

CHAPTER IV

THE STUDY OF ETHNOCENTRIC IDEOLOGY

Daniel J. Levinson

A. INTRODUCTION

Our attention turns now to the problem of prejudice, broadly conceived. The term "prejudice" is not entirely adequate, since it has numerous meanings and connotations which might obscure or distort the ideas guiding this research. The term "ethnocentrism" is preferable because its traditional meaning comes much closer to that used here. First introduced and used descriptively by Sumner (115) in 1906, the term had the general meaning of provincialism or cultural narrowness; it meant a tendency in the individual to be "ethnically centered," to be rigid in his acceptance of the culturally "alike" and in his rejection of the "unlike."

The traditional conception of ethnocentrism, from which the present one is derived, differs in several important respects from the usual notion of prejudice. Prejudice is commonly regarded as a feeling of dislike against a specific group; ethnocentrism, on the other hand, refers to a relatively consistent frame of mind concerning "aliens" generally. Usually, in discussions of prejudice against groups there is specific reference to "race prejudice" or "prejudice against racial and religious minorities." This terminology is used even by people who know that "race" is a socially harmful idea as ordinarily understood, and who know that many groups (zootsuiters, "Okies," and so forth) are discriminated against on neither racial nor religious grounds. Ethnocentrism refers to group relations generally; it has to do not only with numerous groups toward which the individual has hostile opinions and attitudes but, equally important, with groups toward which he is positively disposed.

A theory of ethnocentrism offers a starting point for the understanding of the psychological aspect of group relations—why individuals are inclined toward competition, or conflict, or harmonious interaction, and so on. It is concerned with such questions as: What kinds of general attitudes do individuals have about their own and other groups? What underlying ideas or themes run through an individual's thinking about groups and group rela-

tions? How do these ideas develop? How are they related to trends in the individual's thinking about other social processes? What personality trends, if any, are they related to, and in what way? How are they related to membership in class, church, political party, and so forth?

The term "ethnocentrism" shifts the emphasis from "race" to "ethnic group." The everyday use of the term "race" has been criticized from many sides and on many grounds. It was originally suggested as one type of broad classification of human beings on the basis of skin color. Other anthropometric measures such as head shape and blood type were also suggested. Each of these organic bases of classification divides human beings (also known as the human "race") into groups which are mixed with respect to the other organic characteristics. Thus, the Negroes, a "race" according to the skin color criterion, are mixed with respect to head shape and blood type. But, apart from the arbitrariness of the organic basis of classification, the greatest dangers of the race concept lie in its hereditarian psychological implications and in its misapplication to cultures. Psychologically, the race theory implies, whether or not this is always made explicit, that people of a given race (e.g., skin color) are also very similar psychologically because they have a common hereditary family tree. This notion has been controverted in the past few decades by work in psychology on the problem of "heredity vs. environment" and by work in cultural anthropology on the tremendous psychological variations within any given culture. Furthermore, the term "race" is often applied to groups which are not races at all in the technical sense. Sometimes this term is applied to nations, e.g., "the German race" or even "the American race." Sometimes it is misused in connection with American ethnic minorities, such as Italians or Greeks. There is no adequate term, other than "ethnic," by which to describe cultures (that is, systems of social ways, institutions, traditions, language, and so forth) which are not nations, that is, which do not form politico-geographical entities. This confusion, which is more than merely terminological and which permeates much thinking on social problems, has plagued the Jews particularly; they are a good example of an ethnic group which is neither a formal nation nor a race. From the point of view of sociology, cultural anthropology, and social psychology, the important concepts are not race and heredity but social organization (national, regional, subcultural, communal) and the interaction of social forms and individual personalities. To the extent that relative uniformities in psychological characteristics are found within any cultural grouping, these uniformities must be explained primarily in terms of social organization rather than "racial heredity." The use and development of the concept of "ethnic group," as part of a broad educational program dealing with individual development and social change, can do much to clarify everyday thinking about social processes and problems.

The conception of ideology presented in earlier chapters has been utilized

here. Ethnocentrism is conceived as an ideological system pertaining to groups and group relations. A distinction is made between *ingroups* (those groups with which the individual identifies himself) and *outgroups* (with which he does not have a sense of belonging and which are regarded as antithetical to the ingroups). Outgroups are the objects of negative opinions and hostile attitudes; ingroups are the objects of positive opinions and uncritically supportive attitudes; and it is considered that outgroups should be socially subordinate to ingroups.

The basic questions for research were raised in Chapter II. They concern the inclusiveness of ideas regarding a given group, the *generality* of outgroup rejection, the *content* of ideas about ingroups and outgroups, and the amount of *stereotypy* in thinking about groups generally.

There were numerous indications that some generality of ingroup and outgroup ideology within the individual would be found (13, 25, 85, 90). Sumner found such consistency in his anthropological studies. Fascistic social movements have shown consistent tendencies to oppose a variety of minority groups. Many historians, literary men, and political analysts have, in a nontechnical, nonquantitative way, had this conception of ideology (21, 69, 72, 92, 93, 95, 101). One meets consistent outgroup rejection in everyday parlor and street-corner discussions.

A quantitative indication of consistency was found in a previous study of anti-Semitism (71). Increasing degrees of anti-Semitism were shown to be closely related to increasing opposition to labor unions and racial equality, and to increasing support of Father Coughlin. Members of college sororities—which tend to have a strong ingroup ideology—were significantly more anti-Semitic on the average than nonmembers. And subjects reporting some ideological friction with parents—indicating ability to criticize the family, a major ingroup—were significantly less anti-Semitic than those reporting no such friction.

To obtain a more conclusive answer to the questions raised in Chapter II, it seemed that the best method—in terms of rigor and quantification—was an opinion-attitude scale for the measurement of ethnocentrism. The construction of this scale was, therefore, the first step taken. It was constructed in such a way that an analysis of its statistical properties and internal relationships might help to answer the major questions concerning the structure of ethnocentric ideology.

B. CONSTRUCTION OF THE ETHNOCENTRISM (E) SCALE

The procedure followed in the construction of the E scale was the same as that for the anti-Semitism scale (Chapter III). Once again, and by the same reasoning, the Likert method of scaling was used. Again, all items were nega-

tive, that is, hostile to the group in question, and finally, the same general rules of item formulation were followed.

1. MAJOR SUBDIVISIONS OR AREAS: THE SUBSCALES

Subscales were used in order to insure broad coverage of the total field and to permit statistical analysis of certain relationships with ethnocentric ideology. Since one of the primary research questions concerned the generality of ethnocentrism, each subscale dealt with a different set of ingroup-outgroup relations. Within each subscale an attempt was made to cover a variety of common pseudodemocratic—and a few openly antidemocratic—opinions and attitudes.

The E scale in its initial forms did not include items about Jews; rather, the initial anti-Semitism scale was included separately in the questionnaire

TABLE I (IV)
ETHNOCENTRISM SCALE
Negro Subscale (N)

2. If there are enough Negroes who want to attend dances at a local dance hall featuring a colored band, a good way to arrange this would be to have one all-Negro night, and then the whites could dance in peace the rest of the time.
5. The Negroes would solve many of their social problems by not being so irresponsible, lazy, and ignorant.
8. Negro musicians are sometimes as good as white musicians at swing music and jazz, but it is a mistake to have mixed Negro-white bands.
11. It would be a mistake to have Negroes for foremen and leaders over whites.
14. Negroes may have a part to play in white civilization, but it is best to keep them in their own districts and schools and to prevent too much intermixing with whites.
16. Manual labor and menial jobs seem to fit the Negro mentality and ability better than more skilled or responsible work.
19. In a community of 1,000 whites and 50 Negroes, a drunken Negro shoots and kills an officer who is trying to arrest him. The white population should immediately drive all the Negroes out of town.
22. The people who raise all the talk about putting Negroes on the same level as whites and giving them the same privileges are mostly radical agitators trying to stir up conflicts.
25. An occasional lynching in the South is a good thing because there is a large percentage of Negroes in many communities and they need a scare once in a while to prevent them from starting riots and disturbances.
28. It would be best to limit Negroes to grammar and trade school education since more schooling just gives them ambition and desires which they are unable to fulfill in white competition.
31. There is something inherently primitive and uncivilized in the Negro, as shown in his music and his extreme aggressiveness.
34. Most Negroes would become officious, overbearing, and disagreeable if not kept in their place.

so that correlations between the two scales might be obtained. The development of a more complete E scale, including items about Jews, will be reported later in this chapter.

The initial E scale consists of thirty-four items arranged in three subscales dealing respectively with Negroes, various other minorities, and patriotism (extranational outgroups). These will now be discussed.

a. NEGROES. Since Negroes are a large and severely oppressed group and since imagery of "the Negro" has become so elaborated in American cultural mythology, they merited a subscale of their own. The twelve items presented in Table 1(IV) constitute the Negro subscale. (The items are numbered as they appear in the total scale.)

These items attempt to cover most of the current ideology regarding Negroes and Negro-white relations. Negroes are described as lazy and ignorant (Item 5) and as not really wanting equality with whites (Item 22: it is "radical agitators" who stir them up). Do individuals with the opinion that

TABLE 2 (IV)
ETHNOCENTRISM SCALE
Minority Subscale (M)

1. The many political parties tend to confuse national issues, add to the expense of elections, and raise unnecessary agitation. For this and other reasons, it would be best if all political parties except the two major ones were abolished.
4. Certain religious sects whose beliefs do not permit them to salute the flag should be forced to conform to such a patriotic action, or else be abolished.
6. Any group or social movement which contains many foreigners should be watched with suspicion and, whenever possible, be investigated by the FBI.
9. Although women are necessary in the armed forces and in industry, they should be returned to their proper place in the home as soon as the war ends.
15. One main difficulty with allowing the entire population to participate fully in government affairs (voting, jobs, etc.) is that such a large percentage is innately deficient and incapable.
17. It is a mistake to allow any Japanese to leave internment camps and enter the army where they would be free to commit sabotage.
21. The many faults, and the general inability to get along, of the Oklahomans ("Okies") who have recently flooded California, prove that we ought to send them back where they came from as soon as conditions permit.
24. A large-scale system of sterilization would be one good way of breeding out criminals and other undesirable elements in our society and so raise its general standards and living conditions.
27. Filipinos are all right in their place, but they carry it too far when they dress lavishly, buy good cars, and go around with white girls.
29. Zootsuits demonstrate that inferior groups, when they are given too much freedom and money, just misuse their privileges and create disturbances.
30. The most vicious, irresponsible, and racketeering unions are, in most cases, those having largely foreigners for leaders.
32. We are spending too much money for the pampering of criminals and the insane, and for the education of inherently incapable people.

Negroes are "naturally" lazy or unambitious also have the attitude that when Negroes do strive for higher status they should be "kept in their place" (Item 34) and prevented from having positions of leadership (Item 11)? Is the attitude that Negroes should be segregated (Items 2, 8, 14) held by the same persons who regard Negroes as threatening and inferior and who favor more active subordination of Negroes? These are some of the questions underlying this subscale, and the statistical results should offer at least a partial answer to them.

b. MINORITIES. The second subscale (see Table 2(IV)) contains twelve items dealing with various American minority groups (other than Jews and Negroes) about which negative opinions and imagery often exist and toward which attitudes of subordination, restriction of social functioning, segregation, and the like are often directed. Included are *organized groups* such as minority political parties and religious sects as well as social movements and labor unions "containing many foreigners"; also *ethnic minorities* such as Japanese-Americans, Oklahomans (in California), and Filipinos.¹ Zootsuiters, criminals, the insane, "inherently incapable people" and "undesirable elements," which constitute *moral minorities* or outgroups, are also objects of hostile opinions and attitudes.

Although prejudice is usually thought of as directed against minorities—in the sense of small numbers, and as opposed to a vague "majority"—one may ask if prejudice is not sometimes directed against a group containing more than half of the population. The phenomena of "contempt for the masses" and the subordination of women were considered examples of ethnocentrism of this type; Items 9 and 15 were included to determine how closely such attitudes are correlated with the others. Can the attitude that "women's place is in the home" be considered a prejudice? It would appear that it is, to the extent that people with this attitude have others which are more obviously ethnocentric. A more conclusive proof would require a detailed study of ideology regarding women, oriented within a general theory of ethnocentric vs. nonethnocentric approaches.

c. PATRIOTISM. This subscale (see Table 3(IV)) contains ten items dealing with international relations and viewing America as an ingroup in relation to other nations as outgroups. The term "patriotism" as used here does not mean "love of country." Rather, the present concept involves blind attachment to certain national cultural values, uncritical conformity with the prevailing group ways, and rejection of other nations as outgroups. It might better be termed *pseudopatriotism* and distinguished from *genuine patriotism*, in which love of country and attachment to national values is based on critical understanding. The genuine patriot, it would appear, can appreciate the values and ways of other nations, and can be permissive

¹ During the war at least, the status of the last-named groups was a focal issue in California—more so than in most other states.

TABLE 3 (IV)
ETHNOCENTRISM SCALE
Patriotism Subscale (P)

3. Patriotism and loyalty are the first and most important requirements of a good citizen.
7. There will always be superior and inferior nations in the world and, in the interests of all concerned, it is best that the superior ones be in control of world affairs.
10. Minor forms of military training, obedience, and discipline, such as drill, marching and simple commands, should be made a part of the elementary school educational program.
12. The main threat to basic American institutions during this century has come from the infiltration of foreign ideas, doctrines, and agitators.
13. Present treatment of conscientious objectors, draft evaders, and enemy aliens is too lenient and mollycoddling. If a person won't fight for his country, he deserves a lot worse than just prison or a work camp.
18. In view of the present national emergency, it is highly important to limit responsible government jobs to native, white, Christian Americans.
20. European refugees may be in need, but it would be a big mistake to lower our immigration quotas and allow them to flood the country.
23. It has become clear that the Germans and Japanese are racially war-minded and power-seeking, and the only guarantee of future peace is to wipe out most of them and to keep the rest under careful control.
26. Mexico can never advance to the standards of living and civilization of the U. S., due mainly to the innate dirtiness, laziness, and general backwardness of Mexicans.
33. There will always be wars because, for one thing, there will always be races who ruthlessly try to grab more than their share.

toward much that he cannot personally accept for himself. He is free of rigid conformism, outgroup rejection, and imperialistic striving for power.

Ingroup opinions and attitudes are expressed in Items 3, 7, and 10. They are intended to express a general value for obedience and discipline, the opinion that nations are arranged hierarchically from superior to inferior, and the attitude that the superior ones should be dominant—with the assumption that we are one of the superior nations. The rigidity of the value for obedience is shown by the punitive attitude toward those who disobey (Item 13: Punishment of conscientious objectors and draft evaders).

The glorification of the national ingroup is shown further in the tendency to regard other nations as inferior when they are distant (Item 26), and threatening when they come too close (Items 12, 20, and 23). We are therefore morally justified in excluding refugees, in "wiping out" the Germans and Japanese,² in excluding foreigners and others from government jobs,

² This item (23), so relevant during the war, can of course no longer be used. (It should be pointed out that one could actively support the war without such a destructive attitude toward the enemy or such national smugness.) If these attitudes are correlated with rejection of most other nations, then the people who made high (ethnocentric) scores on this scale may be the ones who now show similar attitudes toward our wartime allies and support militaristic, imperialistic, "tough-minded policies guaranteeing American sovereignty and interests."

and in maintaining our dominant position as a nation. The cynicism about peace and the moralistic attribution of war to "ruthless, grabbing races" also indicate the sense of threat from outgroups and the moral righteousness of the ingroup. The fact that this theory of the cause of war is held by many college students who have been exposed to sociological explanations in terms of socioeconomic organization and conflicts raises the question: What are the inner barriers in some individuals which make them unreceptive to non-moralistic explanations? This problem, to be taken up in later chapters, concerns the personality dynamics underlying ethnocentric ideology.

If people who make high scores on this subscale are also high on the others, then it would appear that although they hold America to be superior and inviolable, they actually reject the great majority of the people in this country. Item 18 brings this out directly: it is only the native, white, Christian Americans who can be trusted. And various items from the "Minorities" subscale indicate that large sections of this population are also in the outgroup category.

2. THE TOTAL ETHNOCENTRISM (E) SCALE

The total E scale is intended to measure the individual's readiness to accept or oppose ethnocentric ideology as a whole. The scale consists of 34 items³ and comprises the three subscales N, M, and P. It is presented in Table 4 (IV), with instructions to subjects, just as it was administered.

C. RESULTS: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SCALE

The subjects were allowed the same six choices of response for each item (+3 to -3, with no neutral response), and the responses were converted into scores in the same way (-3 = 1 point, -2 = 2 points, etc.) as was the case with the A-S scale. All the items were regarded as pro-ethnocentric. For the 34 items, then, the total scores can range between 34 points (1 point on each item, indicating strong anti-ethnocentrism) and 238 points (7 points on each item, strong ethnocentrism). When the total score is divided by 34 we obtain the mean score per item; thus, a total score of 51 can also be stated as a mean per item of 1.5.

This scale was administered as part of the questionnaire which also contained the initial (52 item) A-S scale. As reported in Chapter III, this questionnaire was given in April, 1944, to a class in Introductory Psychology at the University of California. The data presented here are based on the questionnaires of the 144 women subjects, including nineteen members of major minorities.

³ Items 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10 of the present scale were taken, in some cases with slight modifications, from the "Unlabelled Fascist Attitudes" Scale of Edwards (22). Both Edwards' study and the present one have profited from previous studies by Gundlach (46), Katz and Cantril (17), and Stagner (112, 113). Several of the "Negro" items have been taken from Murphy and Likert (84).

TABLE 4 (IV)
 THE TOTAL ETHNOCENTRISM SCALE
Public Opinion Questionnaire E

The following statements refer to opinions regarding a number of social groups and issues, about which some people agree and others disagree. Please mark each statement in the left-hand margin according to your agreement or disagreement, as follows:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| +1: slight support, agreement | -1: slight opposition, disagreement |
| +2: moderate support, “ | -2: moderate opposition, “ |
| +3: strong support, “ | -3: strong opposition, “ |

- _____ 1. The many political parties tend to confuse national issues, add to the expense of elections, and raise unnecessary agitation. For this and other reasons, it would be best if all political parties except the two major ones were abolished.
- _____ 2. If there are enough Negroes who want to attend dances at a local dance hall featuring a colored band, a good way to arrange this would be to have one all-Negro night, and then the whites could dance in peace the rest of the time.
- _____ 3. Patriotism and loyalty are the first and most important requirements of a good citizen.
- _____ 4. Certain religious sects whose beliefs do not permit them to salute the flag should be forced to conform to such a patriotic action, or else be abolished.
- _____ 5. The Negroes would solve many of their social problems by not being so irresponsible, lazy, and ignorant.
- _____ 6. Any group or social movement which contains many foreigners should be watched with suspicion and, whenever possible, be investigated by the FBI.
- _____ 7. There will always be superior and inferior nations in the world and, in the interests of all concerned, it is best that the superior ones be in control of world affairs.
- _____ 8. Negro musicians are sometimes as good as white musicians at swing music and jazz, but it is a mistake to have mixed Negro-white bands.
- _____ 9. Although women are necessary now in the armed forces and in industry, they should be returned to their proper place in the home as soon as the war ends.
- _____ 10. Minor forms of military training, obedience, and discipline, such as drill, marching and simple commands, should be made a part of the elementary school educational program.
- _____ 11. It would be a mistake to have Negroes for foremen and leaders over whites.
- _____ 12. The main threat to basic American institutions during this century has come from the infiltration of foreign ideas, doctrines, and agitators.
- _____ 13. Present treatment of conscientious objectors, draft-evaders, and enemy aliens is too lenient and mollicoddling. If a person won't fight for his country, he deserves a lot worse than just a prison or a work camp.
- _____ 14. Negroes may have a part to play in white civilization, but it is best to keep them in their own districts and schools and to prevent too much intermixing with whites.
- _____ 15. One main difficulty with allowing the entire population to participate

fully in government affairs (voting, jobs, etc.) is that such a large percentage is innately deficient and incapable.

- _____16. Manual labor and menial jobs seem to fit the Negro mentality and ability better than more skilled or responsible work.
- _____17. It is a mistake to allow any Japanese to leave internment camps and enter the army where they would be free to commit sabotage.
- _____18. In view of the present national emergency, it is highly important to limit responsible government jobs to native, white, Christian Americans.
- _____19. In a community of 1,000 whites and 50 Negroes, a drunken Negro shoots and kills an officer who is trying to arrest him. The white population should immediately drive all the Negroes out of town.
- _____20. European refugees may be in need, but it would be a big mistake to lower our immigration quotas and allow them to flood the country.
- _____21. The many faults, and the general inability to get along, of the Oklahomans ("Okies"), who have recently flooded California, prove that we ought to send them back where they came from as soon as conditions permit.
- _____22. The people who raise all the talk about putting Negroes on the same level as whites and giving them the same privileges are mostly radical agitators trying to stir up conflicts.
- _____23. It has become clear that the Germans and Japanese are racially war-minded and power-seeking, and the only guarantee of future peace is to wipe out most of them and to keep the rest under careful control.
- _____24. A large-scale system of sterilization would be one good way of breeding out criminals and other undesirable elements in our society and so raise its general standards and living conditions.
- _____25. An occasional lynching in the South is a good thing because there is a large percentage of Negroes in many communities and they need a scare once in a while to prevent them from starting riots and disturbances.
- _____26. Mexico can never advance to the standards of living and civilization of the U. S., due mainly to the innate dirtiness, laziness, and general backwardness of Mexicans.
- _____27. Filipinos are all right in their place, but they carry it too far when they dress lavishly, buy good cars, and go around with white girls.
- _____28. It would be best to limit Negroes to grammar and trade school education since more schooling just gives them ambitions and desires which they are unable to fulfill in white competition.
- _____29. Zootsuits demonstrate that inferior groups, when they are given too much freedom and money, just misuse their privileges and create disturbances.
- _____30. The most vicious, irresponsible, and racketeering unions are, in most cases, those having largely foreigners for leaders.
- _____31. There is something inherently primitive and uncivilized in the Negro, as shown in his music and his extreme aggressiveness.
- _____32. We are spending too much money for the pampering of criminals and the insane, and for the education of inherently incapable people.
- _____33. There will always be wars because, for one thing, there will always be races who ruthlessly try to grab more than their share.
- _____34. Most Negroes would become officious, overbearing, and disagreeable if not kept in their place.

1. RELIABILITY

Data indicating the reliability and related statistical properties of the E scale and its subscales are given in Table 5 (IV).

TABLE 5 (IV)

RELIABILITY OF THE ETHNOCENTRISM (E) SCALE AND ITS SUBSCALES

<u>Property</u>	<u>Total E Scale</u>	<u>Negroes</u>	<u>Subscales Minorities</u>	<u>Patriotism</u>
Reliability ^a	.91	.91	.82	.80
Number of items	34	12	12	10
Mean (total) ^b	3.17	2.72	3.32	3.53
Mean (odd half)	3.02	2.65	3.23	3.88
Mean (even half)	3.32	2.78	3.40	3.18
S. D. (total) ^b	1.15	1.25	1.21	1.26
S. D. (odd half)	1.17	1.25	1.37	1.26
S. D. (even half)	1.21	1.42	1.28	1.46
Range ^b	1.2-5.6	1.0-5.6	1.0-6.0	1.0-6.1

^aThe split-half reliability of each scale was obtained by correlating the sum of the scores on the odd items with the sum of the even items, and correcting this value by the Spearman-Brown formula.

^bThe means, S. D.'s, and ranges are given in terms of mean score per item on the scale or subscale in question. If this value is multiplied by the number of items in the scale or subscale, it is converted into mean total score.

The split-half reliability of the total E scale is .91, a value which meets accepted statistical standards.⁴ The odd and even halves were roughly equivalent in the sense that they contained about equal numbers of items from the three subscales. The lower mean of the odd half seems due to the slight over-weighting with low-mean Negro items. The obtained range covered most of the possible range, with the exception of the extremely high end. The absence of very high scores (averages of over 6 points per item) is also reflected in the relatively low group mean of 3.17, as compared with the neutral point of 4.0 per item. The distribution of scores is very symmetrical—the mean divides the range in half, and the median is 3.2—but platykurtic, with very little clustering of scores around the mean.

The high reliabilities of the subscales are noteworthy, especially in view of the small number of items in each.

In terms of reliability, equivalence of halves, and form of distribution,

⁴ On the chance that the 19 minority group members might be atypical in some way, a separate reliability was computed for the 125 remaining subjects. The obtained value was .91, identical with that for the total group.

then, it seems safe to conclude that the E scale and its subscales provide adequate measuring instruments. To the extent that the scale is valid, it provides a measure of ethnocentrism, in most of its generality and complexity. It may be claimed that the higher an individual's score, the greater his acceptance of ethnocentric propaganda and the greater his disposition to engage in ethnocentric accusations and programs of one form or another.

2. INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG THE SUBSCALES

The reliability data support the hypothesis that there is such a thing as general ethnocentric ideology and that people can be roughly ranked according to the strength of their acceptance or rejection of it. Support for this hypothesis is also given by the high intercorrelations among the subscales, as shown in Table 6(IV).

TABLE 6 (IV)
CORRELATIONS OF THE E SUBSCALES WITH EACH OTHER
AND WITH THE TOTAL E SCALE^a

	<u>Negroes</u>	<u>Minorities</u>	<u>Patriotism</u>	<u>Total E</u>
Negroes	---	.74	.76	.90
Minorities	.74	---	.83	.91
Patriotism	.76	.83	---	.92

^aThese are the raw correlation coefficients. If they were corrected for attenuation to give the maximal value theoretically obtainable (with perfectly reliable instruments), they would all be .9 or over.

The subscale intercorrelations, which range from .74 to .83, are of considerable significance. The fact that they involve items dealing with so great a variety of groups and ideas suggests again that ethnocentrism is a general frame of mind, that an individual's stand with regard to one group such as Negroes tends to be similar in direction and degree to his stand with regard to most issues of group relations.

The intercorrelations of .90 to .92 between each subscale and the total E scale make the same point; an individual's score on any one subscale permits one to predict very closely his score on the entire E scale. Or, to put it in another way: While almost every subject shows some variability in his responses to the individual items (as will be shown below), almost every one demonstrates a general degree of pro- or anti-ethnocentrism which is relatively consistent from one group or type of group to another. And ethnocentric hostility toward outgroups is highly correlated with ethnocentric idealization of ingroups.

3. INTERNAL CONSISTENCY: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE INDIVIDUAL ITEMS

The functions of item analysis, and the procedures involved, have been discussed in the previous chapter. The data on the item analysis of the E scale are presented in Table 7(IV). Each item is identified by a key word or phrase, and the letters N, M, and P refer to the subscales Negroes, Minorities, and Patriotism respectively. It will be recalled that the Discriminatory Power (D. P.) equals the mean for the high quartile minus the mean for the low quartile. The total group mean is, of course, based on all four quartiles.

In general the D. P.'s in Table 7(IV) are very satisfactory,⁵ averaging 2.97. For the 34 items, 5 D. P.'s are over 4.0, 13 are between 3.0 and 3.9, and 10 are between 2.0 and 2.9; only 3 are between 1.0 and 1.9, and 3 less than 1.0. Furthermore, all 6 items with D. P.'s of less than 2.0 have group means of less than 3.0, so the D. P. is more significant than it appears.⁶

The three least discriminating items are 19, 25, and 28, all in subscale N. They are also the only three items with group means of less than 2.0. Their low means indicate almost unanimous disagreement by all subjects. This is to be expected, since the items are particularly violent and repressive: Negroes should be driven out of town, lynched, kept ignorant and uneducated. But these data show the advantage of permitting three degrees of agreement and of disagreement, and they also reveal a subtle receptiveness in the high-scoring subjects to openly antidemocratic programs. Of the 36 low scorers only one responded with -2 (on Item 28), all other responses on all three items being a firm -3 (and thus a low mean of 1.00). The high quartile, on the other hand, had a mean of 1.8 on each of the three items; nearly half of them responded with -2 or above. One might ask if this is an indication of potential response during a period in which fascism had become a real power. Not all those who score high on E, certainly, are receptive to violent antidemocracy; the task of determining the deeper psychological forces which make for potential receptiveness or opposition to fascism—the ultimate in ethnocentrism—is one which follows the first task of measuring ethnocentrism in its presently existing form.

The item analysis indicates that the N, M, and P subscales contributed about equally to the total differentiation between the high and low quartiles on the total scale, the average D. P. being 3.0, 2.9, and 3.1 respectively. Apart from items 19, 25, and 28, discussed above, the Negro items were highly discriminating. Ethnocentrists and anti-ethnocentrists, as measured by the total scale, are clearly differentiated with respect to most of the ideas contained

⁵ The D. P.'s would be even higher if the "range of talent" in this group included more extreme ethnocentrists. This is shown by results on subsequently tested groups.

⁶ While correlations between items or between each item and the total scale have not been computed for this group, later data on similar scales suggest that the average correlation between single items is about .4, while between each item and the sum of the remaining items the average correlation is about .6.

TABLE 7 (IV)

MEANS AND DISCRIMINATORY POWERS OF THE E-SCALE ITEMS

No.	Item	Mean		D.P.	Mean for Total Group
		High Quartile	Low Quartile		
1.	(M: political parties)	3.72	2.17	1.55	2.85
2.	(N: dance)	6.17	1.97	4.20	4.04
3.	(P: patriotism)	6.48	3.86	2.62	5.21
4.	(M: religious sects)	5.08	1.61	3.47	3.26
5.	(N: lazy)	3.10	1.53	3.19	3.19
6.	(M: foreign groups)	4.50	1.69	2.81	3.02
7.	(P: superior nations)	3.67	1.25	2.42	2.54
8.	(N: bands)	5.08	1.25	3.83	2.77
9.	(M: women)	5.86	3.75	2.11	4.76
10.	(P: military training)	5.06	2.47	2.59	3.83
11.	(N: foremen)	6.05	1.69	4.36	3.99
12.	(P: foreign ideas)	4.86	1.22	3.64	3.13
13.	(P: conscientious objectors)	4.64	1.44	3.20	2.90
14.	(N: districts)	6.33	1.72	4.61	4.08
15.	(M: voting)	5.06	2.33	2.73	3.71
16.	(N: menial jobs)	5.22	1.58	3.64	3.17
17.	(M: Japs in army)	5.86	1.92	3.94	3.87
18.	(P: native white Americans)	4.75	1.08	3.67	2.80
19.	(N: drive out)	1.86	1.00	.86	1.26
20.	(P: refugees)	6.39	3.50	2.89	5.28
21.	(M: Okies)	5.39	1.81	3.58	5.70
22.	(N: agitators)	4.53	1.08	3.45	2.51
23.	(P: Germans and Japs)	5.28	1.50	3.78	3.07
24.	(M: sterilize)	3.11	2.03	1.08	2.71
25.	(N: lynch)	1.81	1.00	.81	1.32
26.	(P: Mexico)	3.69	1.06	2.63	2.15
27.	(M: Filipinos)	5.64	1.22	4.42	3.68
28.	(N: grammar schools)	1.86	1.03	.83	1.30
29.	(M: zootsuits)	5.58	1.39	4.19	3.62
30.	(M: foreigners, unions)	4.08	1.17	2.91	2.42
31.	(N: primitive)	3.72	1.17	2.55	2.42
32.	(M: pamper criminals)	3.22	1.53	1.69	2.20
33.	(P: always war)	5.89	2.64	3.25	4.37
34.	(N: overbearing)	4.75	1.06	3.69	2.67
Means: Total scale		4.70	1.73	2.97	3.17
Subscale N		4.34	1.34	3.00	2.72
Subscale M		4.76	1.89	2.87	3.32
Subscale P		5.07	2.00	3.07	3.53

Number: Total group = 144
H. Q. = 36
L. Q. = 36

Range of scores: Total group = 1.2-5.6
H. Q. = 4.2-5.6
L. Q. = 1.2-2.2

in the Negro items. The mean for the low quartile is invariably below 2.0, indicating that the low scorers seldom agree with these items and usually disagree strongly. The high scorers are not so outspoken in their stand; their most frequent responses are in the range of -1 to $+2$; but the frequency of the agreements overshadows the slight disagreements.

The means are somewhat higher on the Minorities subscale but once again, despite the great variety of groups represented, the highs and lows are clearly differentiated on most items. Three Minorities items (1, 24, 32) had group means below 3.0 and Discriminatory Powers between 1.1 and 1.7. These D. P.'s indicate statistically significant trends but do not establish clear-cut differentiations. The high scorers apparently did not fall for the suggestions in these items that minority political parties be suppressed—perhaps because these parties were not described as immoral or threatening (suppression of religious sects was accepted in Item 4)—that undesirables be sterilized, and that less money be spent on criminals, the insane and the “inherently incapable.” The idea that “woman’s place is in the home” is apparently accepted by most women (Item 9; mean = 4.76). While the low quartile is almost equally divided on this issue, the high scorers are definitely in favor of it; the D. P. of 2.1 is clearly significant. One wonders whether this item would be better correlated with ethnocentrism in men. The most discriminating items in this subscale deal with a variety of groups: religious sects (Item 4), foreign ideas (Item 12), Japanese (Item 17), Oklahomans in California (Item 21), Filipinos (Item 27), and zootsuits (Item 29).

The Patriotism subscale differentiates high and low scorers as well as do the other subscales and on as great a variety of groups. The Discriminatory Powers range from 2.42 to 3.78, with an average D. P. of 3.07. Again the major hypotheses underlying the items are substantiated. Other nations (Japanese, Mexicans, refugees, and “inferior nations” generally) are regarded as backward, immoral, and threatening. The superiority of the American nation justifies a policy of destruction and subordination of others. Submissiveness and obedience to the ingroup are regarded as primary virtues, and a punitive attitude—so characteristically taken toward extranational and intranational outgroups—is taken toward conscientious objectors. It is also interesting that Item 33, concerning the inevitability of war, is highly differentiating (D. P. = 3.25). It is as if the ingroup-outgroup distinction, and the intergroup hostility underlying it, are woven into the fabric of ethnocentric thinking; given a conflict with no conceivable possibility of resolution, there is nothing to do but make sure that the ingroup is on top and prepared to maintain itself.

4. SECOND FORM OF THE E SCALE (FORM 78)

In line with the general policy of contracting proven techniques in order to include new ones which might broaden the framework of the research,

the original 34-item E scale was shortened to 14 items in the next version of the questionnaire, Form 78. This questionnaire, described more fully in Chapter III, included four separate scales whose items, 78 in all, were interspersed randomly in a single series. The revised E scale is presented in Table 8(IV).

TABLE 8 (IV)
THE SECOND FORM OF THE E SCALE (FORM 78)

Old New
No. No.^a

- | | | |
|-----|-----|---|
| — | 4. | All forms of racial and religious discrimination should be made illegal and punishable. |
| 29. | 7. | Zootsuiters demonstrate that inferior groups, when they are given too much freedom and money, just misuse their privileges and create disturbances. |
| 12. | 18. | The main threat to basic American institutions during this century has come from foreign ideas, doctrines, and agitators. |
| — | 25. | If and when a new world organization is set up, America must be sure that she loses none of her independence and full sovereignty as a separate nation. |
| 14. | 29. | Negroes have their rights, but it is best to keep them in their own districts and schools and to prevent too much contact with whites. |
| 9. | 34. | Women, if they work at all, should take the most feminine positions, such as nursing, secretarial work, or child care. |
| 5. | 37. | If Negroes live poorly, it's because they are just naturally lazy, ignorant, and without self-control. |
| — | 41. | America may not be perfect, but the American Way has brought us about as close as human beings can get to a perfect society. |
| 11. | 45. | It would be a mistake to have Negroes for foremen and leaders over whites. |
| 23. | 48. | The only full guarantee of future peace is to wipe out as many as possible of the Germans and Japs, and to keep the rest under strict control. |
| — | 51. | Most of our social problems would be solved if the immoral, corrupt, and defective people could somehow be removed from the scene. |
| 15. | 54. | One main difficulty with allowing the entire population to participate fully in government affairs is that such a large percentage is innately deficient and incapable. |
| 22. | 57. | The people who raise all the talk about putting Negroes on the same level as whites are mostly radical agitators trying to stir up conflicts. |
| 17. | 64. | Citizen or not, no Jap should be allowed to return to California. |

^a "New number" refers to the numbering of the items in Form 78. "Old number" refers to numbering in the initial form discussed previously. Slight revisions will be noted in the wording of several items.

The general rules guiding contraction of the longer form were the same as those described previously in connection with the A-S scale. Statistical adequacy was again a necessary but not sufficient condition for retention of an item. It was deemed necessary to maintain broadness of coverage and to ensure nonduplication as well as significance of ideas. Revisions in the word-

ing of some items were made, especially in the direction of brevity and simplification. Item 9 of the initial form, suggesting that "woman's place is in the home," was entirely revised (present Item 34) in an attempt to improve its discriminability. In view of changing issues, former Item 17, which opposed the entrance of Japanese-Americans into the army, was changed in the new form to Item 64, which opposes their return to California.

There are four new items in the short form. Item 4 proposes legislation against discrimination; it is the first and only positive E item, that is, one in case of which agreement is given a low score. Number 25, a "patriotism" item, was intended to appeal both to the open isolationist and to the kind of pseudointernationalist who, while more or less accepting the idea of a world organization, wanted nevertheless to maintain complete American sovereignty and control. Item 41, which replaces several previous items, was intended to express an uncritically idealizing relation to America as a national ingroup. Finally, Item 51 refers to moral outgroups; it suggests that immorality is a cause of our social problems (rather than a concurrent symptom), and it contains implicitly a punitive attitude against such people, although punitive action is not explicitly proposed. Also worth noting is this item's stereotypic distinction between "good" people and "bad" people—the latter being the cause of the misfortunes of the former. This way of thinking often includes the "contempt for the masses" expressed in Item 54.

The three subscales of the initial E scale are represented proportionately in the new form. There are four Negro items (29, 37, 45, 57), four Patriotism items (18, 25, 41, 48), and six Minority items (4, 7, 34, 51, 54, 64).

It will be recalled from the preceding chapter that Form 78 was administered in the spring of 1945 to four groups: Public Speaking Class Women ($N = 140$), Public Speaking Class Men ($N = 52$), Extension Psychology Class Women ($N = 40$), all from the University of California; and the Professional Women (nurses, social workers, teachers; $N = 63$).

The reliability data for the E scale (Form 78) are presented in Table 9(IV). The average reliability of .80 is at the lower level of significance in terms of precise measurement of the individual, but it is quite satisfactory for the group comparisons and correlations for which it was used.⁷ This is perhaps all that could be expected of so short and diversified a scale. Hope of improvement is held out, however, by the possibility of eliminating or revising poorly discriminating items, and by the fact that the absence of

⁷ There are no absolute standards concerning what is an adequate reliability, as this varies with the variables measured, the uses to which the instrument will be put, and so forth. In the present study the following approximate standards of reliability have been used. (a) Above .85: permits relatively precise measurement of the individual. (b) From .75 to .85: permits rough ordering of individuals into, say, a quartile series of "low," "low middle," "high middle," and "high." Quite satisfactory for statistical analysis of group data. (c) From .60 to .75: lower level of adequacy, but sufficient for determining general relationships and for comparing extreme scorers.

TABLE 9 (IV)

RELIABILITY OF THE E-SCALE (FORM 78)

Property ^a	Group ^b				Over-all ^c
	A	B	C	D	
Reliability	.80	.74	.80	.88	.80
Mean (total)	3.44	3.33	3.68	2.72	3.29
Mean (odd half)	3.36	3.11	3.68	2.56	3.18
Mean (even half)	3.55	3.52	3.68	2.87	3.40
S. D. (total)	1.07	1.04	1.13	1.21	1.11
S. D. (odd half)	1.16	1.12	1.29	1.22	1.20
S. D. (even half)	1.15	1.18	1.25	1.37	1.24
N	140	52	40	63	295
Range	1.4-5.9	1.2-5.9	1.2-6.1	1.0-5.9	1.0-6.1

^aThe values of the means, S. D.'s, and ranges are given in terms of mean per item. If multiplied by 14 (the number of items), they are converted into values representing total scale score per person.

^bThe four groups on which these data are based are:

Group A: U. C. Public Speaking Class Women

Group B: U. C. Public Speaking Class Men

Group C: U. C. Extension Psychology Class Women

Group D: Professional Women

^cIn obtaining the over-all means, the individual group means were not weighted by N.

extremely high scorers (restriction of "range of talent") in these groups tends to depress the reliabilities somewhat. As in the case of the A-S scale, the Professional Women obtained the lowest mean and the highest reliability, being thus the least prejudiced and the most consistent group on both scales. The E scale means and ranges of all four groups indicate, on the average, slight disagreement with ethnocentric ideology, a sizable minority being strongly opposed and relatively few expressing strong support.

The item analysis of the scale is presented in Table 10(IV). The average D. P. of 2.90 is quite satisfactory for a scale of this length. Only one D. P. is below 2.1, and even this one (Item 4) is well above the minimum level of statistical significance. As in the initial, longer E scale, the items dealing with segregation and suppression of Negroes, opposition to "foreign infiltration" and zootsuiters, desire to "wipe out the Germans and Japs," and so on, were highly discriminating. Two of the four new items also worked very well: Item 25, placing American sovereignty above world organization, had an over-all rank D. P. of 4; and Item 41, an expression of ethnocentric conservatism in idealizing the "American Way," ranked 7 in terms of over-all D. P.

Among the poorest items are several which, only fairly successful in the initial form, were revised for Form 78 in an attempt at improvement. Thus,

TABLE 10 (IV)
 MEANS AND DISCRIMINATORY POWERS OF THE E-SCALE ITEMS (FORM 78) ^a

No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Group C		Group D		Over-all ^b		Rank D.P.
		Mean	D.P.	Mean	D.P.	Mean	D.P.	Mean	D.P.	Mean	D.P.	
4.	(Discrimination illegal)	3.99	0.17	3.44	2.29	4.30	1.45	4.06	2.12	3.95	1.51	(14)
7.	(Zootsuiters)	3.73	3.94	3.29	2.93	3.58	4.07	2.90	5.12	3.38	4.02	(1)
18.	(Foreign ideas)	3.36	3.01	3.69	2.15	3.32	3.95	2.30	3.92	3.17	3.26	(5)
25.	(World organization)	4.89	2.76	3.90	3.35	5.60	2.29	4.02	4.74	4.60	3.28	(4)
29.	(Negroes have rights)	3.69	4.54	3.12	3.29	4.52	4.04	2.30	4.12	3.41	4.00	(2)
34.	(Feminine positions)	2.66	1.89	4.42	2.36	2.00	1.91	1.89	2.57	2.74	2.18	(12)
37.	(Negroes lazy)	2.06	2.85	1.75	1.86	2.35	2.34	1.50	1.60	1.92	2.16	(13)
41.	(American Way)	4.11	2.38	3.69	3.14	5.22	2.69	4.33	3.98	4.34	3.05	(7)
45.	(Negro foremen)	4.26	3.76	3.60	3.58	5.28	3.54	3.21	3.06	4.09	3.48	(3)
48.	(Germans - Japs)	2.49	2.27	2.56	2.00	2.90	4.72	2.03	3.33	2.50	3.08	(6)
51.	(Remove corrupt people)	3.59	2.70	3.37	1.50	3.22	1.95	2.43	3.21	3.15	2.34	(11)
54.	(Population incapable)	4.44	2.44	4.33	1.86	3.95	3.11	3.17	3.22	3.97	2.66	(10)
57.	(Radicals pro-Negro)	2.51	2.52	2.75	2.21	2.98	3.65	2.14	3.05	2.60	2.86	(8)
64.	(No Japs in California)	2.52	2.96	2.46	2.93	2.25	1.87	1.75	3.00	2.24	2.69	(9)
	Mean per item	3.45	2.73	3.31	2.53	3.68	2.97	2.72	3.36	3.29	2.90	

^aThe four groups on which these data are based are: Group A, U. C. Public Speaking Class Women (N = 140).
 Group B, U. C. Public Speaking Class Men (N = 52). Group C, U. C. Extension Psychology Class Women (N = 40).
 Group D, Professional Women (N = 63).

^bIn obtaining the over-all means, the individual group means were not weighted by N.

Item 34, stating that women should be restricted to "feminine positions" such as nursing, ranked 12 out of 14. It is interesting that the women's groups (A, C, D in Table 10(IV)) tended predominantly to disagree with this item, obtaining means of only 1.9 to 2.7, while the group of college men showed a slight tendency to agree, having a mean of 4.4. Despite the similar Discriminatory Powers for men and women, the D. P. for women is probably more significant statistically, since their mean is so much lower. It would appear that the ethnocentric women are more bound, at least on the surface, to the traditional imagery of femininity, while the nonethnocentrists wish to emancipate women, occupationally and otherwise, from their traditionally imposed limitations. While the relationship is far from perfect, it suggests that different patterns of ideology regarding masculinity and femininity may exist in the two groups. This general problem is investigated more fully in later chapters.

The attempted improvements in Items 37 and 54 were also relatively unsuccessful. Item 37, which makes the Negroes entirely responsible for their own poverty, was apparently too strongly worded to receive much agreement (mean = 1.92). The low mean indicates that the D. P. of 2.16 is very significant; there is very little overlapping between low and high scorers, the former tending almost uniformly to disagree strongly (-3), while the latter disagree on the average only slightly (-1). Similarly, the relatively low D. P. of 2.7 and mean of 2.2 on Item 64 (No Japs in California) might have been higher had the item been given a pseudodemocratic coloring, thus allowing the ethnocentrists more moral justification for agreeing with it. Item 54, rejecting the bulk of the people as "innately deficient and incapable," has a more ambiguous relation to ethnocentrism. The subjects were evenly divided on this issue, and the D. P. of 2.7, while indicating a significant difference between the high and low quartiles, nevertheless permits considerable agreement by low scorers, disagreement by high scorers.

Of the four entirely new items, two were among the least discriminating. Item 51, which suggests that our social problems could be solved by eliminating "bad" people (rather than by changing the underlying social forces and institutions), had a D. P. of 2.3, rank 11, indicating a clear-cut difference between the high and the low quartiles, but numerous exceptions as well.

The poorest item, with a D. P. of 1.5, was number 4 (urging that discrimination be made illegal). The subjects were apparently evenly divided on this issue, and relatively few were willing to take an extreme stand either way. The fact that the Professional Women had a mean of 4.1 on this item, as compared with their scale mean of 2.7, was perhaps a straw in the wind to indicate that the attempted California Fair Employment Practices Law (referendum) of 1946 would receive far less than majority support. In their interview discussions many strongly anti-ethnocentric subjects—who clearly recognized the crucial role of discrimination in maintaining ingroup-out-

group conflicts—were nevertheless political pacifists in the sense of being unwilling militantly to oppose discrimination. Some of the psychological sources of this point of view will be considered in later chapters.

The E scale (Form 78), while adequate for its intended uses, was revised in the light of the results just discussed. The revision also took account of the correlations now to be considered, between the E and A-S scales.

D. THE INCLUSION OF ANTI-SEMITISM WITHIN GENERAL ETHNOCENTRISM

It will be recalled that the E scale contained no items referring to Jews; rather, the independent A-S scale was included within the total questionnaire. We may now consider the correlations between these scales.

The initial form of the questionnaire, administered in 1944 to the University of California Psychology Class Women, contained the 52-item A-S scale and the 34-item E scale. Correlations of the A-S scale with the E scale and its subscales are presented in Table 11 (IV).

TABLE 11 (IV)

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE A-S AND E SCALES (INITIAL FORMS)^a

	Total E Scale	E Subscale		
		"Negroes"	"Minorities"	"Patriotism"
A-S	.80	.74	.76	.69

^aThe reliabilities of these scales, as presented previously, are as follows: A-S = .92; E = .91; "Negroes" = .91; "Minorities" = .82; "Patriotism" = .80.

The correlation of .80 between E and A-S permits a further broadening in the conception of ethnocentrism. The correlations of .69-.76 between A-S and the E subscales are only slightly lower than the correlations of .74-.83 among the E subscales (see Section C, above). These values indicate once again the generality of the ethnocentric approach to group relations. Anti-Semitism is best regarded, it would seem, as one aspect of this broader frame of mind; and it is the total ethnocentric ideology, rather than prejudice against any single group, which requires explanation. The fact that A-S correlates slightly less with the E subscales than the latter correlate among themselves may be due in part to the shortened range of A-S scores (absence of extreme highs); however, it appears likely that there are certain specific determinants of anti-Semitism apart from those which hold for general ethnocentrism.

The correlations between the A-S and E scales in Form 78, presented in

Table 12(IV), provide a further indication of the generality of ethnocentrism. The average correlation, .68, is lower than that of .80 obtained in the initial form. This difference is due partially to the decreased reliability of the shortened E scale. However, it suggests once again that anti-Semitism,

TABLE 12 (IV)
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE A-S AND E SCALES (FORM 78)

<u>Group</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Correlation</u>
Public Speaking women	140	.71
Public Speaking men	52	.75
Extension women	40	.63
Professional women	63	.63
Mean r^a	295	.68

^aThe mean r is unweighted for N and not based on Z_r .

while it is essentially a facet of a broader ethnocentric pattern, may nevertheless have certain independent determinants of its own.

1. THE THIRD FORM OF THE E SCALE (FORM 60)

The close, though imperfect, relationship between the A-S and E scales in Form 78 led, in the construction of Questionnaire Form 60, to their contraction into an inclusive 12-item E scale. This scale, presented in Table 13 (IV), contains 4 A-S items (numbers 8, 21, 38, 47), 3 Negro items (14, 28, 42), and 5 items dealing with other minorities and with patriotism. Once again slight revisions in the wording have frequently been made, particularly in the direction of simplicity and brevity. Again items were selected on the basis both of statistical adequacy and theoretical significance. Two items (42, 55) were included, despite their previous low means and D. P.'s, because they seemed to express significant ideas and because the means, and thus the D. P.'s, were expected to go up in some of the groups to be tested. Item 59 ("Okies") was recovered from the initial E scale.

a. THE GROUPS STUDIED. Questionnaire Form 60 was administered in the summer of 1945 to the following groups:

1. Summer session students in psychology classes at the University of Oregon (one of us taking advantage of his summer teaching position there).

2. Summer session students in an education class at the University of California.⁸ Whereas the Oregon students were almost entirely of college age, the members of this particular education class at the University of California were somewhat older (age range about 25-45), the most common occupation

⁸We wish to express our thanks to Dr. Harold Carter for the administration of the questionnaires to his class.

TABLE 13 (IV)
THE THIRD FORM OF THE E SCALE (FORM 60)

3. Zootsuiters prove that when people of their type have too much money and freedom, they just take advantage and cause trouble.
8. One trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they stick together and prevent other people from having a fair chance in competition.
14. Negroes have their rights, but it is best to keep them in their own districts and schools and to prevent too much contact with whites.
21. I can hardly imagine myself marrying a Jew.
28. It would be a mistake ever to have Negroes for foremen and leaders over whites.
33. If and when a new world organization is set up, America must be sure that she loses none of her independence and complete power in matters that affect this country.
38. There may be a few exceptions, but in general, Jews are pretty much alike.
42. If Negroes live poorly, it's mainly because they are naturally lazy, ignorant, and without self-control.
47. The trouble with letting Jews into a nice neighborhood is that they gradually give it a typical Jewish atmosphere.
51. The worst danger to real Americanism during the last 50 years has come from foreign ideas and agitators.
55. Citizen or not, no Jap should be allowed to return to California.
59. For the good of all, the Oklahomans ("Okies") who recently flooded California ought to be sent back home as soon as possible.

being that of teacher, although other, particularly semiprofessional, occupations were well represented.

3. Men's service clubs (Kiwanis, Lions, Rotary) in the vicinity of the University of Oregon.

In order that separate data for men and women might be obtained, the above groups were divided and recombined for statistical purposes. The first University of Oregon class obtained included enough women to form a statistical group (Group I, $N = 47$). However, the second class at Oregon was too small to be divisible into statistically adequate subgroups of men and women, and so was the class at California. Accordingly, statistical Group II contains the combined Oregon and California Student Women ($N = 54$), Group III the combined men ($N = 57$). Finally, Group IV contains the Oregon Service Club Men ($N = 68$).

b. RELIABILITY. The reliability data for the E Scale (Form 60) are presented in Table 14(IV). The reliabilities, ranging from .82 to .88 and averaging .86 for the four groups, are entirely adequate in terms of currently accepted standards. The obtained scores cover most of the possible range (1.0-7.0) with the exception of the extremely high end; there are few scores of over 6.0. A slight predominance of low scores is also indicated by the group means, which are well below the neutral point of 4.0.

The differences among the various groups are of some interest. The highest degree of ethnocentrism was expressed by the Oregon Service Club Men.

TABLE 14 (IV)

RELIABILITY OF THE E SCALE (FORM 60)^a

Property	Group				Over-all
	I	II	III	IV	
Reliability	.88	.88	.86	.82	.86
Mean (total)	3.43	3.25	2.96	3.55	3.30
Mean (odd half)	3.48	3.24	2.95	3.72	3.35
Mean (even half)	3.38	3.26	2.97	3.43	3.26
S. D. (total)	1.38	1.29	1.26	1.11	1.26
S. D. (odd half)	1.63	1.77	1.38	1.21	1.50
S. D. (even half)	1.30	1.53	1.23	1.17	1.31
N	47	54	57	68	226
Range	1.0-6.3	1.1-5.9	1.0-6.3	1.3-5.8	1.0-6.3

^aThe four groups on which these data are based are:

Group I: University of Oregon Student Women.

Group II: University of Oregon and University of California Student Women.

Group III: University of Oregon and University of California Student Men.

Group IV: Oregon Service Club Men.

Their mean of 3.55 is significantly higher (1 per cent level) than the lowest mean, 2.96, obtained by the University Student Men. We may note that the group of Service Club Men was also the most constricted in its range of scores (1.3-5.8) and in its internal variability (S. D. = 1.11); that is, its members tended to cluster around the middle position so that there are few extreme high or low scorers. These considerations help to explain why the E scale has the lowest reliability in this group and why the average D. P. is, as will be shown below, also lower for this group than for the others. That this group should exhibit a clustering around a modal "point of conformity" is perhaps not surprising, since conformity is one of its central values. It may, however, be surprising to some that the mode should be in a middle rather than a more extreme position.

It is also of some interest that the California subjects are slightly less ethnocentric than the Oregonians. Thus, Group I, composed entirely of Oregon students, has a slightly higher mean than Group II (3.43 to 3.25), which is more than half Californian in make-up. The likelihood of a regional difference is given greater weight by the fact that at least two items (55, "Japs," and 59, "Okies," and perhaps also 3, "Zootsuits") refer specifically to conditions in California. A slight, though also not statistically significant difference is found between comparable sex groups, the University Student Women (Group II) having a higher mean than the University Student Men (Group III) (3.25-2.96). No consistent, significant difference between com-

TABLE 15 (IV)
 MEANS AND DISCRIMINATORY POWERS OF THE E-SCALE ITEMS (FORM 60)^a

No.	Item	Group I		Group II		Group III		Group IV		Over-all		
		Mean	D.P.	Mean	D.P.	Mean	D.P.	Mean	D.P.	Mean	D.P.	Rank
3.	(Zootsuiters)	3.34	2.31	3.41	3.06	2.77	3.07	4.06	3.11	3.40	2.89	(9)
8.	(J. businessmen)	4.11	3.47	3.65	3.87	3.40	3.47	3.78	2.22	3.74	3.26	(7)
14.	(Negro rights)	3.79	4.55	3.70	5.26	3.46	3.93	4.57	2.28	3.88	4.00	(2)
21.	(Marry a Jew)	4.94	4.15	4.50	2.87	3.61	3.60	4.47	3.22	4.38	3.46	(5)
28.	(Negro foreman)	4.00	4.69	3.87	4.46	3.53	3.67	4.31	4.05	3.93	4.22	(1)
33.	(World organization)	4.49	4.23	4.54	2.73	3.91	3.80	4.32	4.00	4.32	3.69	(4)
38.	(Jews alike)	3.70	4.38	3.15	3.33	2.93	3.66	3.99	3.89	3.44	3.82	(3)
42.	(Negroes lazy)	1.81	1.46	2.04	1.93	1.86	1.80	2.82	2.87	2.13	2.02	(11)
47.	(Jewish neighbors)	3.30	4.00	3.07	3.07	3.00	3.93	3.38	2.54	3.19	3.38	(6)
51.	(Foreign ideas)	2.74	3.54	2.56	3.13	2.75	2.27	3.25	3.61	2.82	3.14	(8)
55.	(No Japs)	2.34	2.69	2.13	1.87	1.93	1.13	2.00	1.50	2.10	1.80	(12)
59.	(Okies)	2.62	2.39	2.41	2.86	2.19	2.26	1.81	0.84	2.26	2.09	(10)
	Mean per item	3.43	3.49	3.25	3.20	2.95	3.05	3.56	2.84	3.30	3.15	

^aThe four groups on which these data are based are:

Group I: University of Oregon Student Women (N = 47).

Group II: University of Oregon and University of California Student Women (N = 54).

Group III: University of Oregon and University of California Student Men (N = 57).

Group IV: Oregon Service Club Men (N = 68).

parable groups of men and women has been found, as may be noted below in the results on additional groups (p. 133 ff.).

c. ITEM ANALYSIS. The results of the item analysis of the E scale (Form 60) are presented in Table 15(IV). The average D. P. of 3.15 is very satisfactory. The three lowest D. P.'s (1.8-2.1) were obtained by the items having the lowest means (2.1-2.3). Two of these items, numbers 42 and 55, obtained similar means on previous forms of the scale. They were included here, slightly revised, with the expectation that the present groups might agree more strongly. This expectation was not borne out. In view of the relatively strong rejection of Oklahomans in California, the low mean and D. P. of Item 59 are probably due more to faults in formulation than to the inadequacy of the idea which we intended to express. Even the three poorest items, however, differentiate significantly and with a minimum of overlap between the high and low quartiles, the low scorers being strongly opposed (almost uniform responses of -3), the high scorers tending to disagree only slightly.⁹

The rank order of goodness of items is, on the whole, consistent with previous results. The five best items (14, 21, 28, 33, 38) include two referring to Negroes, two to Jews, and one to world organization; these items ranked similarly in earlier forms. Item 3 (Zootsuiters) has a rank of 9, as compared with a rank of 1 on Form 78. The drop may well be due to the fact that the zootsuiter issue was less focal, and therefore less likely to produce extreme agreement or disagreement, in Oregon than in California. The groups taking Form 60 agree quite well among themselves regarding the relative level of acceptability (mean) and level of discriminability (D. P.) of the items. While rank-order correlations between the groups were not computed, it appears from inspection of Table 15(IV) that the mean or D. P. rank of each item is fairly stable from group to group.

2. THE FOURTH FORM OF THE E SCALE (FORMS 45 AND 40)

The fourth and final form of the E Scale (see Table 16(IV)), as used in Form 45, involved the deletion of two items ("Japs" and "Okies") from the previous form, the other ten items remaining intact. It was understood that this contraction of the E scale would eliminate many of its qualitative functions and would probably lower its reliability to the minimum required by the present research purposes. Nevertheless, the intention to distribute the questionnaire to a wide variety of groups, many of whom would have very little time for filling it out, made every reduction in size seem desirable. The entire Questionnaire Form 45 could, accordingly, be filled out in approximately thirty minutes—short enough so that, for example, a club or

⁹ The group mean for each item is usually about midway between the means for the high and low quartiles. It is therefore legitimate to infer the quartile means from the item mean and D. P.

TABLE 16 (IV)

THE FOURTH FORM OF THE E SCALE (FORMS 45 AND 40)^a

- E_A 5. Zootsuiters prove that when people of their type have too much money and freedom, they just take advantage and cause trouble.
- E_A 10. Negroes have their rights, but it is best to keep them in their own districts and schools and to prevent too much contact with whites.
- E_A 15. The worst danger to real Americanism during the last 50 years has come from foreign ideas and agitators.
- E_A 20. It would be a mistake ever to have Negroes for foremen and leaders over whites.
- E_B 24. One trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they stick together and prevent other people from having a fair chance in competition.
- E_B 28. I can hardly imagine myself marrying a Jew.
- E_B 32. If Negroes live poorly, it's mainly because they are naturally lazy, ignorant, and without self-control.
- E_B 36. There may be a few exceptions, but in general, Jews are pretty much alike.
- E_B 40. The trouble with letting Jews into a nice neighborhood is that they gradually give it a typical Jewish atmosphere.
- E_A 45. If and when a new world organization is set up, America must be sure that she loses none of her independence and complete power in matters that affect this country.

^a The five E_A items constitute the entire E scale in Form 40. The total ten-item scale was given, numbered as it appears above, in Form 45. The reliability of Form 45 was obtained by correlating the 5 E_A items with the remaining 5 E_B items. It will be noted that there are no items about Jews in E_A, it being desired as a practical aim to construct a questionnaire which would give an index of anti-Semitism without mentioning Jews at all.

organization could take it during a meeting, just before hearing a talk not directly related to the questionnaire.

Demands of practicality and expediency forced an additional compromise. Questionnaire Form 40 was even shorter than Form 45; in addition to contractions of other techniques, the E scale in this form was reduced to five items (as shown in Table 16(IV)). A primary reason for Form 40 was that certain groups might be unable to spare even the thirty minutes required by Form 45. An additional consideration in the contraction of the E scale, however, was the possibility that, in certain groups at least, the items referring to Jews might be too "controversial" or might focus attention too directly on the issue of prejudice. Accordingly, the five E_A items in Form 40 contain no direct reference to Jews. They deal, rather, with Negroes, zootsuiters, foreigners, and "world organization." (In Form 45 the E scale contains, in addition to these, five E_B items, four referring to Jews, one to Negroes.) It was recognized that these five items do not constitute a scale in the more technical sense, but this loss seemed justified by the gain in applicability to various groups.

Our conclusions regarding the advantage of using Form 40 ought perhaps to be noted for those faced with similar problems. Although it avoided focusing atten-

tion on Jews, the loss in terms of research aims was not sufficiently compensated for by the small gain in time nor by elimination of resistance. Indeed, the resistance encountered seemed to be based as much on the other phases of the questionnaire as on the E scale. Probably the basic opposition psychologically was to being "investigated" at all in an intensive way. Unlike the usual several-question poll, this questionnaire seemed, to many a subject, to *identify* him as a total individual even though he knew that his anonymity was preserved. In some cases this was highly anxiety-producing despite our careful attempts at reassurance and at explaining the entire procedure in terms of an impersonal, public opinion, nonindividual approach. In some cases it was impossible to gain the cooperation of the leadership of a group; in other cases cooperative leaders were unable to put the idea across or to have it carried out. Difficulties of this sort were as great with Form 40 as with Form 45. Once a group was induced to cooperate, there were very few omissions of questions or scale items in either form. In short, resistance was related more to the general nature of the questionnaire than to any specific individual items. Form 45 might therefore have been used on practically all of the groups tested. When it is absolutely necessary to delete certain items—e.g., if one were testing groups with a large Jewish or Negro membership and items referring to these groups might cause friction—probably the best procedure would be to have alternative items to replace those deleted.

While the number of groups which were actively but unsuccessfully approached is not large, there is some indication that resistance of the type mentioned above is correlated positively with ethnocentrism. For example, among the "Middle-Class Women" (Table 15(V)) there was an exclusive club which "just barely" decided to cooperate and which refused even to consider our request for volunteers to be interviewed. This group obtained one of the highest E means of all groups tested. Such resistance was seldom encountered in less ethnocentric groups. This difficulty might have been expected on the basis of the ethnocentrists' tendency toward self-deception and concern with prying, which was expressed indirectly in the responses on the A-S and E scales, and which is brought out more directly in the chapters that follow.

Considerations of this type are of great importance in any attempt to generalize from a research sample to a broader population. Thus, because of the greater resistance of ethnocentrists to psychological investigation, it is likely that the average degree of ethnocentrism (over-all mean E score) in our total sample is somewhat lower than that which would be found in a truly random or truly representative sample. Even in the more customary public opinion polls, where population areas are often mapped out in advance (stratification or other attempt at representative sampling), an adequate sample may not be achieved because, in their door-to-door polling, interviewers cannot reach those subjects who are unreceptive to the idea of being "tested."¹⁰

¹⁰ The common assumption that "any 50 people" within a given area or income level will do, and that errors of sampling on an individual level will cancel each other out, overlooks the likelihood that *receptivity* may correlate with what is being polled.

It seems necessary, therefore, in describing the groups on whom data were obtained, to mention briefly the nature and adequacy of the sampling procedure.

a. **THE SAMPLE AND THE SAMPLING PROCEDURE.** The distribution of Forms 45 and 40 took place during the latter part of 1945 and the first half of 1946, a period of about nine months in all. Form 45 was given to the following groups:¹¹

1. *Testing Class Women* (N = 59). This was an adult evening class given by the Extension Division of the University of California. Since it was a class in Psychological Tests, it probably attracted a more diversified group than does the usual adult class in psychology. It was expected to contain not only individuals seriously interested in understanding themselves better—individuals who, as we shall see later, are not likely to be extremely ethnocentric—but also persons interested in psychology more as a means of manipulating others. The class was also varied with respect to age (range about 20–50), income, and previous education. Therefore, despite the desire to get away from the university groups which predominated in our previous samples, we could not resist taking the opportunity to test this marginal university group. The questionnaire was administered during a class meeting, all members being present. The men were too few to constitute a separate statistical group, and our policy of separating the sexes—perhaps too strictly adhered to—prevented us from combining them.

2. *San Quentin State Prison (California) Inmates* (N = 110). Since these men constitute a particularly important group, psychologically and sociologically, they were studied more intensively than the others; the sampling procedures and results are discussed in detail in Chapter XXI. It may suffice here to say that the sample was well randomized.

3. and 4. *Psychiatric Clinic Patients* (71 women, 50 men). This group, like the San Quentin group, was considered to have special importance both practically and for a full theoretical understanding of our problem. As a “key group,” it seemed to merit thorough study and analysis (Chapter XXII). The questionnaires were administered individually (each subject filling out the questionnaire by himself) as part of the clinic routine, and there appeared to be no systematic bias operating in the selection of cases.

5. *Working-Class Men and Women.* A number of small groups were combined to form the “working-class” sample on which statistics were computed. Of the 53 women in this sample, 19 were from the California Labor School (an extremely liberal school for working people which has classes in a variety of fields, from trade unionism to arts and crafts), 8 were members of the United Electrical Workers, C.I.O., 10 were new members of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen’s Union (I.L.W.U., C.I.O.), and 16 were office workers obtained

¹¹ The collection of questionnaires from these groups would have been impossible without the generous cooperation of numerous people. We wish to express our gratitude to Dr. Merle H. Elliott, who obtained questionnaires from his class in the Extension Division of the University of California, Dr. David G. Schmidt, who made the necessary arrangements for the San Quentin Group, Dr. Karl Bowman and Dr. Robert Harris, who made it possible for us to obtain subjects at the Langley Porter Clinic, Dr. Barbara Kirchheimer, who made the arrangements, and Mrs. Emily Moulton, who collected questionnaires at the U.S. Employment Service, Captain Malcolm E. Crossman, who gave his support, and Dr. Boyd R. McCandless, who gave freely of his time in obtaining questionnaires at the Alameda School for Merchant Marine Officers.

through the employers. The 61 men were obtained similarly: 15 were from the California Labor School, 12 from the United Electrical Workers, 26 from the I.L.W.U., and 8 from the United Seamen's Service. All groups were obtained in the San Francisco Bay area. The Labor School subjects constitute the total membership of various classes, the questionnaire being administered in class.¹² The 20 Electrical Workers were obtained in the union hall as they came in on business matters. The 36 I.L.W.U. members were given the questionnaire at the beginning of a class for new members before any indoctrination had started. While the female office workers took the questionnaire at the request of interested employers, it was understood that they maintained their anonymity, and no systematic selective factors appear to have entered in. Less reliance can be placed on the male sample from the Seamen's Service, since the 8 subjects are but a small percentage of those passing in and out of the center. The working-class sample as a whole does not appear to reflect, in either a random or a representative manner, the actual working-class population, and any generalizations from the data must be drawn tentatively and with great caution.

The bulk of the working-class sample was given Form 40, only 19 women and 31 men receiving Form 45. Therefore, for the statistical purpose of relating the E scale to the other scales and measures (see Chapters V through VII), all questionnaires were treated as if they were Form 40, that is, only E_A was statisticized in Form 45. In consequence there are results on Form 40 for *Working-Class Women* ($N = 53$) and *Working-Class Men* ($N = 61$).

However, when additional data were desired on the total Form 45 E scale, it was decided to combine the 19 women and 31 men into a single sample,¹³ the *Working-Class Men and Women* (Form 45) ($N = 50$). This sample is, then, actually a part of the larger Form 40 sample (see below). The men in the Form 45 sample were obtained from the groups mentioned above in almost exactly the same proportions as those taking Form 40. However, the Form 45 women are preponderantly from the Labor School and the United Electrical Workers' Union, and may consequently differ systematically from the others with respect to E.

Form 40 was given to a number of groups forming the following statistical samples:

6. *George Washington University Women* ($N = 132$). This group comprises the total female membership of several day and evening classes in psychology at George Washington University, Washington, D.C.¹⁴ (There were so few men that their questionnaires were not statisticized.) It was included out of an interest in regional differences between California and the East, even though only limited generalizations can be drawn from so selected a sample.

7. *California Service Club Men* ($N = 63$). Two service clubs, Kiwanis and Rotary, comprise this sample. Questionnaires were filled out during a customary luncheon meeting (procedure not previously announced) just prior to the featured talk, given by a member of our staff.

¹² It appeared necessary to distinguish "middle-class" from "working-class" members of the Labor School, and to place the former in the broader "middle-class" sample. (See the discussion of the middle-class sample, Form 40.) The present figures refer only to working-class members.

¹³ This sample was used only for getting the reliability data on the Form 45 E scale; no statistics were computed on the other scales.

¹⁴ As mentioned previously, while the questionnaire was administered to all present, only the native-born, white, non-Jewish, American subjects were included in the statistical treatment. The N's reported refer to the number of cases treated statistically.

8. *Middle-Class Men* ($N = 69$) and 9. *Middle-Class Women* ($N = 154$). These two samples represent the combination, for statistical purposes, of the following groups: The membership at a meeting of the Parent-Teachers' Association in a "solid" middle-class section of Berkeley, California (46 women, 29 men). Again, the questionnaire was administered just before the featured talk on child training. The membership of a Protestant church in a small town just outside of San Francisco (29 women, 31 men). The 15 women in a local Unitarian Church group. The members of the California Labor School who appeared to be "middle class" in terms of occupation (lawyer, engineer, independent businessman, etc.) and income (11 women, 9 men); in case of doubt the individual remained in the "working-class" sample discussed above. The 17 women in one division or panel of the local League of Women Voters. Finally, the 36 members of an exclusive, upper middle-class women's club. It would appear, then, that these two samples, particularly the women, represent diverse elements of the middle class.

10. *Working-Class Men* ($N = 61$) and 11. *Working-Class Women* ($N = 53$). These groups have been described above in connection with the Form 45 sample of Working-Class Men and Women.

12. *Los Angeles Men* ($N = 117$) and 13. *Los Angeles Women* ($N = 130$).¹⁵ In an attempt to obtain greater regional diversity for the total sample, a group of men and women was tested in the Los Angeles area. Because of time limitations the sampling procedure was not thoroughly controlled, and exact figures are not available on the number of subjects in each of the groups comprising the sample. Subjects were obtained from the following groups (not more than 25 per cent of the total N from any one group): parents of college students (volunteers), high school teachers, veterans at a counseling center, Radio Writers Guild (tested during a meeting), League of Women Voters, Boy Scout leaders, members of an anti-Semitic organization (12 responders out of some 100 questionnaires mailed out), and several small local clubs and neighborhood groups. The sample is primarily middle class in composition, although it cannot be considered clearly representative of the middle-class population. Moreover, its mean may be systematically lowered by the relatively high educational level and by the fact that many of the subjects were obtained on a volunteer basis. It was suitable for the present research purposes, however, since it appeared highly diverse with respect to ethnocentrism and with respect to the social and psychological characteristics whose relations to ethnocentrism were being investigated.

In addition to the above groups, the following two groups received both Forms 45 and 40:

14. *Employment Service Men Veterans* ($N = 106$). It seemed likely, early in 1946, that the questionnaire, particularly the F scale (see Chapter VII) and the projective questions (Chapter XV) could reveal much that was of interest to the clinician and the vocational counselor. Thus, when the questionnaire was given to veterans seeking vocational guidance at the local U. S. Employment Service, it was with the thought that it would be an aid to the agency as well as to the research. With a few exceptions, all (white, Christian) male veterans coming in for counseling during a several-month period starting early in 1946 were given the questionnaire, the first 51 receiving Form 45, the next 55, Form 40. The exceptions were men who seemed not to have enough education to handle the questionnaire and men in whose case a convenient time could not be arranged. This group can thus be considered a relatively random sample of the counselees. However,

¹⁵ These questionnaires were collected by Dr. J. F. Brown with the assistance of Emily Gruen and Carol Creedon.

it may well be that counselees as a group are not representative of the veteran population. Thus, our sample is above average in socioeconomic level (see Chapter V) and in education and intelligence (see Chapter VIII). Furthermore, on the basis of evidence to be presented in later chapters, particularly Chapter XI, it appears likely that willingness to seek guidance, and especially to accept the mild psychotherapy going with it, is more common in nonethnocentrists than in others. How serious a sampling bias this produces depends in part on other factors which might impel ethnocentric individuals to seek help (e.g., external pressures, or a tendency to conceive of the Service as benevolent authority). At any rate, it is not unlikely that the mean E score for this sample may be somewhat lower than for the veteran population generally.

15. *Maritime School Men* (N = 343). This group comprises the entire membership of a government training school for Merchant Marine officers. The school is located in Alameda (San Francisco Bay area), but its students come from all parts of the country. Upon admission all of them must have had at least fourteen months of active service as unlicensed seamen. The questionnaires were administered during the study periods, under well-controlled conditions, by members of the Psychology staff who seemed to be on excellent terms with the men. Half of the study sections received Form 45, the other half Form 40, the halves being roughly equated in terms of ability and time in school. This group, like the one described immediately above, cannot be considered a fully representative sample of the armed services population. It is selected in at least the following ways: predominantly lower middle-class background, relatively few members coming from the lower socioeconomic strata or from the upper middle class or above; above average in upward social mobility—in the desire to “raise oneself socially and financially”; above average in intelligence, this being a primary qualification for admission (mean AGCT score of 126.2, range of 102–153).¹⁶ Despite these relative uniformities, the group is extremely diverse in most other ways.

b. **RELIABILITY AND GROUP DIFFERENCES.** The reliability data for Forms 45 and 40 are presented in Table 17(IV). As noted above, the 5-item E_A scale in Form 40 contained no items referring to Jews; Form 45 contained these five items plus five E_B items, four of which are from the former A-S scale. Since the small number of items in Form 40 made it unfeasible to compute a reliability coefficient, it was decided to determine the reliability of the total scale by correlating E_A with E_B rather than by correlating odd-even or equivalent halves. This procedure gave some indication of the degree of equivalence between scores on Form 40 and scores on Form 45; it provided, for example, a partial answer to the question: of a group scoring in the low quartile on the E_A scale, what percentage would score in the low quartile on $E_A + B$? The average reliability of .79 for the seven groups taking Form 45 (Table 17(IV) A, C) indicates that the overlap is relatively great—although it also brings out the advantage of using the longer scale.

The present method of computing reliability, while it was helpful in determining the degree of relationship between E_A and $E_A + B$, and in showing

¹⁶ No detailed description of the social and psychological properties of the various groups will be presented in this chapter. Instead, each set of properties will be presented and discussed in the appropriate chapter, e.g., politico-economic properties in Chapter V, religion in Chapter VI, and so on.

the great, though incomplete, unity in ethnocentric ideology, had nevertheless the disadvantage of yielding lower reliabilities than would have been obtained by a division into odd-even or equivalent halves. Two halves equated for content are certainly likely to intercorrelate more highly than two halves, such as E_A and E_B , which differ in content. This hypothesis was tested on two groups. In the case of the San Quentin Men, who obtained an $E_A - E_B$ reliability of .65, the lowest of any group tested, the reliability rose to .79 when odd-even halves were used. In a group of 517 women, students at the University of California,¹⁷ the reliability based on E_A vs. E_B was .79, while the odd-even reliability was .87. Since in its usual meaning "reliability" refers to the relation between "equivalent measures of the same thing," the reliability of the total E scale is probably around .85 on the average, a value which meets current testing standards.

In view of the shortness of the E scale (Form 40), it was not feasible to compute reliabilities on it. Instead, the mean Discriminatory Power (D. P.)

TABLE 17 (IV)
RELIABILITY OF THE E SCALE (FORMS 45 AND 40)

A. Groups Taking Form 45 (E_{A+B})

Property	Group ^a					Over-all ^b
	I	II	III	IV	V	
Reliability ^c	.82	.65	.84	.75	.91	.79
Mean (total)	3.41	4.61	3.65	3.67	3.34	3.74
Mean (A half)	3.77	5.33	4.23	3.92	3.62	4.17
Mean (B half)	3.06	3.86	3.06	3.42	3.07	3.29
S. D. (total)	1.40	1.28	1.60	1.59	1.78	1.53
S. D. (A half)	1.68	1.31	1.81	1.78	1.91	1.70
S. D. (B half)	1.35	1.60	1.64	1.70	1.77	1.61
N	59	110	71	50	50	340
Range	1.0-6.1	1.6-7.0	1.0-7.0	1.0-6.2	1.0-7.0	1.0-7.0

^aThe groups taking this form are as follows:

- Group I: Extension Testing Class Women
- Group II: San Quentin Men Prisoners
- Group III: Psychiatric Clinic Women
- Group IV: Psychiatric Clinic Men
- Group V: Working Class Men and Women

^bIn obtaining the over-all means, the individual group means were not weighted by N.

^cThe reliabilities for Form 45 are not based on odd-even or equivalent halves but on E_A vs. E_B ; they are therefore slightly lower than they would be had equivalent halves been used (see text).

¹⁷ This group was not included in the over-all sample because the proportion of students in the sample was already too great. This group was obtained for the primary purpose of making a correlational analysis of the Form 45 scales, particularly the F scale (see Chapter VII).

TABLE 17 (IV) (CONT'D.)
 RELIABILITY OF THE E SCALE (FORMS 45 AND 40)

B. Groups Taking Form 40 (E_A)^a

Property	Group ^b								Over-all ^c
	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	
Mean	4.04	4.31	3.89	3.64	3.92	3.91	3.82	3.71	3.90
S.D.	1.58	1.73	2.08	1.96	1.71	2.25	1.89	1.78	1.87
Mean D.P.	4.10	4.54	5.28	5.11	4.53	5.64	5.08	4.67	4.87
N	132	63	69	154	61	53	117	130	779
Range ^d									

^aThe E scale in Form 40 contained only 5 items, referred to as the E_A items and identical to the E_A items in Form 45.

^bThe groups taking this form are as follows:

- Group VI: George Washington University Women
- Group VII: California Service Club Men
- Group VIII: Middle-Class Men
- Group IX: Middle-Class Women
- Group X: Working-Class Men
- Group XI: Working-Class Women
- Group XII: Los Angeles Men
- Group XIII: Los Angeles Women

^cIn obtaining the over-all means, the individual group means were not weighted by N.

^dThe range in every case was 1.0-7.0.

TABLE 17 (IV) (CONT' D.)

RELIABILITY OF THE E SCALE (FORMS 45 AND 40)^aC. Groups Taking both Forms 45 and 40

<u>Property</u>	<u>Group</u>		<u>Over-all</u>
	<u>Employment Service Men Veterans</u>	<u>Maritime School Men</u>	
<i>Form 45:</i>			
Reliability	.86	.73	.80
Mean (total)	4.26	4.34	4.30
Mean (A half)	4.67	4.82	4.74
Mean (B half)	3.85	3.85	3.85
S. D. (total)	1.60	1.25	1.42
S. D. (A half)	1.63	1.40	1.52
S. D. (B half)	1.71	1.36	1.54
N	51	179	230
Range	1.1-6.6	1.2-6.6	1.1-6.6
<i>Form 40:</i>			
Mean (E _A)	4.21	5.08	4.64
S. D. (E _A)	1.75	1.47	1.61
N	55	164	219
Range	1.0-7.0	1.2-7.0	1.0-7.0

^aThe total number of cases on Forms 45 and 40 is as follows:

	Form 45	Form 40	Total
N	570	998	1568

is reported for each group in Table 17 (IV)B. The over-all mean D. P. of 4.87 suggests what the total E reliability also suggests: that the subjects show a relatively high degree of consistency in response to all items. The mean D. P. in four of the eight groups is over 5.0; this suggests that the distribution of scores is bimodal, that is, that the subjects tend either to agree strongly or to disagree strongly (in contrast to the more common result in which scores cluster around the "uncertain" neutral point). The high S. D.'s and wide range of scores indicate the same thing.

The group differences in average degree of ethnocentrism are of some interest. Among the groups taking Form 45, the three which stand clearly at the head of the list in terms of mean E score are the San Quentin Men (4.61), the Maritime School Men (4.34), and the Employment Service Men Veterans (4.26), these means being significantly higher than the others (3.34-3.67). That the San Quentin Men are so ethnocentric makes it clear that being in a subordinate group is not a guarantee against ethnocentrism. The results for the San Quentin group, and the psychological affinity between criminality and fascism, are considered in detail in Chapter XXI.

It is unclear why, in the Veteran and Maritime School groups, the E_A

means should be so different in Form 40 as compared with Form 45 (Table 17(IV) C). Thus, for the Veterans, the E_A mean drops from 4.67 to 4.21, while for the Maritime School it increases from 4.82 to 5.08. Although these differences are not statistically significant (at the 5 per cent level), they might, if they were both in the same direction, suggest a general systematic difference between the two Forms. It might be hypothesized, for example, that the presence of the anti-Semitic items in E_B makes some people defensive and thus lowers the mean on the entire scale in Form 45. This hypothesis is opposed, however, by the facts that neither difference is significant, that in the Maritime School the E_A mean is higher in Form 40 than in Form 45, and that the E_A means in the other Form 40 groups (Table 17(IV) B) are of the order of magnitude as in the Form 45 groups. It would appear, in short, that the presence of the E_B items in Form 45 produces no systematic increase or decrease in scores on the other items.

The mean E score of 3.7, as well as the wide range and the large S. D., for the Psychiatric Clinic patients indicates that no simple relationship exists between psychological ill health and ethnocentrism. The degree of ethnocentrism in this group of neurotic and psychotic—primarily the former—individuals just about equals the average of all groups tested. It would appear incorrect, therefore, to assume that there is on the average more pathology, psychologically speaking, in ethnocentrists than in nonethnocentrists or conversely.¹⁸ Evidence to be presented later, however (Chapter XXII), will show that high and low scorers differ significantly with respect to type of pathology. The least ethnocentric groups taking Form 45 and 40 are the Testing Class Women and the Working-Class Men and Women. The low mean for the former group is consistent with previous results on University groups in California and Oregon. The E_A mean for the Form 45 group of Working-Class subjects is slightly but nonsignificantly lower than for the larger Working-Class group taking Form 40. This difference is apparently due to the fact that the Form 45 sample contains a greater proportion of subjects from the California Labor School, a subgroup with an extremely low E mean. Further discussion of the relation of economic class and politico-economic ideology to ethnocentrism is reserved for Chapter V. From the results in Table 17(IV), particularly for the groups taking Form 40, it would appear that socioeconomic class, as such, is not a major determinant of differences in ethnocentrism. The means for the Middle-Class groups are almost identical with those for the Working-Class groups. This is not to

¹⁸ This conclusion depends, of course, on the representatives of our sample. What can be stated unequivocally is that every quartile on E contains some psychologically disturbed individuals. We may suspect, however, that a truly random sample of seriously disturbed individuals would show a higher average degree of ethnocentrism than is shown by the present sample, which includes, for the most part, individuals who recognize their problems as primarily psychological and who are willing to undergo psychological treatment—personality trends associated, as later chapters will show, with lack of ethnocentrism.

say that economic forces play no role in ethnocentrism, or that class membership is unimportant. However, the *average* amount of ethnocentrism in the two classes appears to be the same, to the extent that the measuring instrument is valid and the sample adequate. Moreover, there are wide variations within each class, some groups being very high in ethnocentrism, others very low. Thus, within the middle class, the service clubs are significantly more ethnocentric than the university groups. Individual and group differences in E score within each class are associated with differences in *ideology* (political, religious, and so forth) and in *personality* as shown by the chapters which follow.

C. ITEM ANALYSIS: FORMS 45 AND 40. The item means and D. P.'s for the groups taking Forms 45 and 40 are presented in Table 18(IV). While the item means for men average slightly higher than those for women, the rank orders of the individual item means and D. P.'s are similar for the two sexes. Furthermore, the wide range of the over-all item means and D. P.'s suggests that similar consistency exists among the various groups of men and women comprising the total sample. In other words, the relative level of acceptability (mean) and "goodness" (D. P.) of the items is fairly stable from group to group.

The best items in Form 45 deal with Negroes, Jews, zootsuiters, and foreigners. For the women two items, 32 (Negroes' own fault) and 40 (Jewish neighborhoods), had means of below 3.0 and D. P.'s ranking 10 and 9 respectively. Even the lowest D. P. for men and for women (3.0 in each case) is sufficient to differentiate high from low scorers with a minimum of overlap. The only item in Form 45 with a mean of over 5.0 for both men and women is number 45 (World organization). While this item discriminates very well between low and high scorers on the total scale, the low scorers are apparently less sure of themselves on the issue of national sovereignty than on the other issues; the high scorers almost uniformly rate this item +3, but the low scorers are less emphatic and more divided.

The significantly higher means for men than for women on both forms may not reflect a true sex difference since they are not based on *comparable groups* of men and women. Thus, the four highest men's groups (San Quentin, Veterans, Maritime School, Service Clubs) have no high-scoring counterparts among the women. The absence of a significant sex difference is also suggested by the very similar means obtained by comparable sex groups (see Table 17(IV) B): Working-Class, Middle-Class, and Los Angeles Men and Women. Significant differences between comparable groups of men and women might, of course, be found on various individual items; this problem has not been systematically explored.

The differences in means and D. P.'s between Forms 45 and 40 may also be less significant than they appear at first glance. That the mean D. P. is almost one point higher for both sexes on Form 40 than on Form 45 is

TABLE 18 (IV)
 MEANS AND DISCRIMINATORY POWERS OF THE E-SCALE ITEMS (FORMS 45 AND 40)

No.	Item	MEN'S GROUPS ^a (N = 969)			WOMEN'S GROUPS ^b (N = 599)								
		Form 45 (N=440)		Form 40 (N=529)	Form 45 (N=130)		Form 40 (N=469)						
		Mean	D.P.	Rank	Mean	D.P.	Rank	Mean	D.P.	Rank	D.P.		
5.	(Zootsuiters)	4.14	3.57	(7)	4.10	4.26	(5)	3.64	4.05	(4)	3.48	4.50	(4)
10.	(Negro rights)	4.57	4.58	(1)	4.25	4.92	(2)	3.93	4.91	(1)	3.96	5.21	(1)
15.	(Foreign ideas)	3.81	3.34	(9)	3.64	4.44	(3)	3.26	3.99	(5)	3.25	4.49	(5)
20.	(Negro foremen)	4.32	4.54	(2)	4.07	4.93	(1)	4.00	4.60	(2)	3.86	5.15	(2)
24.	(J. businessmen)	4.11	4.04	(4)				3.48	3.88	(6)			
28.	(Marry a Jew)	3.25	3.49	(8)				3.24	3.50	(7.5)			
32.	(Negroes live)	3.10	3.82	(5)				2.42	2.99	(10)			
36.	(Jews alike)	4.03	4.35	(3)				3.20	4.24	(3)			
40.	(Jewish Neighb.)	3.55	3.71	(6)				2.96	3.26	(9)			
45.	(World org.)	5.54	3.01	(10)	4.97	4.38	(4)	5.16	3.50	(7.5)	4.58	5.07	(3)
	Mean-per item ^c	4.04	3.84		4.20	4.59		3.53	3.89		3.83	4.88	

^aThe data were obtained from the following groups of men: San Quentin Men Prisoners (N = 110). Employment Service Men Veterans (N = 106). Maritime School Men (N = 343). California Service Club Men (N = 63). Psychiatric Clinic Men (N = 50). Middle-Class Men (N = 69). Working-Class Men (N = 61). Los Angeles Men (N = 117). The Working-Class Men and Women (N = 50) were also included here since 34 of these 50 subjects were men.

^bThe data were obtained from the following groups of women: Extension Testing Class Women (N = 59). George Washington University Women Students (N = 132). Psychiatric Clinic Women (N = 71). Middle-Class Women (N = 154). Working-Class Women (N = 53). Los Angeles Women (N = 130).

^cIn obtaining the over-all means and D.P.'s, the individual group values were not weighted by N.

due in part to the smaller number of items in Form 40 (each item therefore contributing a larger portion of the total score). It is also partly due to sampling factors: the composition of the various samples taking Form 40 was more heterogeneous, resulting in larger S. D.'s (Table 17(IV)), more extreme scorers, and thus higher D. P.'s. Both men and women had slightly lower E_A means on Form 40 than on Form 45 (4.48-4.20 for men, 4.00-3.83 for women). For reasons discussed earlier, these differences in means may be attributed mainly to sampling differences (both systematic and random) rather than to the nature of the forms themselves.

d. CORRELATIONAL ANALYSIS: FORM 45. It was possible, using the group of 517 University of California student women mentioned above, to make a correlational analysis of the E scale (Form 45).¹⁹ Only the highlights of these results need be presented here. The group was near the average of the total sample with respect to mean (3.64), S. D. (1.52), and reliability (.79 for E_A vs. E_B , .87 for odd vs. even halves). For the single items the means ranged from 2.25 for Item 32 (Negroes' own fault) to 5.00 for Item 45 (World organization), while the S. D.'s ranged from 1.77 for Item 32 to 2.47 for Item 28 (Marry a Jew). The average of the interitem correlations was .42. The lowest interitem r 's, .25 and .26, were between Item 15 (Foreign ideas) and Items 40 (Jewish neighborhoods) and 32 (Negroes' own fault), respectively. The highest r 's, .61 and .62, were between Items 24 (Jewish businessmen) and 36 (Jews alike), and between Items 10 (Negro rights) and 20 (Negro foremen), respectively. The correlations between each item and the sum of the remaining items averaged .59; the two lowest values, .43 and .46, were for Items 15 and 45, the two highest, .67 and .69, for Items 10 and 36. Six of the ten items correlated .60 or higher with the sum of the remaining ones. These results, including the rank order of goodness of items and the general level of magnitude of the correlations, are consistent with the results for the other groups. While there is a tendency for items referring to a given group to cluster somewhat, the predominant trend is toward broad internal consistency. That the consistency is incomplete is shown by the fact that the correlations are far from perfect. In terms of statistical rigor, the scale shows about the same degree of unidimensionality (consistency) as the standard intelligence tests.

e. AGE AND ETHNOCENTRISM. The total sample from which the above data were obtained was not randomly distributed with respect to age. Its members were predominantly in their twenties and thirties, a disproportionately small number being in their forties or older. It was hypothesized that younger people tend to be less conservative and less ethnocentric than their elders, and that the mean E scores for the present sample might consequently

¹⁹ We wish to express our thanks to the Social Science Research Council for the funds which made this aspect of the research possible.

be lower than for the population at large. As a partial check on this hypothesis, correlations between age and E score (Form 45) were computed for the Psychiatric Clinic Men and Women ($N = 121$). This group, despite its atypicality with respect to psychological health, appeared to be the most diverse group taking Form 45, and its E-scale results (mean, reliability, internal consistency, and correlations with other scales) were fairly representative of the total sample. Approximately 80 per cent of this group was between 18 and 40 years old, the mean (and median) being 34 years. The figures for men were very similar to those for women.

The correlation between age and E score for both men and women was .19. This value for men and women combined is significantly above zero at the 5 per cent (lowest acceptable) level of confidence. It suggests that there is a slight but consistent tendency for younger adults to be less ethnocentric than those of middle or old age. That the correlation is not likely to be higher for the general population is indicated by the fact that very high E-scale means were made by such young adult groups as the Employment Service Veterans and the Maritime School Men. The sampling bias in favor of younger age levels appears, then, to be of minor importance in our final results: the average degree of ethnocentrism found is slightly but significantly lower than would be found in a more representative sample.

3. A SUGGESTED FINAL E SCALE

The above data indicate that even the brief ten-item E scale in Form 45 can be used as a dependable measure of ethnocentrism. Whenever possible, however, it would appear advantageous to use a longer form which is likely to be more reliable and which can cover in a more systematic fashion various aspects of ethnocentric ideology. Table 19 (IV) contains a suggested final E scale of 20 items—short enough to meet most demands of practicality, yet sufficiently long to meet theoretical and statistical requirements. These items were selected, on the basis of both statistical adequacy and theoretical significance, from previous forms of the Ethnocentrism and Anti-Semitism scales. The wording of several items has been shortened and simplified. Subscales have been reinstated: six items dealing with Jews, six with Negroes, and eight with other Minorities and Patriotism.

In some cases the demands of time or administrative expediency may require that the scale be shortened or that certain items be deleted. From the experience of the present research it would appear that such changes can be made without seriously damaging the effectiveness of the scale in providing an adequate index of ethnocentrism. From a broader point of view, however, it is desirable to have further data on the internal structure of ethnocentric ideology, as revealed by the total scale, and on the social and psychological structures with which this ideology is associated.

TABLE 19 (IV)
ETHNOCENTRISM SCALE: SUGGESTED FINAL FORM

A. Jews

1. One trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they stick together and prevent other people from having a fair chance in competition.
2. I can hardly imagine myself marrying a Jew.
3. There may be a few exceptions, but in general Jews are pretty much alike.
4. The trouble with letting Jews into a nice neighborhood is that they gradually give it a typical Jewish atmosphere.
5. To end prejudice against Jews, the first step is for the Jews to try sincerely to get rid of their harmful and irritating faults.
6. There is something different and strange about Jews; it's hard to tell what they are thinking and planning, and what makes them tick.

B. Negroes

1. Negroes have their rights, but it is best to keep them in their own districts and schools and to prevent too much contact with whites.
2. It would be a mistake ever to have Negroes for foremen and leaders over whites.
3. Negro musicians may sometimes be as good as white musicians, but it is a mistake to have mixed Negro-white bands.
4. Manual labor and unskilled jobs seem to fit the Negro mentality and ability better than more skilled or responsible work.
5. The people who raise all the talk about putting Negroes on the same level as whites are mostly radical agitators trying to stir up conflicts.
6. Most Negroes would become overbearing and disagreeable if not kept in their place.

C. Other Minorities and Patriotism

1. Zootsuits prove that when people of their type have too much money and freedom, they just take advantage and cause trouble.
2. The worst danger to real Americanism during the last 50 years has come from foreign ideas and agitators.
3. Now that a new world organization is set up, America must be sure that she loses none of her independence and complete power as a sovereign nation.
4. Certain religious sects who refuse to salute the flag should be forced to conform to such a patriotic action, or else be abolished.
5. Filipinos are all right in their place, but they carry it too far when they dress lavishly and go around with white girls.
6. America may not be perfect, but the American Way has brought us about as close as human beings can get to a perfect society.
7. It is only natural and right for each person to think that his family is better than any other.
8. The best guarantee of our national security is for America to have the biggest army and navy in the world and the secret of the atom bomb.

E. VALIDATION BY CASE STUDIES: THE RESPONSES OF MACK AND LARRY ON THE E SCALE

In order to throw some light upon the validity of the E scale, we may compare the responses of Mack and Larry on the scale with their ideas about groups and group relations as brought out by the interview. The scores of these two subjects for each of the items of the E scale (Form 78), together with the group means and D. P.'s, are shown in Table 20(IV).

TABLE 20 (IV)
RESPONSES OF MACK AND LARRY ON THE E SCALE

<u>No.</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Mack</u>	<u>Larry</u>	<u>Group^a</u>	<u>Group^a</u>
				<u>Mean</u>	<u>D.P.</u>
4.	(Discrimination illegal)	5	1	3.95	1.51
7.	(Zootsuiters)	6	1	3.38	4.02
18.	(Foreign ideas)	5	1	3.17	3.26
25.	(World organization)	7	7	4.60	3.28
29.	(Negroes have rights)	6	1	3.41	4.00
34.	(Feminine positions)	3	1	2.74	2.18
37.	(Negroes lazy)	5	1	1.92	2.16
41.	(American way)	5	2	4.34	3.05
45.	(Negro foremen)	6	1	4.09	3.48
48.	(Germans and Japs)	6	1	2.50	3.08
51.	(Remove corrupt people)	5	1	3.15	2.34
54.	(Population incapable)	3	5	3.79	2.66
57.	(Radicals pro-Negro)	6	1	2.60	2.86
64.	(No Japs in California)	6	1	2.24	2.69
Over-all mean		5.3	1.8	3.29	2.90

^aThe group means and D.P.'s are based on all four groups taking Form 78.

In the analysis of Mack's interview, in Chapter II, it was shown that he exhibited in a clear-cut fashion all of the trends which, according to the present theory, are most characteristic of ethnocentrism. That he should score near the top of the high quartile on the E scale may therefore be taken as evidence of its validity. He agrees with 12 of the 14 scale items, thus presenting a picture of very general ethnocentrism. His idealization of the ingroup is as marked as his hostility toward outgroups. His rejection of Negroes, zootsuiters, and Japanese is particularly pronounced, and decidedly more extreme than his rejection of Jews. (His mean score on the five items pertaining to the former minority groups is 5.8 as compared with his mean score of 4.6 on the A-S scale.) It may be recalled that Mack's ideology con-

cerning Jews has a somewhat special quality. He wishes to make the point that Jews ought to participate more fully in American life and that they would be accepted and liked were it not for the fact that they would rather stay apart. In order to make this point, it is necessary for him to disagree with statements pertaining to the exclusion of Jews, and this lowers his mean score. It seems that he is impressed by what he conceives to be Jewish power. The interview, unfortunately, concentrating as it did upon anti-Semitism, did not explore Mack's imagery of other minority groups. It is fairly safe to assume, however, that he considers Negroes, zootsuiters, and Japanese weaker and more submerged than the Jews, and hence more suitable objects of hostility; certainly his scale responses express strong opposition to the idea of these groups participating more fully in American life.

Mack's failure to agree with Item 34 (Feminine positions) may have to do with the fact that he is engaged to be married to a school teacher; this is a matter that will be discussed more fully later on. The other item with which he disagrees, and the one on which he scores below the group mean is 54 (Population incapable); some light may be shed upon this inconsistency by considering that Item 54 is an unusually strong statement, one that includes no pseudodemocratic rationalization, and that Mack in his interview does not make extremely aggressive statements. It will be seen later that on other scales also he fails to agree with the more openly aggressive antidemocratic statements, a fact that is considered to be in keeping with the general picture of him as a potential follower rather than a potential leader in a fascist movement.

Larry's mean E-scale score of 1.8 is extremely low. This is consistent with the fact that in the interview he makes every effort to place himself squarely on the side of democratic internationalism and social equality for minorities. He disagrees strongly with 12 of the 14 scale items, his total score being raised by agreement with Items 25 (World organization) and 54 (Population incapable). Although the group mean for item 25 is high, indicating that strong sentiment in favor of national sovereignty is probably characteristic of the country as a whole, the item nevertheless discriminates very significantly between high and low scorers on the total scale. That Larry should agree strongly with the item may be due, not to concern with power as seemed to be the case with Mack, but to his conservatism and to his linking world organization with Roosevelt's economic policies, which he generally opposes. This interpretation is supported by the interview material, as will be shown later.

It is interesting that both subjects show inconsistency in the case of Item 54. Although this statement was intended to be strongly ethnocentric, the prejudiced subject disagrees with it while the unprejudiced subject agrees. This is in keeping with the fact that the item has one of the lowest D. P.'s of any in the scale. The reason might well be that some low scorers interpret the statement not in a cynical, antihuman way, imputing the incapability to

outgroups (the high scorers show clearly, in their responses to other E items, who they think are the incapable people), but rather in the sense that there are too many people in all groups who have not, because of social conditions, developed sufficiently. This explanation probably holds for Larry.

F. CONCLUSIONS: THE STRUCTURE OF ETHNOCENTRIC IDEOLOGY

On the basis of the various scale results presented above and of supporting evidence from interviews, we can now attempt to formulate a more detailed theory of ethnocentric ideology. Such a theory should indicate the generality of the ethnocentric frame of mind, should permit various patterns of surface opinions and attitudes to be viewed as alternative expressions of the same underlying point of view, and should show how the ethnocentric approach to groups and group relations differs from other approaches.

A word may first be said regarding the implications of the data presented above for such a theory. To what extent can ethnocentrism be considered a consistent, organized system of ideas? From the scale statistics the following points can be made. On an *item-by-item* basis most people are not entirely consistent in their agreement or disagreement with ethnocentric ideas. This is indicated by the correlations, about .4 on the average, between individual items. Also, inspection of the scale responses of individuals in the high and low quartiles shows that even extreme scorers vary somewhat around a generally ethnocentric or anti-ethnocentric position. Thus, to know that a person is ethnocentric in terms of total E-scale score permits only fair prediction of his stand on any single item in the scale (correlations between single items and total E scale averaging about .6).

On the other hand, there is much greater consistency on a *subscale-by-subscale* basis. The high reliability of the initial E scale and of its relatively short subscales indicates that, whatever the item-by-item fluctuation, each subscale measures a rather consistent trend. Furthermore, the correlations among the initial Negro, Minorities, Patriotism, and Anti-Semitism scales indicate that these trends are closely related, that people are notably consistent in their acceptance or rejection of *general* ethnocentrism. To attempt to measure this ideology as a totality, however, is not to deny that it has components with respect to which individuals may vary. Indeed, the assumption that each trend *is* complex underlies the formulation of subscales and the attempt to make each subscale as complex and inclusive as possible.

A person is considered ethnocentric when his total score (average agreement with items) is high enough to indicate that he has accepted most of the ideas expressed in the scale. Whenever in the text a reference is made to "generality" or "consistency," it is always on a subscale or scale basis and with a recognition of item-by-item variability. And whenever there is a reference to any specific idea in ethnocentric ideology it is understood that

most, though usually not all, ethnocentrists have this idea; that is to say, *each facet of ethnocentric ideology as here conceived is accepted by most high scorers, rejected by most low scorers.*²⁰ Ethnocentric ideology is held in its entirety by only the most extreme high scorers on the E scale. The less extreme members of the high quartile have accepted most, though not all, of the ethnocentric ideas described below. It would be erroneous, then, to regard high scorers as "all alike"; they have in common a general way of thinking about groups, but there are wide individual differences in the imagery and attitudes regarding various groups. Similar reasoning applies to the low scorers.²¹

We may now return to a consideration of the preliminary definition of ethnocentrism as an ideology concerning ingroups and outgroups and their interaction.

The term "group" is used in the widest sense to mean any set of people who constitute a psychological entity for any individual. If we regard the individual's conception of the social world as a sort of map containing various differentiated regions, then each region can be considered a group. This sociopsychological definition includes sociological groups such as nations, classes, ethnic groups, political parties, and so on. But it also includes numbers-of-people who have one or more common characteristics but who are not formal groups in the sense of showing organization and regulation of ways. Thus, it is legitimate in a sociopsychological sense to consider as groups such sets of people as criminals, intellectuals, artists, politicians, eccentrics, and so on. Psychologically, they are groups in so far as they are social categories or regions in an individual's social outlook—objects of opinions, attitudes, affect, and striving.

"Ingroup" and "outgroup" are sociopsychological rather than purely sociological concepts, since they refer to identification and, so to speak, contraidentification, rather than to formal membership in the group. A person may be identified with groups to which he does not formally belong. This is exemplified by the type of socially upward mobile person who is identified with groups of higher status and power (class, profession, political faction) than those to which he now belongs; also by the person with motivated downward mobility²² who identifies with lower status and power groups such as Negroes, Jews, "the proletariat," "the weak and suffering."

²⁰ The difference between high and low scorers is shown statistically for each item by the Discriminatory Power and the item-total scale correlations; for the subscales it is shown by the subscale-subscale and the subscale-total scale correlations.

²¹ Various patterns of "high" and "low" ideology, as found in the interview material, will be considered later, in Chapter XIX.

²² The word "motivated" is used to distinguish this type of downward mobility—which is psychologically desired and sought—from a loss of status which is externally imposed by depression or economic failure (and in which the individual usually remains identified with the higher status group). Similarly, a person may want to rise in economic status primarily because of the desire for comfort, leisure, and so on; this is psychologically different from that upward mobility in which the desire for status and power, and identification with powerful groups, are primary motivating forces.

An individual may, of course, be concerned with many groups which are neither ingroups nor outgroups for him. One may feel sympathetic towards Negroes or the Catholic Church without actually identifying with them. Conversely, one may be opposed to many groups in the sense of feeling a difference in interest or values, or merely of feeling that their aims and existence are irrelevant to him; but these are not outgroups if there is not the sense of contraidentification, of basic conflict, of mutual exclusiveness, of violation of primary values.

A primary characteristic of ethnocentric ideology is the *generality* of outgroup rejection. It is as if the ethnocentric individual feels threatened by most of the groups to which he does not have a sense of belonging; if he cannot identify, he must oppose; if a group is not "acceptable," it is "alien." The ingroup-outgroup distinction thus becomes the basis for most of his social thinking, and people are categorized primarily according to the groups to which they belong. The outgroups are usually entirely subordinate (Negroes, Mexicans), or groups with relatively low status and power who are struggling to better their position in society. The major outgroups in America today appear to be Jews, Negroes, the lower socioeconomic class, labor unions, and political radicals, especially Communists. Other groups whose outgroup status varies somewhat are Catholics, artists, intellectuals; Oklahomans and Japanese (in the West); pacifists, Filipinos, Mexicans, homosexuals. Most other nations, especially the industrially backward, the socialistic, and those most different from the "Anglo-Saxon," tend to be considered outgroups. While there are probably considerable sectional, class, and individual differences regarding which groups are regarded as outgroups, it would appear that an individual who regards a few of these groups as outgroups will tend to reject most of them. An ethnocentric individual may have a particular dislike for one group, but he is likely nonetheless to have ethnocentric opinions and attitudes regarding many other groups.

Another general characteristic of ethnocentric ideology is the *shifting* of the outgroup among various levels of social organization. Once the social context for discussion has been set, ethnocentrists are likely to find an outgroup-ingroup distinction. Thus, in a context of international relations ethnocentrism takes the form of pseudopatriotism; "we" are the best people and the best country in the world, and we should either keep out of world affairs altogether (isolationism) or we should participate—but without losing our full sovereignty, power, and economic advantage (imperialism). And in either case we should have the biggest army and navy in the world, and atom bomb monopoly.

However, the superior American "we" breaks down when the context shifts to intranational affairs. In a religious context the ingroup-outgroup distinction may shift in various ways: religious-nonreligious, Christian-Jewish, Protestant-Catholic, among Protestant sects. Similar outgroup-ingroup distinctions can be found in various other phases of American life.

It seems, then, that the individual who has a pseudopatriotic conception of America in relation to other nations actually regards most of America as an outgroup: various religions, non-whites, "the masses," too-educated people and too-uneducated people, criminals, radicals, and so on, tend largely to fall in the outgroup category. This is not to say that nonethnocentrists regard all these groups as ingroups; rather, the nonethnocentrist can take a supportive attitude without necessarily identifying, and he can be critical without a sense of alien-ness and of categorical difference.

The social world as most ethnocentrists see it is arranged like a series of concentric circles around a bull's-eye. Each circle represents an ingroup-outgroup distinction; each line serves as a barrier to exclude all outside groups from the center, and each group is in turn excluded by a slightly narrower one. A sample "map" illustrating the ever-narrowing ingroup would be the following: Whites, Americans, native-born Americans, Christians, Protestants, Californians, my family, and finally—I.

The ethnocentric "need for an outgroup" prevents that identification with humanity as a whole which is found in anti-ethnocentrism. (This lack in identification is related to the ethnocentrists' inability to approach individuals *as* individuals, and to their tendency to see and "prejudge" each individual only as a sample specimen of the reified group. Their experience of interpersonal relations involves, so to speak, the same stereotypy as their opinions regarding groups generally.) The inability to identify with humanity takes the political form of nationalism and cynicism about world government and permanent peace. It takes other forms, all based on ideas concerning the intrinsic evil (aggressiveness, laziness, power-seeking, etc.) of human nature; the idea that this evil is unchangeable is rationalized by pseudo-scientific hereditarian theories of human nature. The evil, since it is unchangeable, must be attacked, stamped out, or segregated wherever it is found, lest it contaminate the good. The democratic alternative—humanitarianism—is not a vague and abstract "love for everybody" but the ability to like and dislike, to value and oppose, *individuals* on the basis of *concrete specific experience*; it necessarily involves the elimination of the stereotypical ingroup-outgroup distinction and all that goes with it.

What is the *content* of ethnocentric ideology regarding outgroups? There are, of course, individual differences here, and the same individual has different conceptions of, and attitudes toward, different outgroups. Nevertheless, certain common trends seem to exist, and these are generally the same as those found in anti-Semitic ideology. Most essentially, outgroups are seen as *threatening* and *power-seeking*. Accusations against them tend to be moralistic and, often, mutually contradictory. One of the main characteristics of most outgroups is that they are objectively *weaker* than the groups whom they supposedly threaten. Sometimes this weakness is perceived by the ethnocentrist, but this does not seem to lessen his sense of being threatened. The conflict as he sees it is between an ingroup trying to maintain or

recapture its justly superior position, and an outgroup, resentful of past hurts, trying to do to others what they have done to it. But the conflict is seen as permanent and unresolvable; the only alternatives are dominance and submission; justice requires dominance by the superior ingroup, and the subordinate group will always remain resentful and rebellious. Because he considers hierarchy and power conflict "natural" he has difficulty in grasping a conception of group relations in which power considerations are largely eliminated and in which no group can control the lives of other groups.

The moralistic accusations against outgroups are similar to those that were seen in the case of anti-Semitism; again we find stereotypy, an absence of theories—save simple hereditarian ones—to explain why groups are as they are, and a readiness to place all the blame for group conflict upon outgroups.

The general outlook just described must, it would seem, have to do primarily with psychological trends within the ethnocentrist rather than with the actual characteristics of the outgroups. For one thing, many people who have had bad experiences with members of minority groups—and most of us have had unhappy experiences with members of most groups including ingroups—or who have heard derogatory remarks about these groups, do not have ethnocentric imagery and attitudes. It is not the experience as such that counts, but the way in which it is assimilated psychologically. Also, the prejudiced individual is prepared to reject groups with which he has never had contact; his approach to a new and strange person or culture is not one of curiosity, interest, and receptivity but rather one of doubt and rejection. The feeling of difference is transformed into a sense of threat and an attitude of hostility. The new group easily becomes an outgroup. The stereotypy, the illogicality, the large number of outgroups, the consistency of outgroup imagery—all these point to things in the psychological functioning of ethnocentrists which differentiate them from anti-ethnocentrists.

Ethnocentric ideology regarding ingroups shows similar trends, though often in an opposite direction, to that regarding outgroups. The ingroups are conceived of as superior in morality, ability, and general development; they ought also to be superior in power and status, and when their status is lowered or threatened the ethnocentrist tends to feel persecuted and victimized. Attempts by subordinate groups to improve their status are regarded as threats; he cannot imagine that they are struggling for equality and mutual interaction because he does not think in these terms. The ingroup is idealized and blindly submitted to. Obedience and loyalty are the first requirements of the ingroup member. What is called power-seeking and clannishness in the outgroup is transformed into moral righteousness, self-defense, and loyalty in the ingroup. In all other respects the ingroup is regarded as the opposite of the outgroup: clean, unaggressive, hard-working and ambitious, honest, disciplined, well-mannered. The same values, then, are applied to both ingroups and outgroups, and in the same stereotyped way.

The interaction of ingroups and outgroups, and indeed all social inter-

action, is conceived in hierarchical and authoritarian terms. Groups as well as individuals must "find their level," and the greatest danger is that certain groups will attempt to rise above their natural position. The same conceptions are applied to ingroup structure and functioning. As in the army, there should be a series of levels, and individuals on a given level should submit to those above and dominate those below. The conception of the ideal family situation for the child is similar: uncritical obedience to the father and elders, pressures directed unilaterally from above to below, inhibition of spontaneity and emphasis on conformity to externally imposed values.

We can now consider the ethnocentric solution to problems of group conflict. The ingroup must be kept pure and strong. The only methods of doing this are to *liquidate* the outgroups altogether, to keep them entirely *subordinate*, or to *segregate* them in such a way as to minimize contact with the ingroups. The first method represents politicalized ethnocentrism—fascism and the dissolution of democratic values. This method so obviously violates traditional American values of nonviolence, fairness, and equal opportunity that it has found relatively little support in this country. The second and third methods are supported, however, by large numbers of ordinary citizens.

Attitudes that the main outgroups should be subordinated and segregated are characteristic of American ethnocentrism because, it would seem, they combine so well ethnocentric imagery and sense of threat on the one hand, and certain democratic values which still prevail even in ethnocentrists, on the other. The democratic values often prevent more drastic action, but they may also serve to permit discrimination and oppression behind a pseudo-democratic front.

From these considerations the following general statement emerges. *Ethnocentrism is based on a pervasive and rigid ingroup-outgroup distinction; it involves stereotyped negative imagery and hostile attitudes regarding outgroups, stereotyped positive imagery and submissive attitudes regarding ingroups, and a hierarchical, authoritarian view of group interaction in which ingroups are rightly dominant, outgroups subordinate.*