Teddy Roosevelt, Herbert Hoover, Edgar Hoover, John Paul Jones, Dewey, "True Americans."

3. *Parents and relatives*. It is not uncommon for highs to list several family members, in addition to other individuals, in response to this question.

Example: "My mother who, although isn't famous or seemingly different from any other person, I think is one of the greatest persons alive today; you may think me prejudiced and childish, but I do have my reasons." It happens, though rarely, that a low mentions the parent of the opposite sex; this is scored L if the context is clearly low: "My Parents."

4. *Miscellaneous*. Responses expressing high trends but not in the above categories.

High women often mention actresses and movie stars, e.g. Kate Smith, Bing Crosby. Sabatini is a writer preferred by highs; best-seller authors are also included here for the most part. An example of a descriptive high response is: "My girl friends who live happily without any worry." (Superficial, anti-intraceptive.)

*Scoring Procedure*. Most subjects list several names in response to this question; the names may fall into more than one category, but they are usually uniformly high or uniformly low. In some cases, however, both H and L categories are represented. These cases are scored H, L, or Nhl according to the predominant trend.

Thus the response, "da Vinci, Ely Culbertson, Henry Ford" is scored H, while "Einstein, Edison, Carver" is scored L. One man gave a list of some 15 names representing most of the high and low categories above, with no apparent unifying theme or predominant trend; his response was scored Nhl. Clinically, he was a "conflicted low" who seemed to be struggling with opposing high and low trends, so that his score on this item was very meaningful.

#### QUESTION 4. WHAT MIGHT DRIVE A PERSON NUTS?

##### *Low Categories*

Both low and high categories for this question are similar to those for Question 1 (Moods). The lows tend to respond mainly in terms of psycho-

logical conflict and frustration. They have an intrceptive orientation and they emphasize the role of the individual himself in the neurosis. Once again we find a context of achievement values and active striving—striving which is made difficult by inner problems or by external blocks.

1. *Inner psychological states.* The main concepts here are focal conflict and anxiety. There is often a strong sense of failure, of self-blame, of helplessness or impotence.

Examples: "Inability to cope with problems; frustration." "Hardly anything that would make them express the above opinion (see the full statement of this question); sometimes complete suppression of a person's feelings, emotions, energies would do it." "Self-condemnation." "His own failure to put an end to the situation causing the disturbance or to stop thinking about it." "Despair caused by inability to cope with distressing situations; continual criticism without constructive suggestions." "Frustrations, pointlessness of existence, morbidity, sorrow, *violation of one's ego.*" "Insecurity." "Tension without release." "Being dishonest with oneself; wrong attitude toward life's problems." References to *fear* are low.

While undifferentiated "worry" or "brooding" are high, there is a kind of focal, *differentiated worry* or anxiety which is scored L. By this is meant not a vague anxiety in the face of a generally threatening world, but concern over specified personal frustrations.

Examples: "Continual worry about family problems, continual striving to earn a living." "Worry, emotional or economic." "Severe emotional strain, especially if combined with physical hardships or pain." (The highs often refer to physical hardships *per se*, but they seldom refer to the actual experience of emotion or pain.)

The inner life of the lows, while apparently relatively rich and satisfying in many ways, seems often to be stormy and conflictful. The sense of going too far, of being carried away by emotion, of having *too much inner life*, so to speak, may be expressed in responses to this item.

Examples: "Letting our emotional states wear us down." "Exaggerating one's personal problems." Obsessional trends are sometimes exhibited: "The man's mind is in a groove or rut; unless he has a varied interest, he will go insane from worry and thinking of one thing." "A person might become insane over too much interest in religion, love, money, etc.; any obsession carried too far might do it." The lows' references to inner life can be distinguished from those of the highs on the basis of their greater awareness, and acceptance, of emotion and of their more differentiated introspective experience. Compare the responses above with the high responses: "Worry" or "constant worry of a particular thing." Or compare the low response, "Too much self-analysis" with the high, "Talk oneself into it." (See high category 2, below.) In general, responses indicating rejection of inner life are more common in highs than lows.

2. *Dominating, blocking, rejecting environment.* These responses may take an "interpersonal" or an ideological form. In the former case, the individual is in a disturbing situation from which he cannot extricate himself, in part for inner reasons (explicit or implicit). Moral conflict and open *ambivalence* are

often expressed. There is not only hostility toward a dominating or rejecting person, but also some feeling of relationship or obligation. Surface conflict about hostility, especially toward love objects or those who represent both love and authority, is fairly common among lows. (The highs appear to resolve their ambivalence toward the ingroup by maintaining only the positive side in consciousness and by [unconsciously] redirecting the hostility toward outgroups, thus avoiding for the most part a clear-cut sense of inner conflict.)

Examples: "Living on intimate terms with people who insist on controlling every move." "Being mad or constantly irritated by one whom you must associate with." Compare these with the high response: "Worry, or have to live with and be nice to selfish or disagreeable or unpleasant people."

References to an *unhappy childhood*, to depriving parents, or to lack of love are low. However, references to bad parents in terms of poor discipline or lack of discipline, are scored H. While the idea of overwork or lack of *rest* is high, references to lack of *leisure* or of pleasant relaxation (ego-satisfying passivity) are low.

The more ideologized responses refer to the social system as creating insecurity and frustration, or as making complex and contradictory demands which the individual cannot meet. The imagery of the "social system" is similar to that of the family authority: dominating, rejecting, stifling.

References to "oppression" by lows and highs are sometimes difficult to distinguish. Thus, a low wrote: "Prolonged persecution could drive a person nuts, particularly if he felt un-united with anyone else and felt that he alone was subjected to the full brunt of the persecution." By way of contrast, note the following high response: "Constant oppression by employers, fellow-workers, or unions." In the high response we find not only the antiunion sentiment, but also a feeling of generalized threat and a strong extrapunitive quality with no self-orientation or intraception. The low, on the other hand, expresses intraception, an attempt at self-analysis, and a desire for strong emotional ties with his environment.

*Neutral Responses.* Facetious references to the questionnaire as a cause of going nuts are neutral. Presumably the highs' reasons for rejecting the test is their anti-intraception and opposition to "prying," whereas the lows are disturbed by the large number of scale items with which they strongly disagree. However, references to the projective items, and to this one in particular, are scored H. For example: "Trying to answer questions like this one" (see high category 2, below). References to *diet* and *nutrition* are neutral in themselves; they are given, usually as part of a larger response, more often by low than by high scorers.

#### *High Categories (Question 4)*

The main variables underlying these responses include anti-intraception, extrapunitive, external orientation, ego-alien passive-dependency, hos-

tility, and anxiety; and an emotionally shallow diffuse inner life. These characteristically high variables also emerged from the analysis of interviews and of T.A.T. material.

1. "*Rumblings from below.*" The rationale for this concept has been given above (Question 1: Moods). The orientation in these responses is toward the individual rather than toward the situation, but there is no reference to inner insecurities, conflicts, or affective states. On a more interpretive level, we find a superego-ridden ego with a rigid moral façade; "going nuts" involves break-through of the underlying impulses or anxieties and destruction of the façade. The popular expression, "blow your top" and "blow your cork" are literal representations of this underlying imagery. They refer primarily to quasi-psychotic episodes rather than to neurotic symptoms. The main ego defenses seem to be projection, denial, and reaction-formation (emphasis on work, opposition to leisure).

One common type of response involves the idea of *overwork*, strain, or pressure.

Examples: "Pressure." "Overwork, mental fatigue, or nervous strain." "Too much work (physical or mental)." "Undertaking too much." "Overtaxing your strength in business or social affairs." "Continual difficulties, suspense." "Too long hours at work; debt." "Long hours—16 or 18 hours a day for 7 days a week working on something that doesn't keep you busy constantly" (note the combined emphasis on overwork as well as boredom, and the fear of "having your mind unoccupied"). "Overwork—lousy physical conditions coupled with sudden shock." "The constant grind and routine of everyday life would drive me nuts if I couldn't find some way to lose myself; my books serve this purpose." In the last example, books apparently have a defensive, anti-intrceptive function rather than a creative or expressive one. Fear of overwork seems to exist most strongly in just those individuals who value work most. By inference—and this is supported by much clinical material—the overwork represents overconformity or "being too good for too long," something which leads to the break-through of passivity and/or hostility against external work-demanding authority.

Once again we find frequent references to *worry* with a minimum of elaboration or differentiation. Worry is often related to *body anxiety* and fear of physiological ("nervous") breakdown. Indeed, the references to overwork above often involve, implicitly or explicitly, the idea that mental breakdown is caused primarily by body breakdown. This underlying anxiety over body weakness and threat of body harm in the ethnocentric men stands in marked contrast to their surface emphasis on rugged masculinity which is expressed in other projective questions as well as in other techniques.

Examples: "Sickness, ill health, worry, trouble." "Insanity is (due) to several things, most of which are physical deteriorations; disease or sudden shock." "Loss of his senses (sight, etc.) or the fatigue of battle." "Unknown illness not treated in time."

Excessive *drinking* is included here because it represents a bodily rather than a psychological threat. Another common cause given is *heredity*. For example: "Wouldn't go mad without an innate streak of insanity." "Taxing self beyond innate ability." The hereditarian theory of neurosis is like the hereditarian theory of group differences and human nature; it helps to obviate the necessity for looking inward or for seeking psychosocial explanations of human behavior.

While *anti-intracception* is an aspect of many of the above responses, it is in many cases the primary theme. These responses are usually not difficult to differentiate from low category 2 ("too much inner life"). "Going nuts" is attributed to thinking about oneself or to straining one's mind.

Examples: "A strain on his nerves from overconcentration or something." "Intent concentration for a long period of time (years)." "Talk self into it." "Thinking too much about your own troubles and forgetting to let God help you." (Compare this with the low response: "Not learning to face problems squarely in the face and with courage.") "His imagination runs away with him." The response, "Trying to answer questions like this one," expresses both opposition to "prying" by others and a sense of discomfort and threat in the face of one's own emotions.

Individuals giving the above responses seem afraid to look inward at all, for fear of what they will find. Is this one basis for the tendency, at least in its more extreme forms, to regard extroversion as good, introversion as bad? A similar idea is expressed in Item 9 of the Form 45 F scale: One should concentrate on "cheerful things" and not think about "worries or problems." It seems also to be involved in the idea of leisure merely as rest from work or as escape rather than as a means of self-expression and self-understanding.

Responses referring to "*loss of loved ones*" or to worry over possible loss or harm, may be included here since they seem to express the rumbling of deep-lying hostility toward family and ingroup members.

As mentioned previously, the highs tend to handle their ambivalence toward family members by exaggerating the surface positive feelings (idealization, admiration, submission) and by deflecting the hostility by means of projection (imagery of outgroups and human nature), displacement and rationalization (hostility expressed directly but explained as moral indignation), and so on. The infrequent references by lows to concern over loved ones usually involve more explicit indications of strong personal relationship.

2. *Threatening, irritating, or nonsupporting environment.* These responses show a predominantly external orientation, with no reference to the individual's inner needs, strivings or values, and with no implication of surface inner conflict. Neurosis is, so to speak, imposed on the individual from without, by an invidious stimulus or idea that overwhelms his mind much as a germ infects the body.

Examples: "Continued irritating noises or lights, also pain or torture; depends on the person and his weaknesses; religion and alcohol are the two most frequent things in my belief." "Monotonous humdrum such as a quiet routine or just the opposite as a bombardment; from one extreme to the other." "Another war will drive most of the people nuts—mostly people who have been in World War II" (by a veteran).

"Constant noise of unpleasant nature, such as shrill whistles." "Continuous arguing, tedious work, lots of noise." "The current strikes, the uncertainty of the times, governments of the world constantly bickering." "A nagging wife, Harry James' Orchestra." "A continual series of things going wrong." "Financial troubles." "Loss of money."

The idea of aloneness, without reference to actual relationship or to striving for love, is included here. For example: "Loneliness and departure from a nice manner of living; solitude, etc." *Fear of solitude* per se is high; it seems to represent, as do many of the examples above, underlying anxiety in the face of an environment unconsciously felt to be threatening. References to *self-pity* are fairly common and are consistent with the extrapunitive, projective trends in some of the other responses. For example: "Constant self-pity and imagination of a thousand ills." References to *sexual frustration* are usually high in men, low in women, although contextual qualities must be considered in scoring.

The idea of *monotony* or *tedious work* is high, particularly when the general context of the response indicates boredom, lack of stimulation, or other high trends; it is scored L when there is some indication of blocked inner (achievement) values and needs.

An example of a high response is: "Continuous repetition of a disliked subject or action." By way of contrast, consider the following response: "Frustration from lack of factors in the environment which will interest or inspire him in any way whatever." Despite the external orientation, this response is scored L because of the reference to frustration and the desire for inner satisfaction.

3. *Omissions* of Question 4 are statisticized as H. Omissions occurred in only 4 per cent of the cases, but three-fourths of these were highs (see Table 2 (XV)). This result is consistent with the anti-intrapection and other trends differentiating those high from those low in prejudice.

#### QUESTION 5. WORST CRIMES A PERSON COULD COMMIT?

##### *Low Categories*

The main inner problem to which these responses refer is aggression, the primary difference between lows and highs lying in the manner of handling this deep-lying need. Formal low categories have not been distinguished for this item, but certain general properties of the low responses may be indicated. *Achievement values* once again provide a moral frame of reference. Intrapection, understanding, hesitancy in condemning, identification with the underdog, intense personal relationships, and the like are common qualities of the low responses. Concern with crimes against the personality is much more common than concern with crimes against the body; and bodily harm, when it is referred to, is described in a less primitive and a more object-related way. There is strong concern with the psychological development and integrity of the individual. It is convenient here as

elsewhere to distinguish the ideological area from that of interpersonal relationships.

In the sphere of *ideology* we find references to exploitation and discrimination against minority groups, lower economic classes, "the common man," and other nations. Also references to crimes against "humanity" or "society" as a whole.

Examples: "The worst possible crime a person can commit would be that of true treason; by true treason I mean the motive or attempt to injure, impair, or jeopardize those things that are dear to the majority and of their best interests." "Race extermination and starting wars." "Hate, intolerance, narrowness; his crimes against society as a whole." "Selling out his fellow man for profit to himself." "Each crime is different—depends on motivation and result; in general, crimes against fellow man, Jew-baiting, etc." "Permit mob rule, economic exploitation." "Racial persecution and the enforced militarism of a country during peacetime." "Slavery, including mental slavery, warping and distorting the minds of children."

With regard to *interpersonal relationships* we find themes and qualities similar to those above.

Examples: "Tell a person's confidence; get personal gain from another's rights." "Graft, fraud, etc. at the expense of innocent victims; malicious slander" (while graft and fraud given alone are high, the focus on the victims and the last part of the response suggest a score of L). "The greater sins are committed by us who know the right and the needs of others but 'pass by on the other side'" (this response was given by a strongly religious low; compare with high religious responses). "Betrayal of principles, friends." "Avarice, intolerance." "Hypocrisy, deception; be untrue to oneself." There are frequent criticisms of *authority figures*. For example: "Abuse of authority." "Negligence on the part of a military commander or anyone that results in a loss of life."

While "murder" alone is scored Na, and brutality alone is H, responses involving *murder or physical attack* which bring in motivations and which describe more than the aggressive act itself are scored L.

Examples: "Murder for gain or envy." "Crimes done just to make people miserable." "Murder—because no man should have control over another's life" (intrapersonal, achievement values). "Sadistically causing the suffering of others" (references to sadistic motives, to cruelty, and to resulting suffering are scored L, while the idea of "blind hate" implying breakdown of ego controls is scored H). "Brutality for the sake of seeing persons suffer." "Cruelty to helpless things." "Cause another to degenerate." "To take another's life" (more object-related than "murder"). References to crime as a *symptom* requiring psychological understanding also fall here.

A response involving *incest and matricide* was given once, by a low man and in a context meriting a score of L; "Incest with his mother or matricide, (crime against an individual); destroying world culture, that is books, sculpturing, etc. (crime against humanity)." (Parenthetical remarks by the subject.) This response seems to express, in a characteristically low form, deep ambivalence toward the mother in which love and hate motives are extremely strong. The ambivalence of the high man is not likely to be expressed in this way, and their erotic attachment to the mother is probably not as great (see the psychiatric clinic material, Chapter XXII). Note also

how this man's relationship to his mother has become the image on which is built his relationship to humanity and culture. References to incest or matricide in a moralistic context would be scored H.

*Neutral Responses.* "Murder" alone is scored neutral; it is given seldom, and about equally often by highs and lows. References to murder are common, but in a context that is usually clearly high or low. "Create war" without further qualification is scored Na. *Omissions* are neutral for this item. They occurred in 8 per cent of the responses.

This is the only item which the lows omitted slightly more frequently than did the highs (9 per cent and 7 per cent respectively). The following hypothesis may help to explain this result. Whereas the highs are disturbed by looking inward, the lows are more disturbed by looking outward at major value-violations, particularly aggressive ones. (This hypothesis might be tested by determining high-low differences in reading reports of aggressive crimes, the highs being expected to read, to condemn, and to enjoy these more without recognizing that personal motives are at work.) To the extent that the highly ethnocentric subjects are more punitive than the others, they would be expected to show more interest in crime and other punishment-evoking activities. The disturbance of the lows may also be due in part to the tendency to identify with the victim.

#### *High Categories (Question 5)*

1. *Crude aggression and sex.* These responses suggest, as have responses to previous items, that for many highs there is a deep-lying, ego-alien fund of aggression and sex. These trends seem to have remained relatively primitive, destructive, unsocialized; and they are not well fused with or modified by other trends in the ego. The frequent association of sex with aggression suggests that sex is conceived as aggressive and threatening. Aggression is aimed at the body of the victim, without reference to personal relationships or to psychological meanings for aggressor or victim. It has the primitive quality commonly found in the fantasies and fears of small children. (The same impersonal, destructive, object-less quality is often found in the current flood of mystery detective fiction, in which the hero, finding a close friend or relative murdered, immediately responds not with sorrow or concern but with moral indignation and a list of suspects.) The responses often refer to bizarre, destructive acts one might commit in a psychotic episode when ego-control and cognitive structuring of the environment are eliminated and unsocialized impulses break through.

Examples: Probably the most popular high response is "*Murder and rape.*" In the group of Veteran men, for example, this was given, sometimes along with other crimes, by 15 out of 26 highs as compared with 4 out of 25 lows. "Torture." "Sex crimes." "Murder without sufficient reason." "Rape on juveniles." "Sex crimes on children, women; kidnapping; murdering of newly born babies." "Having been a prisoner of war in the Philippines, I would consider some of the sights I saw there truly unprintable, but to my knowledge the worst crime that is printable would be rape."

References to *attacks on children* are fairly common; this is perhaps related to the fact that in San Quentin the sex offenders, many of whom engaged in sexual activities with children, were extremely high on ethnocentrism (see Chapter XXI). Occasionally there are *detailed concrete descriptions of brutal acts*. For example: "Kidnap a person, starve them for two weeks, then strangle them; after they are finally dead, dissect their body, wrap up the pieces and mail them home to the victim's parents."

2. *Other immoral acts*. These responses fall within a context of ethnocentrism, pseudopatriotism, and moral values dealing with conventional masculinity-femininity and conformity.

Examples: "Treason, traitorism, sedition" (crimes against the *status quo*). "Dope peddling, failure of a politician to protect his country." "Heresy." "Traitorous acts against those who have faith in him, as well as sex crimes." (This is a matter of not living up to others' expectations rather than a matter of personal relationship or inner demands.) "Adultery." "Crimes against his person, sex crimes, and to willfully smear a woman's name." "Murder, immoral acts, dishonesty." "To neglect himself and family" (no reference to relationship, motivation). "The one against the Holy Ghost." "Willful passing on of dangerous disease to other person" (body anxiety, concern with contamination).

3. *Various legal offenses*. We note here the tendency to think in formal, external, legal terms. Again the concern with property and money is expressed.

The more common specific offenses include robbery, stealing, larceny, blackmail, kidnapping, "Destruction of property," arson, manslaughter, and so on. References to murder in legalistic terms are included here: "Willful first-degree murder." "Unjustifiable homicide."

## QUESTION 6. MOST EMBARRASSING MOMENTS?

### *Low Categories*

The defining context for the low responses includes violation of achievement values, self-blame and guilt, concern for the feeling of others, feelings of failure and inadequacy.

1. *Hurting another's feelings*. Both highs and lows often refer to acts which involve breaches of common courtesy. However, the highs ordinarily focus on the act per se and on the idea of etiquette, whereas the lows are concerned mainly with the problem of rejection and with the feelings of the other person. Also, there is often an element of self-reproach in the low responses.

Examples: "Forgetting things about others that I really should know" (explicit self-blame). "Unintentionally offending any person, but particularly any loved one or well-liked one." "When I have done anything tactless that may hurt someone, or any act of stupidity." "To see others suffer from embarrassment" (identification and empathy). "Walk into room at wrong moment, others are being intimate" (self-rejection for intruding, rather than rejection of others for behaving that way).

2. *Feelings of inadequacy, failure, being rejected.* In these responses the focus is mainly on oneself and there is explicit or implicit self-criticism.

Examples: "When I start talking, realize that I don't know what I'm talking about." "Ignorance—that is, not knowing well something I should know." "Meet someone and not know what to say." "Situations in which I am inadequate." "To be laughed at for failing to get off a presentable public speech; to be put in an embarrassing position by a person who outmaneuvers you mentally." ("Making a public speech" alone is Na.) "To find out that after taking a strong stand I was absolutely wrong." "People laugh at me, not with me." "Not go somewhere because I didn't have a date, then be asked how it was." "Asking someone something or some service" (scored L because of surface inhibition, inadequacy, implied fear of rejection).

The embarrassing situation may involve *moral obligation* and guilt. In some cases the individual does not meet his own inner standards; in other cases he does not want to do something or be with someone, but feels both obligation and open ambivalence.

Examples: "Not fulfilling promises I made." "When I feel I have neglected to do something I should have done." "Getting into some situation in which you had no desire to be but someone expected you to be there."

In general, references to *mistakes*, especially when they are described as silly or stupid, are scored L; they seem to be based on self-evaluation, inner focusing and intrapunitiveness.

Responses like "Exposure of my own weaknesses, I suppose" and "Being caught for the faker I am" are included here because of the explicit self-blame and the self-critical humor, although the idea of "exposure" or being caught, without this context, is high (see below).

### *High Categories (Question 6)*

1. *Violations of convention and etiquette.* Probably the most common high response to this item refers to breaches of etiquette. The focus is on the behavior per se, on behavior which violates specific formulae of the Emily Post variety. There is almost never a reference to inner needs or faults, the violations usually being regarded as "slips" or unmotivated accidents. In this way guilt, self-blame, and ego-reference are made unnecessary. Whereas the embarrassment of the lows is primarily an inner matter, relatively independent of whether or not they were observed, the embarrassment of the highs depends almost entirely on being frowned upon by an external moral force. The idea of "being caught" is prominent in the high responses, and with it the implication that the same thing done without detection would not be embarrassing.

Examples: "Making a decided error in social etiquette would be the worst." "Forgetting names of people" (social anxiety, no reference to personal concern for person). "Faulty dress." "Saying something degrading of another person *within their bearing*" (author's italics). "To appear inefficient." "Saying the wrong thing at the wrong time." "When I talk about something and forget what I have been talking

about" (compare with L response: "Discover I don't know what I am talking about"). "When the children pipe up in front of company with something I've said about the person or some other innocent thing which sounds evil and embarrasses me." "When my husband is rude to me in front of other people" (inhibited hostility?). "If I am found being lax about kindness, courtesy toward everybody" (the idea of kindness (not love) toward *everyone* as a kind of task is not uncommon among people who, in the details of their ideology, ethnocentrically reject the bulk of mankind). "Being disapproved of." "Get called down for an error in front of other people" (compare with the L response: "Being exposed for the faker I am"). "Mispronounce words." "Guests arrive and the house is dirty or I'm unkempt." "Be accidentally rude or impolite." "Do something out of the ordinary." The idea of being threatened, rather than being rejected, is often an undercurrent in high responses. So too is extrapunitiveness. For example: "Dirty jokes (by others)." "People's thoughtlessness." The response "Nothing I can write here" is scored H for its "antiprying" character.

2. *Blows at exhibitionism and narcissism.* Many of the violations in Category 1 imply unacceptable conspicuousness and loss of prestige. The same thing is expressed more directly in this category. Some of the main properties of the H responses are social anxiety, rigid conformity and fear of nonconformity, emphasis on appearance (apparently based on a combination of conventionality and exhibitionism, though the motives are largely unrecognized by the individual), nonintrceptive approach.

Examples: "Walking into a crowded room with my shorts on." "To stumble in public." "Fall off a horse in a riding exhibition." "Fall on a banana peel with men watching." "Have my slip showing or a hole in my sock." "I passed out waiting for an elevator one day and even now I can remember my humiliation when I opened my eyes and saw 'thousands' of people gazing at me." The humiliation over fainting lends itself to interpretation in terms of ego-alien, anxiety-producing passive needs covered over by a masculine façade. Some anxiety regarding women or regarding sexual impulses (or both) is implied in such responses as "Being alone with a crowd of women" and "Surrounded by women."

*Neutral Responses.* Omissions are scored Na. They occurred in .9 per cent of the cases and equally often in highs and lows.

When the response deals with errors of tact in personal relationships and it is not clear whether the subject is disturbed over hurting someone's feelings (L) or violating a rule of etiquette (H), the response should be scored Na. The superficial event is the same; it is the *meaning* of the experience that differentiates highs from lows, and the meaning is sometimes ambiguous.

Often, however, subtle cues can be used. Consider, for example, the response, "When I talk to a person, repeat his name wrong over and over, don't realize my mistake till later." The two scorers, working independently and "blindly," both correctly assigned a score of L primarily on the basis of the phrase, "realize my mistake" which seemed to imply introspection and self-blame. Similarly, they gave score of H to the response, "Speaking or acting out of turn," a score of L to "Barging in where I don't belong." Most of the responses are more clearly H or L.

## QUESTION 7. HOW WOULD YOU SPEND YOUR LAST SIX MONTHS?

*Low Categories*1. *Achievement values: creativity and social contribution.*

Examples: "Conveying accumulated ideas to my fellow man." "I would like to spend such a time solely in creative endeavor." "Reading poetry, philosophy, studying psychiatry." "Fight intolerance and social wrongs." "Try to do something, anything, for mankind or at least help someone; will my eyes and nerves to medicine, find someone who could use them." (Words like *mankind* and *fellow man* are used frequently by lows, seldom by highs.) "Make people happy" (in contrast to H responses "try to be good" or "doing good deeds"). "If I were altruistic I would try to do as much as I could for the other person, but actually I would do everything possible to make my stay enjoyable" (scored L because of the surface conflict between social contribution and personal pleasure).

The general idea of "doing things for others" is expressed by both lows and highs, but in characteristically different forms. In the lows we find references to nurturance and love-giving which are either personalized towards a few love objects or else generalized to include all humanity.

Examples: "Try to make the world a better place for all to live in." "In doing the most I would be capable of for those of whom I am fond." In the highs, on the other hand, we find more moralized references to "doing good" rather than "making happy," and the generosity is usually directed toward individuals who are characterized as ingroup members rather than as love objects. For example: "Seeing if I could do the people I thought most of any good; my family, such as mother, father, sister and brother." In short, nurturance is scored L when it is found in a context of love, close relationship, and achievement values; it is scored H in a context of superficial conventionality and ingroup orientation. (It should be noted that there are many conventional lows, but their conventionality is expressed in a context of love-giving rather than conformity *per se*.)

2. *Open sensuality and active pleasure.* There were few references to sex, but most of these were by lows.

Examples: "Drinking and carousing around with women." "Making love." "Have a romantic love affair while touring South America." Sometimes a sexual-intellectual balance is sought: "Spend part of the time whoring around, most of the time trying to write 'the Great American Novel'—though I'm probably not good enough" (written by a low-scoring man).

The enjoyment of active sociability is characteristically low. It may occur in a sensual and/or intellectual context, or simply in the form of warmth and friendly interaction.

Examples: "Travel, enjoy life, take it easy with friends." "Spend the time with friends in a constant rush of vacation and work if they didn't know I had only 6 months; if they knew, I'd take off to spend the time with strangers—reading, playing, working." "I'd spend all that time with my friends, the people I know and like." "In the company of my wife and child, enjoying good shows, car rides, and

doing things I now do in my leisure" (compare to the highs' references to their families, below; note also the reference to *leisure*, a strong indication for scoring L). The high's references to pleasure are characteristically more dilute and empty, e.g., "Have a good time" or "Do as I please" (see below).

Reference to *seclusion* in the sense of "rejecting the world" may be included because, though apparently the opposite of sociability, it seems to spring from similar deep sources.

Example: "I would go to some wild country region where I could just live and not be disturbed by anyone or anything." (In this man's interview, the desire for solitude seemed associated with depressive feelings of rejection by the mother.) This is in marked contrast to the objection to solitude in highs (see also Items 1 and 4); some high men, however, give "seclusion" responses in which the primary source seems to be passivity rather than ego-recognized rejection of others.

### *High Categories (Question 7)*

An important aspect of many high responses is *constriction of fantasy*. Although the question allows complete freedom of choice—"if you could do just as you pleased, how would you spend your time?"—some highs (and no lows in the present groups) make their actions explicitly conditional on the presence of certain external conditions. It is as if they cannot allow themselves a completely uninhibited fantasy, as if they cannot get away from concrete "reality" even for a moment. This unimaginativeness, or rather circumscription of ego bounds, seems related to the barren inner life, the shallow emotions, and the "escape into reality" which are also revealed in the F scale and in the interview material.

Examples: "Probably quit my job—if I had a job." "Perhaps go fishing in the Sierras if the season was right." "That is a question that is impossible to answer, as I do not know how I would act under those circumstances."

1. *Conventional morality and inhibition*. The main theme in these responses is making peace with God and man (particularly ingroups), in the sense of being "good," of conforming, of denying oneself active pleasure. Many of the responses are in a religious context, but it must be stressed that there are also low religious responses. (To repeat a scoring slogan: It is not the event as such, but the meaning of the event to the individual, that determines whether the score is H or L.) Compare for example the high response, "Making peace with God," with the low equivalent, "Working toward spiritual realization in a monastery." The highs' emphasis is on inner peace and harmony, *on the absence of conflict rather than on positive achievement*. Religious responses having such qualities as self-expression, intraception, and self-blame should be scored L. (See also low category 1.)

Examples: "I would try and do as much good as I could." "Be nice to everyone." "I would live with God and prepare myself to meet Him." "I'd meet as many people as I could, go all over the world and above all, go to church." "With my wife" (devoid of content, no sign of pleasure or relationship). "Being normal." (The

emphasis on *normality*, which is commonly expressed, suggests that the person is worried about "letting loose.") A recurrent high theme is that of "Getting my affairs in order," a sort of last-minute concern with compulsive detail. The response "*Commit suicide*" occurred in a few highs and no lows, and it was scored H. This response may reflect an authoritarian contempt for "cowards"; the individuals giving it would seem to regard death as more attractive than life—suicide being a temptation that "strong" men resist—something that the low scorers are not so likely to feel.

2. *Incidental, dilute pleasures.* These responses refer to pleasure-fun activities of a highly conventionalized, desensitized, and emotionally shallow nature. Interpretively, the individual is seeking satisfaction but his moral façade prevents the free, intense, ego-accepted expression of underlying impulses. *Travel* is probably the most common activity; whatever its other meanings (e.g., voyeuristic), it may also express the vague, undifferentiated desire for change (ego-alien rebellion?) which is also expressed in some of the interviews. These responses are distinguished from those in low category 2 by the lack of open sensuality and achievement values, and by the conventionalized quality.

Examples: "I would travel as far as possible, with a companion of the fair sex." "I think I would go the forest and wild life and enjoy some companionship, but be more or less reserved in my actions." "See interesting things, read books" (superficial, concrete, dilute). "I would spend the time at home and with my friends with a normal amount of recreation." "Marry—traveling around the world."

A "travel" response is scored L even when there is no explicit sensual quality, as long as there is some differentiation or detailed description. For example: "Traveling the world and visiting the countries to see their natural and man-made wonders and to see the natural habitats of the peoples of the world." "Travel to South America, Mexico and New York." There are, of course, transitional responses between the clearly high and the clearly low, but these are not numerous.

Included here also are responses in which there is no specific reference to what one would do but only to *empty pleasures*, e.g., "Have fun," "Spend money doing exactly what I please" (release of conventional inhibition), "Try to be happy."

All the references to *athletics* in the present groups were by highs, and were scored H. (Had athletics been mentioned in a clearly low context, it would have been scored L.)

Examples: "Probably quit my job—if I had a job; see as many sports events as I could; play golf and, I imagine, get drunk fairly often also" (by a "middle-class" man). "Traveling, playing golf, bowling; a great variety of activities and as little sleep as possible" (this is escape into reality rather than pleasure-sensuality). "Travel, adventure, general mischief, hazardous play." "Hunting and fishing."

When there is reference only to a single, specific behavior without a defining context, e.g., "go to camp," the response is scored *Neutral*. Also Na is the response, "Same as ever" when no qualifications are given.

3. *Passivity*. That many "high" men have considerable conflict between a surface emphasis on work-ambition-activity and an underlying, ego-alien passive-dependent trend, is suggested by several projective questions (1, 3, 4 especially), and it has been demonstrated by the material in other chapters. The passivity is occasionally expressed in the responses to this question. It is interesting that whereas the guiding (achievement) values of the lows come out more strongly than ever on this item, the guiding (work-success) values of the highs are less important, in the last six months—when one's individuality is at stake, so to speak—than are religious values,<sup>5</sup> passivity, or other pleasures. The main forms of passivity are sleep, fishing, and relaxing (in the sense of not working rather than of active leisure).

Examples: "Doing the things I like to do and *getting ten hours' sleep*" (underlining by subject). "I would go to a nice quiet place and just sit down by a stream and fish and think" (mainly passivity; insufficient evidence of intellectuality or intensity to merit a score of L). "Relaxing, but trying not to worry or I would die before my six months came up." "Not thinking about it" may be included here; it represents not only anti-intracception but also a high trend toward negative rather than positive solutions of inner problems.

4. *Omissions* are recorded as Nb, converted to H.

#### QUESTION 8. WHAT EXPERIENCES WOULD BE MOST AWE-INSPIRING?

##### *Low Categories*

1. *Realization of achievement values*. As discussed previously, these values may be expressed in terms of interpersonal relations, where they refer to personal achievement (intellectual, aesthetic, scientific), warm relationships and social contribution; or they may be expressed on an ideological level in the form of progressive social change, elimination of prejudice, and the realization of broad democratic values.

Examples: "To see the day when the people (collectively) really controlled their own destiny and would no longer be dictated to by special interests." "Mass emotion usually; awe that an emotion can be so uniform in so many people at the same time" (empathy, sense of unity with others). "The composition or fine performance of good music." "Impersonal and unselfish love for mankind." "The responsibility that a Negro friend of mine feels for 13 million people." "Birth of anything new—children, animals, seasons, scientific ideas" (references to *birth* and creativity are fairly common in lows). "A great work of art, poem, piece of sculpture, or symphony." "Certain manifestations of human personality where people are unexpectedly good, strong and beautiful, especially ordinary people who haven't had much chance; in people the two qualities which arouse my wonder are the power of courage and the power to accept defeat humbly and without bitterness and resentment." References to being *loved* are low, to being *praised* or popular are high.

<sup>5</sup> The sudden increase in the importance of religion to highs when they are faced with death reminds us of the acquiring of "fox-hole religion" during the war. These results, as well as the interview material on religion, suggest that such last-minute conversions occur more often in highs than in lows.

2. *Power as exemplified in man's achievements and in nature.* The idea of power is expressed by both low and high scorers, but again the same event seems to have systematically different meanings for the two groups. The highs' conception of power is extremely personalized (see below); they admire and are awe-inspired by powerful people, toward whom they show deference and submission. The lows, on the other hand, conceive of power in more impersonal terms; they see it mainly as a means toward socially beneficial ends (rather than an end in itself), as more universal in the sense of existing everywhere and for the over-all social good. The main kinds of admired power are material-technological achievements by man and examples of grandeur in nature.

Examples: "Watch a two-thousand-ton aircraft take off; the Golden Gate Bridge; the view of the Bay Area from Mt. Tamalpais on a clear night." "The great structures which man has built in this world." "Seeing a star explode or earthquakes—any extreme natural manifestation." "Great material achievements—building projects, etc." "The atomic bomb, Grand Canyon, Boulder Dam, etc." References to the *atomic bomb* in itself are neutral; it is scored L in a context of man-made power or material achievement, H in a context of destructiveness or other high trends.

3. *Intense nature experiences.* References to nature are scored L if there are explicit indications of a strong aesthetic, sensual-emotional experience, or if there is fairly specific description of what one would be looking at. Vague, empty references to nature in general or to "just looking" are scored H (see below).

Examples: "Natural phenomena such as Crater Lake, Grand Canyon." "Thoughts of God's infinite intelligence, power, etc., as shown in nature—the structure and physiology of living creatures, behavior of the universe, etc." (This is a good example of a low religious response; understanding, imaginative, universalistic, idea of God-in-universe rather than God-over-universe.) "Watching a beautiful sunset; seeing Frisco at night from a ferry boat in the middle of the Bay." "A descent into the center of the earth; a walk on the bottom of the ocean."

### *High Categories (Question 8)*

1. *Realization of conventional values.* These are highly conventionalized responses referring to acquisition or possession of things, to peace of mind (in the sense of freedom from worry), to a vague, undefined sense of virtue, and to incidental, desensitized pleasures.

Examples: "Feelings of good, examples of good." "Marriage and happy family life; ownership of something important such as a home, new auto, business concern, etc." "Love, I guess; from what I understand, when it dawns a fellow he has met the right girl; this is something I imagine and I really believe will be true" (love as a completely strange emotion, more imposed from without than motivated from within). "To know that when I get married I would be able to live very comfortably in a home with my wife and child." "If my husband were home evenings" (no reference to relationship). "To get married." "Get rid of my stomach trouble." "Be

in a good frame of mind all the time." "Possession of great wealth; outstanding accomplishment of any kind" (note the equating of wealth and accomplishment). "Knowing my husband loved me without a doubt; peace on earth" (this seems to refer more to freedom from anxiety than to emotional warmth and exchange). The responses in this category suggest a lack of inner emotional vitality.

2. *Power: deference and submission toward power figures.* The highs' references to power are in an *authoritarian* context: the power is personalized in a strong man toward whom the subject has, implicitly or explicitly, a deferent, submissive relation. The authority figure may come from various areas of social life: military, political, industrial, religious. There is often an emphasis on *ritual* and a concern with what is *external* rather than with intrinsic meanings and values.

Examples: "During the war: to sit in on a meeting of the German General Staff; to witness a V-2 bomb launching. For peacetime: a presidential conference with his aides and Cabinet; a meeting of the country's leading personnel men." "Watching politicians in action in Washington; talking with professional athletes." "A coronation, a college graduation, awarding of Nobel prizes" (emphasis on ritual and success, not an achievement in an inner sense). "Meeting a truly great man such as Admiral Halsey or General Patton, or President Truman."

The religious references by highs express the same underlying variables.

Examples: "Certain church services I have seen; religion in the midst of war, on battlefields I have seen." "A conversation or sight of God." "A picture of President Roosevelt, whom I admire; being in church during the service." Note the primary concern with religion as ritual rather than as ethics, and the conception of God in terms similar to those expressed above with regard to personnel men, athletes, military authorities, politicians. Again we find an indication of religion as a fox-hole phenomenon—something that one turns to only as a support against external threat and inner anxiety. A mystical, *superstitious* trend is illustrated by the following response: "The feeling relating to something that is supernatural, something that happens in a weird way and has no factual reasons about it."

In some cases the subject wants to play the power role *himself*, often with specific reference to someone else playing the deferent role.

Examples: "To be able to fly in the Army Air Corps" (gaining power through the plane; desire for military experience). "I have the mad desire to hear an audience screaming 'Author' for me when my play has been the greatest ever to see Broadway" (more emphasis on personal prestige, audience deference, than on achievement). "To know the basic actualities of electricity; to create something or see something created, heretofore considered impossible or unbelievable" (not achievement values, but wanting to do what no one else is powerful enough to do).

3. *Destruction-harm of other persons.* Many of the military experiences in Category 2 have this aspect, but it is the focal one here.

Examples: "Death of a close relative; torture to reveal an important plan." "To see death" (this presumably means death in someone else; references to one's personal experience of death would be scored L). "To see San Francisco destroyed by an

earthquake." "To see the results of the atomic bomb." "To watch a delicate stomach operation" (references to *surgery* are usually high; they seem related to the body-anxiety found in previous items). "To see an alcoholic who cannot help himself stay away from the cravings of liquor, a person who has been severely crippled by a disease, and to go to a funeral." (Note the associative sequence from dependency to disease to death.)

4. *Dilute experiences of nature and beauty.* These responses are matter-of-fact, general, superficial descriptions of aesthetic or "nature" experiences, with no detail and no indication of sensual-emotional involvement. The person is for the most part "just looking."

Examples: "Experiences in nature." "The sight of rare jewels and metals; the viewing of great natural wonders of the world." "Traveling to another planet-galaxy, though I doubt the probability of it" (note the "constriction of fantasy" observed also in Item 7). "The great natural beauties of nature have thrilled me and probably always will." "Trips through all the important nations of the world and not have to worry about the expenses involved" (note the limitation to "important" nations and the desire for gratuities). "Music." "Watching some unusual scientific event such as atomic energy" (merely watching, not participation or achievement). "Scenic grandeur." "Seeing something of real importance."

5. *Omissions* are recorded as Nb, scored as H. Of the 6 omissions (9 per cent), 5 were by highs.

Note: Due to various circumstances (see p. 580), only 65 of the total of 312 subjects received this question. It is likely, therefore, that further experience will suggest modifications and particularly additions to the present scoring scheme.

## SUMMARY OF PROJECTIVE QUESTION CATEGORIES

### *High Categories*

### *Low Categories*

Question 1: What moods are unpleasant or disturbing?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Violations of conventional values        | 1. Conscious conflict and guilt                           |
| 2. Threatening or nonsupporting environment | 2. Focal dependency and love-seeking                      |
| 3. "Rumblings from below"                   | 3. Open hostility, by self or others, toward love objects |
| 4. Omissions                                |   |

Question 2: What desires are most difficult to control?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Nonfocal and/or motor aggression                           | 1. Focal (usually verbal) hostility directed against violators of achievement values |
| 2. Ego-alien passivity  | 2. The tendency to violate achievement values oneself                                |
| 3. Impersonal sex   | 3. Miscellaneous   |
| 4. Incidental pleasures and violations of conventional values |  |
| 5. Omissions  |  |

Question 3: What great people do you admire most?

- |                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| 1. Power and control      | 1. The arts and philosophy                              |
| 2. Conservative Americans | 2. Physical and biological scientists                   |
| 3. Parents and relatives  | 3. Social scientists, liberal-radical political figures |
| 4. Miscellaneous          | 4. Active denial of admiration                          |

Question 4: What might drive a person nuts?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. "Rumblings from below"                                  | 1. Inner psychological states                  |
| 2. Threatening, irritating, or non-supporting environment. | 2. Dominating, blocking, rejecting environment |
| 3. Omissions   |  |

Question 5: Worst crimes a person could commit?

- |                             |                                    |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Crude aggression and sex | 1. Violation of achievement values |
| 2. Other immoral acts       |                                    |
| 3. Various legal offenses   |                                    |

Question 6: Most embarrassing moments?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Violations of convention and etiquette | 1. Hurting another's feelings.                     |
| 2. Blows at exhibitionism and narcissism  | 2. Feelings of inadequacy, failure, being rejected |

Question 7: How would you spend your last six months?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Conventional morality and inhibitions | 1. Achievement values: creativity and social contribution |
| 2. Incidental, dilute pleasures          | 2. Open sensuality and active pleasure                    |
| 3. Passivity                             |   |
| 4. Omissions                             |   |

Question 8: What experiences would be most awe-inspiring?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Realization of conventional values                   | 1. Realization of achievement values                        |
| 2. Power: deference and submission toward power figures | 2. Power as exemplified in man's achievements and in nature |
| 3. Destruction-harm of other persons                    | 3. Intense nature experiences                               |
| 4. Dilute experiences of nature and beauty              |   |
| 5. Omissions  |   |

## D. RESULTS

Practical considerations prevented quantification of the Projective Question material from every group to which the questionnaire was administered. (For a complete list and description of these groups, see Chapter IV.) The responses of the entire high and low quartiles of the following groups were analyzed. (The N's in the parentheses refer to the number of cases in the

extreme high and low quartiles combined, on which the Projection Question analysis was made.)

1. *Psychology Women* (N = 63): the members of a Psychology class at the University of California. Initial forms of questionnaire, prior to Form 78.
2. *Employment Service Veteran Men* (N = 51): an unselected sample of the Veteran population going through an office of the United States Employment Service. Forms 45 and 40.
3. *Psychiatric Clinic Men* (N = 29); and 4. *Psychiatric Clinic Women* (N = 34): in- and out-patients at a local Community Clinic. Most of these subjects received Form 45, but some were given a shorter form which included only four projective questions.
5. *Middle-Class Women* (N = 70): A highly diversified sample from various middle-class groups: religious, political, business, and the like. Form 40.
6. *Middle-Class Men and Service Club Men* (combined) (N = 65): While the scale responses of these two groups were statisticized separately, it seemed feasible to combine them into a single group for the present purposes. The Middle-Class Men were obtained from largely the same groups as the Middle-Class Women. Form 40.

These groups constitute a fairly representative sample of all those studied. On the basis of the present results, it appears likely that similar quantitative differences between the highs and lows would have been obtained had we analyzed the Projective Question material of the remaining groups. The determination of qualitative differences among the highs from various groupings, and among the lows from various groupings, remains an interesting problem for future research.

Questionnaire Form 45 contained the eight Projective Questions in the order listed above (Section A). As part of the process of cutting Form 40 down to an absolute minimum (see Chapter IV), only the first five of these questions were used. Further complications occurred in the case of the initial form (taken by the Psychology Women), which contained only the first seven questions, and in the case of the Psychiatric Clinic Men and Women, some of whom received a shorter form which contained only Questions 3, 4, 5, and 6. The inconsistency is part of the general problem of working out a standard set of questions. However, the inconsistencies in Form 40 and in the form given to the clinic patients must be regarded as methodological errors, since complete data on all eight questions would have compensated for any possible increase in administrative difficulties. As a result of differences in the number of questions in each form of the questionnaire, there are also differences in the number of subjects receiving a given question. The number of subjects receiving each of the eight questions is indicated and explained in Table 1(XV), below. All 312 of the subjects received forms containing Questions 3, 4 and 5. The N varies for the other questions, reaching a low of 65 on Question 8, which was contained in Form 45 given to the Employment Service and Clinic groups.

The Scoring Manual presented above is a slight modification of the one used by the scorers. The original Manual contained the same categories with substantially the same definitions. It was based on an analysis of the responses of two large groups: University of California Students (male and female) and the University of California Summer Session Adults, Form 60 (adult men and women from various sections of the middle class). As the scoring proceeded, certain additional implications and theoretical points were brought out and incorporated as notes in the original Manual. Also, an attempt was made to clarify certain ambiguities pointed out by the scorers. These notes are in the text of the present Manual. The only further change is the addition of a number of examples from the groups on which the data below are based. While the present Scoring Manual is more articulate than the original, no essentially new theoretical points have been added.

### 1. RELIABILITY OF SCORING

The critical reader may, after going through the Scoring Manual above, legitimately ask whether the proposed differences between highs and lows are "really" there, or whether they are not imposed by the writer's bias. A partial answer to this question is offered by means of the controlled scoring procedure. In the last four groups (all but the Psychology Women and the Veteran Men), the following scoring procedure was followed.

The high and low quartiles from a given group were combined and their responses to each item typed in a single, randomly ordered series. Each response was identified by a code number, so that the scorer did not know whether it was given by an individual scoring high or by an individual scoring low on ethnocentrism. Moreover, the code numbers for each individual varied from item to item in order to prevent halo effect (e.g., the tendency to give an individual a score of H on Item 2 because he was scored H on Item 1). Each rater went through all responses of the combined-high-plus-low grouping for each item, recording her scores of H, L, Na, Nhl, or Nb (see Section A for key to symbols) for each code number. Only after all items had been scored were the code numbers taken away and the identity (with respect to standing on E) of each subject restored. The scorer was, therefore, entirely on her own in deciding whether each response fell into a high, low, or neutral category. This is what is meant by "blind" scoring.

In the case of the Psychology Women and the Employment Service Veterans the scoring was not done blindly. This was recognized as a methodological error and corrected on all subsequent groups. However, the advantage in knowing the subjects' standing on E may have been partially counterbalanced by the newness of the task for the scorers, and by the emphasis placed on caution.

As a further check on the dependability of scoring, it was always done independently by two raters. Their degree of agreement in assigning scores

gives a measure of reliability, i.e., of the probability that these results can be duplicated by other raters with similar training. While high reliability does not in itself prove the correctness of the *interpretations* regarding the deeper meaning of the scoring categories, it does indicate that the scoring categories, *as specifically defined*, have been objectively measured and are not merely figments of the imagination. Scoring reliability is, then, one index of objectivity.

A word ought perhaps to be said about the training of the raters.<sup>6</sup> Both were, when the scoring started, at approximately the level of first-year graduate students in psychology. Their learning of the Scoring Manual was part of the process of becoming familiar with the general theoretical orientation of the present research. Neither had had any clinical experience or intensive training in dynamic personality theory, beyond a few undergraduate courses. In addition to studying the Scoring Manual, they had the benefit of several preliminary practice sessions on groups not included in the final statistical treatment. The nature of the scorers' background and training is stressed because it reveals that detailed familiarity with a particular psychological theory is not essential for scoring; theory is, of course, essential for an integrated understanding of the total pattern of data.

When the two raters had independently made and recorded their scores for a given group, a conference was held for the purpose of assigning a final score for each response. As has been noted above, each response was scored High, Low, or Neutral; the H or L scores did not specify which particular category (e.g., high category 3 or low category 1) the response represented. The reason for this is that a response might represent variables in more than one category; or it might express in abstract form an underlying high or low trend without falling into a specific category as described. A scoring disagreement was registered whenever the two original scores were not identical. Discussion of the disagreements usually convinced one rater or the other to change in the other's direction. Occasionally a response scored H by one rater and L by the other received a final score of Na or Nhl.

The scoring reliability, that is, the percentage of agreement between raters, was computed as follows. A full error was counted when one rater scored H, the other L. A half error was counted when one rater scored Na or Nhl and the other scored H or L. Thus, if in a group of 50 there are 8 full errors and 4 half errors, the percentage disagreement is 10/50 or 20 per cent, or in positive terms there is 80 per cent agreement.

The reliability data are presented in Table 1(XV). The mean percentage agreement of 90 meets current standards for materials of this sort, and indicates that the two sets of scores, independently and blindly derived, agreed very well. In the case of Groups 1 and 2, which were scored independently but not blindly (the raters knowing which was the high-on-E subject, which

<sup>6</sup> We wish to express our thanks to Anne Morrow and Ellan Ulery for their work "beyond the call of duty" in learning and applying the scoring scheme.

TABLE 1 (XV)

SCORING RELIABILITY (PERCENTAGE INTERRATER AGREEMENT)  
FOR THE EIGHT PROJECTIVE QUESTIONS

Group	N	Percentage Agreement								Mean <sup>b</sup>
		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	
1. Psychology Women <sup>c</sup>	63	94	75	87	84	95	94	85	-	88
2. Employment Service Veteran Men	51 (24) <sup>a</sup>	100	96	95	95	94	90	100	87	) 95
3. Psychiatric Clinic Men	29 (17) <sup>a</sup>	76	82	91	71	90	90	59	71	) 80
4. Psychiatric Clinic Women	34 (24) <sup>a</sup>	96	79	94	88	87	84	81	88	) 87
5. Middle-Class Women <sup>d</sup>	70	91	82	96	92	97	-	-	-	92
6. Middle-Class and Business Club Men <sup>d</sup>	65	86	83	95	80	98	-	-	-	89
Mean Percentage Agreement <sup>b</sup>		93	85	94	88	95	90	83	83	90
Total N	312	290	290	312	312	312	150	128	65	1859

<sup>a</sup>The N for Groups 2, 3, and 4 is complicated by the fact that two questionnaire forms were given. Only 24 of the 51 highs and lows in Group 2 received Form 45, which contained all 8 questions; the remaining 27 received Form 40, containing only questions 1-5. Similarly, some of the subjects in Groups 3 and 4 filled out Form 45, while others received a modified form containing items 3, 4, 5, and 6 only. The differences between subgroups within each sample are random.

<sup>b</sup>The over-all group and item means are based on single item means weighted by N.

<sup>c</sup>Group 1 received Form 78, which did not contain question 8.

<sup>d</sup>Groups 5 and 6 received Form 40, which did not contain questions 6, 7, and 8.

<sup>e</sup>Key to questions: 1 (Moods), 2 (Desires), 3 (Great People), 4 (Drive Nuts), 5 (Crimes), 6 (Embarrassing), 7 (Last Six Months), 8 (Awe-inspiring).

the low), only Group 2, with 95 per cent agreement, is above the over-all mean. For only one group, the Psychiatric Clinic Men, does the reliability drop conspicuously below 90 per cent. This drop (to 80 per cent) seems due in part to certain intrinsic ambiguities in the responses of this group, and in part to the fact that this was the first group to be scored blindly.

The reliabilities for the individual items are also satisfactory, ranging from 83 to 95 per cent. Questions 1 ("Moods"), 3 ("Great people"), and 5 ("Crimes") were scored most consistently. The average agreement on Questions 7 ("Last six months") and 8 ("Awe-inspiring") might have been higher had they been filled out by Groups 5 and 6. In only 6 cases out of the total of 41 did an item have a reliability of less than 80 per cent. It would appear, therefore, that the present scoring scheme is relatively reliable, and in this sense "objective."

## 2. PROJECTIVE QUESTION SCORES IN RELATION TO STANDING ON THE E SCALE

To what extent are L scores on the Projective Questions characteristic of the anti-ethnocentric individuals, H scores characteristic of the extremely ethnocentric individuals? The Scoring Manual is based on the hypothesis that the low quartiles on the Ethnocentrism scale will give responses falling mainly in the low categories, whereas the responses of the high quartiles will fall mainly in the high categories.

Data bearing on this question are presented in Table 2 (XV), which indicates the degree to which the Projective Questions differentiate the ethnocentric from the anti-ethnocentric subjects.

In order to obtain a quantitative measure of the relationship between Projective Question scores and standing on the E scale, the *percentage of PQ-E agreement* was computed for each quartile. This is called the *L%* in the case of the low quartile, *H%* for the high quartile, and *%A* for the two quartiles combined (average over-all agreement). Let us use *L%* to illustrate the procedure. Had scores of H and L been the only ones assigned, the *L%* would be simply the number of L scores divided by the total number of cases; thus, if all the low quartile members received L scores on a given item there would be 100 per cent agreement between PQ and E. But this procedure was not feasible because of the neutral scores.<sup>7</sup> Since a neutral score represents a half error, i.e., it signifies less agreement than an L score but more agreement than an H score, the *L%* was computed according to the following formula:

$$L\% = \frac{\text{Sum of L scores plus } \frac{1}{2} \text{ sum of neutral scores (Na, Nb, Nhl)}}{\text{Number of subjects in low quartile}}$$

<sup>7</sup> One possibility would have been not to consider subjects receiving scores of N, and to get a L/H ratio for the remaining subjects. This would have given higher *L%* values than those obtained by the method finally used, since in the latter method the N scores were used in such a way as to lower the *L%*. It was believed that all individuals taking the test should be included in the statistical treatment.

where Na means "ambiguous," Nb means "blank" (omitted), Nhl means "mixed high and low trends."

The only exception to this formula is in the case of Nb on Items 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8, where Nb is equivalent to H and is included among the H scores.

The computation of H% is based on an equivalent formula:

$$H\% = \frac{\text{Sum of H scores plus } \frac{1}{2} \text{ sum of neutral scores (Na, Nb, Nhl)}}{\text{Number of subjects in high quartile}}$$

Finally, %A is the average of L% and H%, weighted by N (number of cases in each quartile), and it indicates the over-all PQ-E agreement.

Table 2 (XV) gives the L%, H%, and %A for each group tested and for all groups combined. It also gives the number and percentage of Nb, Na, and Nhl responses. It may be noted first that the over-all PQ-E agreement (%A) is 74.9 per cent—a value which indicates a statistically significant relationship between Projective Question scores and high vs. low standing on the E scale. On a purely chance basis, the agreement would be only 50 per cent. The highs tend, however, to be more consistent in their PQ responses than do the lows: the highs have an over-all H% of 80.7, while for the lows the L% is only 69.1. In other words, the lows received more H scores than the highs did L scores. It is, so to speak, easier to make an H than an L score. The reason for this does not appear to lie primarily in the subjects themselves, for our general impression, based on other results and on clinical judgment, was that the low quartiles fitted the over-all conception of the "democratic" personality at least as well as the highs approximated the prototypic "authoritarian" personality. The preponderance of H scores is probably due to the conditions of testing. Since many of the groups were pressed for time, and since the instructions were not emphatic in suggesting that a fairly detailed answer be given, many of the responses were brief and superficial. It will be recalled from the Scoring Manual that references to "vague, dilute emotional experiences," as well as references only to "behavior or the situation *per se*, without consideration of inner meanings and motives," were important cues for assigning a score of H. It may be argued that if the instructions emphasized the giving of more detailed answers, both highs and lows would give more responses meriting a score of L. In the present groups, however, the elaborations of most lows took an L direction, of most highs an H direction. It might be expected, then, that the obtaining of longer responses would clarify and increase the differences between the low and high quartiles. It would also probably reduce somewhat the proportion (8.8 per cent) of responses scored Na and Nhl. We should not, of course, overlook the likelihood that numerous pressures in our culture, and perhaps the predominant ones, tend to make for authoritarianism in the individual. To the extent that this is true, we should expect some H trends even in individuals attempting to achieve a thoroughly democratic orientation.



29

## 3. Psychiatric Clinic Men

Low quartile	14	L%	55.6	38.9	82.2	50.0	46.4	50.0	88.9	58.1
	(9)	N <sub>b</sub>	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	6
		N <sub>a</sub> -NHL	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	9
High quartile	15	H%	75.0	75.0	83.3	86.7	66.7	93.8	50.0	77.7
	(8)	N <sub>b</sub>	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	4
		N <sub>a</sub> -NHL	0	0	3	0	1	1	0	8
Total	29	%A	64.7	55.9	82.8	69.0	56.8	70.6	70.6	67.9
	(17)	N <sub>b</sub>	0	4	1	1	2	0	0	10
		N <sub>a</sub> -NHL	0	1	5	0	3	2	0	17

34

## 4. Psychiatric Clinic Women

Low quartile	17	L%	84.6	76.9	70.6	82.5	70.6	42.3	88.5	71.3
	(13)	N <sub>b</sub>	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3
		N <sub>a</sub> -NHL	0	0	3	0	4	1	1	12
High quartile	17	H%	72.7	55.5	50.0	94.1	58.8	86.4	81.8	74.5
	(11)	N <sub>b</sub>	0	2	1	0	4	1	3	12
		N <sub>a</sub> -NHL	0	0	4	0	2	1	0	7
Total	34	%A	79.2	66.7	60.3	88.3	64.7	62.5	85.4	72.8
	(24)	N <sub>b</sub>	0	2	2	0	6	1	3	15
		N <sub>a</sub> -NHL	0	0	7	0	6	2	1	19



	Score	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total	Mean
7. All groups combined											
Low quartile											
L%	76.7	63.0	75.8	68.4	65.8	63.0	57.0	85.9			69.1
N <sub>b</sub>	9	19	8	3	14	7	0	1		61	6.6%
N <sub>a</sub> -N <sub>HL</sub>	8	8	22	20	12	11	13	1		95	10.3%
ER	146	146	155	155	155	73	64	32		926	116
High quartile											
H%	84.0	79.9	71.3	84.4	86.0	75.3	85.9	72.7			80.7
N <sub>b</sub>	15	33	17	9	11	7	2	5		99	10.6%
N <sub>a</sub> -N <sub>HL</sub>	4	4	27	9	15	3	4	2		68	7.3%
ER	144	144	157	157	157	77	64	33		933	117
Total											
%A	80.3	71.4	73.6	76.5	76.0	69.3	71.5	79.2			74.9
N <sub>b</sub>	24	52	25	12	25	14	2	6		160	8.6%
N <sub>a</sub> -N <sub>HL</sub>	12	12	49	29	27	14	17	3		163	8.8%
ER	290	290	312	312	312	150	128	65		1859	232

<sup>a</sup>For Groups 2, 3, and 4 the number of subjects varies somewhat from item to item because two questionnaire forms were used. The number indicated in the "N" column is the total N in each group or quartile. The N in parentheses refers to those subjects who received the complete set of projective questions. Thus, in Group 2 all 51 subjects received items 1-5 (Forms 45 and 40); only 10 Low and 14 High received all 8 questions (Form 45), so that the N's on items 6, 7, and 8 are 10 and 14 respectively, as indicated in parentheses in the "N" column. Similarly, of the 14 Lows in Group 3, only 9 received the full battery, the remaining 5 receiving a form which did not include items 1, 2, 7, and 8. For the high quartile in Group 3, there is an N of 8 on items 1, 2, 7, and 8. In Group 4, the N on these same items is 13 for Lows and 11 for Highs.

Group 1 received a form which did not include item 8 (see text).

Groups 5 and 6 received Form 40 which contained items 1-5 only.

Thus, while there were 312 subjects in all, the N per item varied. This is shown in the table under "All groups combined," where the row "ER" gives the number of subjects answering each item.

<sup>b</sup>In the computation of all means, the component values are weighted by N.

Key to questions: 1 (Moods), 2 (Desires), 3 (Great People), 4 (Drive Nuts), 5 (Crimes), 6 (Embarrassing), 7 (Last Six Months), 8 (Are-Inspiring).

The average agreement varies among the six groups from 67.9 per cent for the Psychiatric Clinic Men to 82.6 per cent for the Employment Service Veteran Men. It appears that the scorers, try as they did to be unbiased, were systematically influenced by the fact that they knew the E-quartile standing of the Psychology Women and the Veteran Men. Thus, the %A for these two groups is about 80 per cent, whereas for the remaining four groups (scored blindly) it averages slightly over 70 per cent. The relatively low %A for the Clinic Men is consistent with the low scoring reliability for this group (see Table 1(XV)). The data for the Clinic Women and the Middle-Class Men and Women probably best represent what can be expected with the present Scoring Manual; the average agreement of about 72 per cent for these groups might have been slightly higher had all subjects received questions 6, 7, and 8.

The over-all average agreement for the individual items varies from 69.3 to 80.3 per cent. The poorest questions are 2 ("Desires"), 6 ("Embarrassing"), and 7 ("Last six months"). In all three of them the L% is particularly low (57-63 per cent), probably because of the brevity of the answers, as discussed above. Correction of this error should lead to considerably better results, particularly for Item 7. The agreements for the individual items reveal again the great consistency of the highs. Thus, the L% varied within a range of 29 points (57-86 per cent), whereas the H% covered a range of only 15 points (71-86 per cent). It is of some interest that the two most differentiating items, 1 ("Moods") and 8 ("Awe-inspiring"), deal with issues which, in their literal meanings, are completely removed from ideology about group interaction.

Table 2(XV) provides the empirical basis on which omissions (Nb) of Questions 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8 were converted into H scores in the statistical treatment. On each of these questions approximately two-thirds or more of the total number of omissions were made by the high quartiles. Moreover, it is consistent with the differential trends found that the highs should omit, more often than the lows, questions dealing with inner life (moods, desires, drive nuts) and with emotionally intense experiences (last six months, awe-inspiring). Question 3 might also have been scored in this way since some 70 per cent of the omissions were by highs. However, omissions on this item were not scored H because they did not appear to fulfill the requirement of theoretical consistency. Should the highs continue, in future groups, to make most of the omissions, Nb would have to be scored H and a theoretical rationale found. The scoring of Nb as H would, in the present groups, have raised the over-all agreement several points.

Having considered the degree to which groups are distinguished with respect to the H and L categories, we may consider briefly how the scoring scheme applies to the individual. It is possible to give each subject a total score which is the sum of his individual item scores. This total may be called

the *L-H score*, and is computed as follows: One point is given for each H score, zero points for each L score, and one-half point for each Neutral score (except for Nb on Items 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8 where, as noted above, Nb is converted to H). Thus, the L-H scores may range, for eight questions, between 0 (all L scores) and 8 (all H scores), with a mid-point of 4.0. A subject receiving 4 H scores, 3 L's and 1 Na has an L-H score of 4.5, i.e., just on the high side of center. The over-all H% of 80.7 for the high quartiles can be converted to an average L-H score of 6.5 for the eight items. Similarly, the over-all L% of 69.1 for the low quartiles becomes an L-H score of 2.5.

The computing of L-H scores for each subject provides a means of determining the amount of overlap between the low and high quartiles. This has been done in the case of the Middle-Class Men and Women, who have a combined N of 135, and who received a battery of five Projective Questions. The L-H scores of the low quartile ranged between 0.0 and 4.5, those of the high quartile between 1.0 and 5.0, the mean for the total group being about 2.7 (slightly more H than L scores were assigned). Using 2.7 as a dividing point, we may then say that all L-H scores of 2.5 and below will be called "low," all scores of 3.0 and above will be called "high." On the basis of this criterion, 22 per cent of the low quartile members would be considered high in terms of Projective Question score, while 14 per cent of the high quartile members have a low L-H score. These are the exceptions. Or, to put it positively, 78 per cent of the anti-ethnocentric group, and 86 per cent of the ethnocentric group, would be correctly diagnosed on the basis of total Projective Question score.

The above data do not, of course, include the middle scorers on E. However, it is not unlikely that a longer Projective Question Test of perhaps fifteen or twenty items, applied to all subjects and not merely to the extreme quartiles, might yield correlations in the neighborhood of .7 between L-H score and E. The Projective Questions might then be used, like the F scale, as an indirect measure of ethnocentrism—a measure in which no reference to current social issues need be made. They also, like the F scale, permit one to go beyond the immediate limits of the scoring scheme and to make numerous inferences regarding individual dynamics. That the variables in the two techniques are so consistent is an important argument in favor of the validity of each.

In summary, the results indicate that the Projective Question Test meets current standards of reliability, under the most demanding of scoring conditions. It has also been demonstrated that the categories denoted as "high" are in fact characteristic of the high scorers on the Ethnocentrism scale, the "low" categories characteristic of the low quartile on E. There are, however, many highs who get L scores on single items, and many lows who get scores of H, the average PQ-E agreement being in the neighborhood of 75 per cent. In terms of individual L-H scores, the ethnocentrists and anti-

ethnocentrists could, in the two groups considered, be diagnosed with approximately 82 per cent accuracy.

The present results can probably be improved in the future by modifications of the Scoring Manual, by an increase in the number of items (which, other things being equal, will improve the reliability of the L-H score), and by instructions which lay greater stress on full answers (two or three sentences would do). Moreover, in its practical application the test may be scored in a clinically more meaningful way, once the scorers have demonstrated their competence. If all the items for a given individual were scored at once, many apparently ambiguous responses might be interpreted in the light of the total pattern. This would not only improve the quantitative scoring but would also stimulate further differentiation and elaboration within the broad framework now conceived. There is also considerable research which needs to be done regarding additional categories, relative frequencies of specific categories, sex differences, various patterns among lows and among highs, differences among various religious, political, and other groupings, and so on.

### 3. VALIDATION BY MEANS OF CASE STUDIES: MACK AND LARRY

Throughout the present research the attempt has been made to develop techniques that would yield *statistically significant* relationships among numerous variables and that would, as well, provide *clinically meaningful* material regarding the individual. Accordingly, following the presentation of statistical (group) results for each technique, the protocols of the high man, Mack, and the low man, Larry, have been considered in relation to the group data. To the extent that their results on a given technique are consistent with those for the total sample, and to the extent that interpretations based on the technique are congruent with those derived from other techniques, further evidence of validity appears to be indicated.

The Projective Question responses of Mack and Larry are as follows (the scores being given at the end of each response):

MACK (High)	LARRY (Low)
	1. <i>Moods</i>
Physical weakness, perhaps due to ill health over the last 4 years. (H)	A lonesome mood, or a feeling that I am not progressing toward my goal, or a feeling that I have hurt someone. (L)
	2. <i>Desires</i>
Anger. (Na)	When someone is persecuted unjustly, or to see a Negro serviceman endure unjust discrimination and prejudice. (L)

3. *Great people*

Lincoln, Lee, Gen. Geo. C. Marshall, Edison. (H)

Lincoln, Willkie, Washington, Stalin, Chiang Kai Shek, Churchill, MacArthur, Eisenhower, and the great scientists of past and present. (H)

4. *Drive nuts*

It depends a lot on definition, but if crazy is meant, such a thing as losing my wife and children would most closely approximate it. (H)

A person might become insane over too much interest in love, religion, money, etc. Any obsession carried too far might drive a person insane. (L)

5. *Worst crimes*

Murder, rape. (H)

Murder, rape and a person that will incite hate toward another people, and groups that incite wars. (Nhl)

6. *Embarrassing*

Not included in this form.

7. *Last six months*

Seeing all of the world possible, with a particular person to see it with me. (H)

Trying to enjoy life as I have always wanted; travel, meet important people, have lots of friends, go to a lot of parties. All this without harming anyone. (L predominantly, despite some H trends.)

8. *Awe-inspiring*

The viewing of great natural wonders of the world, new scientific achievements, meeting really great men and women and the sight of rare jewels and metals. (H)

To see American people practice true democracy. Such incidents as a member of one race protects a member of another race. True comradeship between races. (L)

The scoring, done blindly and with complete agreement between two independent judges, gives Mack an L-H score of 6.5 out of 7 (or an H% of 93), Larry an L-H score of 1.5 (or an L% of 79). Mack's responses are relatively typical of those given by the high men; if he shows no bizarre features, neither does he show much individuality. Given an opportunity to be emotionally expressive (Items 7 and 8), he responds in a shallow, conventionalized manner; his concern with "looking," with a minimum of differentiation or focal affect, appears to be based on a deep but inhibited curiosity for which he has few constructive expressions. His tendency to align himself with power and success is expressed in Item 3 and again in Item 8 ("meeting really great men and women"). Item 1 reveals his anxiety over bodily harm and his conception of ill health as a form of weakness (rather than, for example,

a barrier in the way of achievement). The equation of sickness with weakness is particularly interesting in the light of his mother's and his own weakness during childhood (see Chapters II and XX). It suggests, as does the material from other techniques, that his surface identification with powerful figures and groups is at least in part a means of maintaining his sense of mastery and of allaying his anxiety over bodily harm. It is not clear from his Projective Question responses alone whether Mack's aggression is more a surface defense against the admission of passive dependency or, rather, a strong underlying need. That he has aggressive impulses which he cannot easily assimilate into the ego is suggested by his "Murder, rape" on Item 5 and "Anger" on 2. Moreover, that these impulses are partially directed against family (ingroup) members is suggested by his response to Item 4: his fear of "losing my wife and children" (particularly since he is not yet married) would seem to be based on unconscious hostility toward them—hostility which is projected onto the "threatening world." (His fantasy, while he is still unmarried, of the death of wife and children may also be a projection of his own fear as a child that he might die when his mother did.) However, the over-all impression given is that of a conventional, deferent, pseudo-independent façade, and that what lies beneath the surface is primarily anxiety and dependency rather than active destructiveness.

Larry's responses, here as elsewhere, are less characteristically low than Mack's are high. Like Mack, Larry is attracted to those who have power, but his conception of power is different from Mack's. Thus, Larry can admire foreign as well as American leaders (Item 5: in 1945 Chiang Kai Shek was still conceived as a democratic leader). And his relationship to power figures seems to be based more on the open expression of dependency and need for support than on defense against fear of his own weakness. Indeed, Larry is openly and intensely identified with the weak and the helpless, and he can therefore be opposed to social authority when it mistreats Negroes and others (Items 2, 5, and 8). He is also characteristically low in his intraction, intrapunitiveness, achievement values, conscious guilt, and the like.

Larry's "timid dependency" is clearly expressed in his response to Item 7: what he wants most is to be loved and protected—"all this without harming anyone." The great fear of hurting anyone, expressed also on Item 1, seems to imply deep-lying hostility which he must at all costs inhibit. Thus, his inhibition of aggression, combined with his tremendous love-seeking dependency, probably prevent Larry from fighting actively even for those things in which he believes most. He is disturbed by discrimination and he would be awe-inspired by the attaining of democratic group relations in America, but is not likely to be able militantly to oppose those who violate his basic values.

It cannot be said that the interpretations above were made in the absence of other clinical material on these two cases. However, the scoring was done

in a controlled manner and many of the inferences follow fairly directly from the theory contained in the Scoring Manual. The conclusions reached here regarding Mack and Larry are in general agreement with those derived from other techniques, for example the F scale (Chapter VII) and the Thematic Apperception Test (Chapter XIV). It would seem, then, that the Projective Question technique may fruitfully be used not only for purposes of group research but also as an aid in the intensive study of the individual case.

## E. CONCLUSIONS

It was apparent in the Scoring Manual that certain themes were repeated, with perhaps minor variations in form or content, in many of the Projective Question categories. There are, moreover, several instances in which two or more recurring themes, taken together, permit inferences regarding deeper-lying trends and processes. The results and theoretical constructions derived from the application of this technique are similar to those obtained from the other techniques used in the present research. In some cases there is almost exact duplication of variables; in others there is a more complementary or congruent relation, the variables from several techniques expressing diverse facets of a single, inclusive structure. Because the amount of duplication is considerable, a very brief discussion of the theoretical implications of the present results will suffice. Differential trends for high and low scorers on the E scale seem to exist in the following areas.

1. *General Ego Functioning.* Highs and lows differ markedly in their manner of handling deep-level trends such as aggression, sex, dependency, anxiety, and the like. We are not yet in a position to say whether one group or the other shows a greater total amount of any given trend; what is clear is that both groups exhibit all of these trends to a significant degree. The primary difference seems to lie in the ego functioning, and particularly in the relation of the ego to the deeper levels of personality. In the lows, as other techniques have shown, the underlying trends are more *ego-assimilated*, in the highs more *ego-alien*.

The lows appear to differ from highs in at least the following respects. The relations between the various levels of personality are more fluid, the boundaries more permeable. The ego defenses of the lows are relatively more impulse-releasing: at best we find considerable sublimation, to perhaps a greater degree we find that impulses have been assimilated into the ego without being fully integrated—witness the recurring Projective Question category, "Conscious conflict and guilt." In the highs, on the other hand—and the analysis of interviews led to the same conclusion—the ego defenses are characteristically more counter-cathetic; there is less sublimation and more use of defenses such as projection, denial, and reaction-formation, defenses which aid the individual in maintaining a moral façade at the expense of self-expression and emotional release.

These formulations are supported by many of the Projective Question results. Compare, for example, the low category, "Conscious conflict and guilt," with the contrasting high category, "Rumbling from below" (Questions 1, "Moods," and 4, "Drive nuts"). The former category refers to impulses which, disturbing though they may be, the individual at least to some extent recognizes and tries to handle. If there is conflict, there is also an attempt to integrate; if there is much that remains unconscious, there is also a willingness to look within and an attempt to assimilate. For most highs, on the other hand, there are few focal conflicts but there is a deep sense of anxiety and distress. The conflict is covered over by a moral façade or by symptomatic behavior; the disturbance is explained on the basis of a distressing (overdemanding, boring) external situation or of poor bodily condition, and the conflict is never faced in psychological terms. The difficulty of the highs in assimilating many important needs is shown by several other categories. Thus, when asked about highly satisfying emotional experiences ("Last six months" and "Awe-inspiring") they show much less intensity and inner vitality than the lows, that is, much less ability to utilize their psychic energies for constructive and ego-satisfying purposes. When the highs refer more directly to needs such as dependency, sex, and aggression ("Desires" and "Worst crimes"), they are more crude, impersonal, primitive, object-less and ego-less.

2. *Specific Properties of the Ego.* These properties are, of course, intimately bound up with ego functioning as discussed above. As might be expected from their use of primarily counter-cathetic defenses, the highs have comparatively narrow, circumscribed egos. One manifestation of this narrowness is *constriction of fantasy* (particularly in Question 6, see also Chapter XIV); this is probably related to the highs' emphasis on "sticking to the facts," to their extracatheticness, and to their rejection of "imagination" and "emotion."

The highs also differ from the lows in their greater *concreteness of thinking* and in their *less differentiated emotional experience*. Thus, the responses of the highs characteristically refer to specific behavioral acts or situations, while the lows tend, to a greater degree, to describe more subtle experiences and more abstract, generalized situations. On Question 3 ("Great people"), for example, the lows, more than the highs, give the qualities that they admire in a person, with or without specific examples. The same is true for Question 5 ("Worst crimes"). Evidence of the greater complexity and abstractness of the lows has been given in the interview chapters (Part II) and in Chapter VIII (showing negative correlations between ethnocentrism and intelligence). These results are consistent with those showing the highs to be more stereotyped in their ideology (Chapters III, IV, XVI, XVII), more rigidly concrete in their solutions of arithmetical and spatial problems (Rokeach (98)).

The lows tend, in a frustrating situation, to blame themselves (*intrapunitiveness*), the highs to idealize themselves and to see the evil as existing in the external world (*extrapunitiveness*).

Finally, the greater *intraception* of the lows and the great *anti-intraception* of the highs is apparent in their responses to the Projective Questions as well as in the material elicited by the interviews, the T. A. T., and the F scale.

3. *Achievement Values vs. Conventional Values.* This distinction has been essential for the scoring of the Projective Questions. It is important not only because of the difference in the content of the values, but also because the values themselves express significant aspects of the personality dynamics of the two groups. It should be noted first that the two sets of values are not entirely mutually exclusive; few individuals will have only one set or the other. It is, rather, a matter of degree and of primacy. In most individuals one set of values is likely to be primary and most potent, the other to be of secondary importance. An individual who is struggling to decide between these two value orientations is, we believe, essentially struggling to decide, consciously or unconsciously, between conflicting needs and between conflicting conceptions of himself as a total person.

Achievement values found predominantly in the lows place primary emphasis on self-expression. Abstract and open-ended, they always leave room for further development and they can never be defined in terms of simple behavior formulae or rigid rules. Their main emphasis is on long-range goals, and the attainment of a given goal leads always to the formulation of new, higher goals expressing the same basic values. Examples of achievement values, taken from the Projective Question material as well as from the interviews and other material, include the following: Value for scientific, intellectual, and aesthetic achievement, and for understanding for its own sake, regardless of immediate practical application. Creativity is valued above efficiency, constructiveness above practicality; productive living, even if it involves inner conflict, is preferred over good adjustment at the expense of self-expression; richness and intensity of inner experience are valued more than "mere contentment." In personal relationships, as other techniques have shown, there is concern with giving as well as taking, and with the exchange of love rather than the exchange of things. What is particularly important here is that recognition of one's own individuality is the basis for recognition of the individuality of everyone, and for the democratic concept of the dignity of man.<sup>8</sup> These values are expressed ideologically in terms of opposition to all social structures (military, religious, educational, politico-

<sup>8</sup> This point has also been made by Fromm (43). His distinction between "humanistic" and "authoritarian" ethics corresponds very closely to the present one between "achievement" and "conventional" values, and is based on a similar attempt to distinguish two broad psychological approaches to man and society.

economic) which are based on the principle of absolute authority, which value power more than love, which engage in group suppression and exploitation, in short, which prevent man from developing his innate potentialities to a maximum degree. Once again we find anti-ethnocentrism as but one facet of a larger psychological framework.

What has been called "conventional values" might also have been called "*conditional values*," since their main function is to place limitations or conditions on the expression of needs rather than to stimulate need-experience. They might also have been called "*authoritarian values*," since they are based on the assumption of conformity to external authority rather than on inner moral responsibility. Whatever the name given, both of the above meanings, as well as others, belong to its definition. The prototypic examples of this value system are the Emily Post book of etiquette, the military "rules of behavior," and certain custom-ridden cultures, literate and nonliterate.<sup>9</sup> The main content of these values, at least for individuals with a strong middle-class identification, deals with conformity and loyalty to ingroup standards.

The difference between achievement values based on inner authority (internalized conscience), and conventional values based on external authority (and thus replaceable when the authority changes), results also in a difference in reaction to value-violations. This is the difference between *guilt* and *shame*.

It would be an exaggeration to state that the lows feel no shame, the highs no guilt. Nevertheless, there is considerable evidence from the Projective Questions, as well as from the ratings of interviews, that guilt is most characteristic of lows, shame of highs. The low categories for Questions 1, 2, 4, and 6 are for the most part concerned with personal violations of achievement values, with practically no reference to "being caught" or to external authority. For the same items there are high categories referring to violations of conventional values most of which require, almost by definition, an external observing and punishing agent. Indeed, the explicit idea of inner conflict in any form is practically lacking from the high responses. Moreover, it is much more common for the lows to refer to their own personal violations of values, whereas the highs refer either to violations by others, or, more often, to events which have, explicitly, neither moral nor motivational significance.<sup>10</sup>

These results are in keeping with the findings reported in earlier chapters that the highs, particularly those who are more conventional and "middle-class," have a punitive but poorly internalized superego. The ego, submitting

<sup>9</sup> See Kardiner (59, 60) and Benedict (15) for nonliterate societies, and Reich (96); these are but a few of many examples.

<sup>10</sup> We should have to predict—and there is already considerable supporting evidence—that studies of specific cultures will show a connection between shame as a predominant emotion, threat of punishment or isolation as a means of discipline in raising children, emphasis on ritual and custom, an authoritarian conception of God, relative lack of achievement values, and ethnocentrism in group relations within the culture and with other cultures. The higher E scale means made by the more ritualized, fundamentalistic religions in our own culture (see Chapter VI) may be cited in support of this hypothesis.

out of fear, must constantly forego conscious, constructive impulse gratification; instead, it finds morally acceptable ways of gaining indirect satisfaction (e.g., aggression by means of ethnocentrism and moral indignation, dependency through submission to powerful authority), and it "cheats" the superego when fear of detection is minimized (e.g., at conventions). Again we have a contradiction in levels: The highs, so moral on the surface, are essentially most concerned with underlying anxiety and with the gratification of impulses which, being ego-alien, have developed but little beyond their primitive, infantile form; whereas the lows, often so rebellious and so opposed to traditional morality on the surface, have more fully internalized moral *principles* and in their emotional functioning are more troubled with moral conflict.

4. *The Handling of Dependency as an Underlying Trend.* General differences in the ego functioning of lows and highs have been discussed above. We may turn now to a particular disposition, namely dependency, and see what light the Projective Questions shed on its differential ego-assimilation in lows and highs. It should be noted that there are certain sex differences here, since the expression of dependency is culturally permitted, even valued, in women, whereas in men it is opposed and inhibited. For convenience the following discussion will focus on high versus low *men*, with the understanding that for women some of these differences are somewhat reversed, while others hold equally well and still others are not found.

Dependency in lows is expressed mainly in the form of *concern with love*; many of their Projective Question responses deal with love-giving (nurturance) and love-seeking (active, focal dependency). They seem highly concerned with emotional exchange in their personal relationships.

Dependency plays a much different role in the personality of high men. It remains for the most part an ego-alien trend which can seldom be expressed directly because it violates the image (ego ideal) of the *normal, masculine man*: rugged, practical, realistic, earthbound, independent, "normally sexual and acquisitive, ready to take an active part in the bitter competition demanded by human nature, and eager to rise to the top of the ladder of success." It is apparent that not all men who have this self-ideal are high with respect to E or personality. Nevertheless, the present results indicate that most high men have this ideal, and that most men with this ideal are high.

Part of the high man's defense against ego-alien passive dependency—it is not the love-seeking dependency of the lows—is the rigid value for work, and anxiety over dependency is expressed in the idea that overwork would drive one nuts (Projective Questions 1 and 4).

If dependency promotes a concern with love in the lows, it promotes a *concern with power* in the highs. One of the more direct forms in which high dependency is expressed is *submission to power figures*. Whereas the ego-assimilated dependency of the lows is expressed in their value for equali-

tarian relationships and social structures, the ego-alien dependency of the highs leads to the acceptance of absolute authority and to a value for authoritarian forms of social interaction. As shown in Projective Question 3 ("Great people"), what the highs admire most in others is power, strength, authority, rugged masculinity. While the aggressive-assertive needs of authoritarian individuals are the most conspicuous ones, the dependent-submissive needs are equally if not more important. In the Projective Questions, particularly 7 ("Last six months") and 8 ("Awe-inspiring"), it was the highs' deference to authority which was expressed most strongly.

The ego-alien passive dependency of the highs is expressed in another form in Projective Questions 1 ("Moods") and 4 ("Drive nuts"). In Question 1, the most unpleasant moods are those involving a feeling of helplessness and dependency in the face of a threatening or barren environment. The dependency comes to the surface but meets an unwelcome reception in the weak, superego-ridden ego: there are no persons toward whom it can be satisfyingly expressed; there is no differentiated affect to make it an enriching experience; there is only a vague anxiety which is actually based not on the external situation but on a deep inner conflict between the superego and the upsurging primitive dependency. It is as if to express the impulse would be to lose one's masculinity or even to undergo bodily harm. Similar conflicts are expressed in Question 4. Again we find the inability to look inward and the vague rumblings of ego-alien trends, including body anxiety and aggression as well as dependency.

5. *The Handling of Other Trends.* There is evidence that aggression, sex, curiosity, homosexuality, and other trends are handled by highs and lows in ways similar to those discussed above. One additional point should be made regarding aggression. It appears not to have undergone much real socialization in highs but has, rather, remained relatively crude, destructive, punitive, unsoftened by ego-assimilation. If the term "hostility" be used for the aggression found in lows, then the term "destructiveness" seems most appropriate for what exists in highs, especially as revealed in Questions 2 ("Desires"), 5 ("Crimes"), and 8 ("Awe-inspiring").

The results and interpretations discussed above must not be applied in a stereotyped way. It should be understood that, while *most* highs show *most* of the high variables, and similarly for the lows, there are numerous exceptions and numerous variations on the central theme. The personality prototype above was that of the pseudodemocratic high, and other patterns, such as the "fascist leader" or the "psychopath" will be different in many respects. It is believed, nevertheless, that the Projective Question technique has yielded results comparable, and congruent, with those of other techniques, and that it may profitably be used for the study of other personality structures.

## P A R T I V

### INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The present volume has so far offered findings from our research ranging from surface ideology to largely unconscious psychological traits of our subjects. The direction of research and the order of presentation were suggested by the nature of the ideological data themselves; they could not be derived solely from external factors, such as economic status, group membership, or religion; but rather the evidence pointed unmistakably to the role played by motivational forces in the personality. However, the study did not move mechanically from the ideological to the psychological; rather, we were constantly aware of the structural unity of the two. It thus seems permissible that we reverse the procedure now and ask: what is the meaning of the subjects' overt opinions and attitudes in the areas covered by the A-S, E, and PEC scales, when they are considered in the light of our psychological findings, particularly those deriving from the F-scale and the clinical sections of the interviews? By answering this question we may come closer to an integration of the various aspects of a study which is centered in the problem of the relationship between ideology and personality.

As was natural, the material for this task was mainly taken from the non-clinical parts of the interviews. Not only did these data promise to yield additional evidence bearing on the major issues discussed thus far, but the wealth of detailed and elaborate statements which our subjects had formulated spontaneously and in their own way, offered numerous psychological leads. There is good reason to believe that the non-clinical sections of the interviews constitute through their inherent structure a link between ideology and personality. However, attention was not limited to this inter-relationship; at the same time an attempt was made to obtain a more colorful picture of the various ideologies themselves than was possible as long as we limited ourselves to the standard questionnaires.

Since the data from the questionnaire and from the Thematic Apperception Test and the clinical parts of the interviews had been subjected to thorough statistical treatment, quantification of the present material, though desirable, did not seem necessary. The aim, rather, was to develop for the problem areas under consideration, a phenomenology based on theoretical formulations and illustrated by quotations from the interviews. This procedure, it was hoped, would yield not only more information about the specific structure of the ideologies and the manner in which personality is expressed in them but also a further differentiation of the guiding theoretical concepts themselves.

The advantages of this supplementary procedure are several. It permits

us to exploit the richness and concreteness of "live" interviews to a degree otherwise hardly attainable. What is lost for want of strict discipline in interpretation may be gained by flexibility and closeness to the phenomena. Rare or even unique statements may be elucidated by the discussion. Such statements, often of an extreme nature, may throw considerable light on potentialities which lie within supposedly "normal" areas, just as illness helps us to understand health. At the same time, attention to the consistency of the interpretation of these statements with the over-all picture provides a safeguard against arbitrariness.

A subjective or what might be called speculative element has a place in this method, just as it does in psychoanalysis, from which many of our categories have been drawn. If, in places, the analysis seems to jump to conclusions, the interpretations should be regarded as hypotheses for further research, and the continuous interaction of the various methods of the study should be recalled: some of the measured variables discussed in earlier chapters were based on speculations put forward in this part.

In view of the discussions in Chapters III and IV it was not deemed necessary to differentiate between A-S and E in the treatment of the interview material. While the generally close correlation of anti-Semitism and ethnocentrism could be taken for granted on the basis of previous results, more specific accounts of the nature of their interrelation, as well as of certain deviations, were incorporated into the first chapter of the present part (Chapter XVI).

The chapter which discusses various syndromes found in high and low scorers (XIX) is also included in this part. Although from a strictly logical point of view it may not belong here, it seemed nevertheless appropriate to include it, since it is based almost entirely on interview material and focused on the interconnection between ideology and personality. The syndromes evolved in this chapter should be followed up by quantitative investigation.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> We have not deemed it necessary to establish cross references between interviewees' statements presented here—under interview numbers—and those given in Part II under code numbers (see Chapter X, p. 342). Therefore, some quotations may appear here which have already been given there, in a different connection. However, as twelve of the San Quentin inmates are dealt with as a special group in a later chapter (XXI), a Key linking the interview numbers used here with the fictitious names assigned to them there has been inserted on the bottom of Table I (XXI).