099

ABSTRACT

SELF PERCEPTIONS AND PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED BIBLE CHARACTERS: A STUDY OF DEPRESSED PSYCHIATRIC PATIENTS

by William L. Hiemstra

The study was designed to determine possible differences in a measure of self-regard (measured by Actual Self and Ideal Self tetrachoric correlation coefficients) between normals (30), depressed patients (30), and nondepressed patients (30) in a church-related general psychiatric hospital. Ss were members of a Protestant subculture and were equated for age and education. The study also sought to determine if the groups differed in perceptions and choices of Most and Least Preferred Bible Character.

Ss ranked, in relation to psychological affinity, ten selected Bible characters, empirically derived from a preliminary project involving a different sample from the same sub-culture. They also marked an empirically derived adjective check list indicating their perceptions of Bible Character No. 1 Most Preferred, Bible Character No. 10 Least Preferred, Your Self As You See Yourself, and Your Self As You Would Like To Be.

The discrimination of depressed and nondepressed (within the hospitalized sample) was done by attending psychiatrists who gave a diagnostic evaluation of symptomatology (qualitative, quantitative, observability) on a four point scale (1 = none, 2 = little, 3 = some, 4 = much). The mean diagnostic evaluations were: depressed Ql. 3.366, Qt. 3.1, Ob. 3., and nondepressed Ql. 3.3, Qt. 3.2, Ob. 2.8.

1

As a secondary criterion for depression the $\underline{D}$ scale of the MMPI was administered to all $\underline{S}$s resulting in mean $\underline{T}$ scores: normals 50., depressed 88.3, and nondepressed 68.57.

$\underline{z}'$ transformations led to a $\underline{z}$ test of the significance of the difference between r_t's of independent samples and the $\underline{t}$ test was used to test the significance of the difference between r_t's of non-independent groups. Spearman r_s' were used to test for significant differences in choices of Most and Least Preferred Bible Character. One-tailed, .05 level of significance tests were used for accepting or rejecting the hypotheses.

Eight hypotheses were studied with the following results:

The r_t of Actual Self and Ideal Self was significantly greater for normals than depressed, confirming the findings of Rogers (1951), Chodorkoff (1954), Raymaker (1956), Chase (1956), Aspromonte (1959), and Gavales (1960). The r_t was not significantly greater for the nondepressed than for the depressed.

The r_t of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s was $.84r_t$. Normals did not differ from depressed, and the relationship was not greater for the nondepressed over depressed.

The r_t of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character was significantly greater than r_t of Actual Self and Most Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s. The difference was greater for depressed than normals and nondepressed.

The r_t of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character was significantly greater than the r_t of Ideal Self and Least Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s. The difference was greater for normals than depressed, but the difference was not greater for the nondepressed than depressed.

The r_t of Actual Self and Most Preferred Bible Character was significantly greater than r_t of Actual Self and Least Preferred Bible

Character for all $\underline{S}$s; the difference was greater for normals than depressed, and the difference was greater for nondepressed than depressed.

Depressed did not differ significantly from normals or nondepressed on r_t Actual Self and Least Preferred Bible Character.

Depressed did not differ significantly in choice of Most Preferred Bible Character from total normal or nondepressed groups. The sex variable causes a significant difference when all small groups are compared. Depression affects the specific choice of Most Preferred Bible Character, when controlling for the sex variable, even though it does not affect significantly the perception of Most Preferred Bible Character.

Distortion (there were 13 diagnosed schizophrenics in the 30 nondepressed) accounted for significant differences of nondepressed from depressed in choice of Most Preferred Bible Character.

Depressed did not differ significantly in choice of Least Preferred Bible Character from normals or nondepressed. The sex variable affected the r_s only when $\underline{N}$ was large.

The sex variable caused r_s' below level of significance on the Sums of Rank Order of all ten Bible characters.

The investigation suggests the following conclusions:

1. Depression affects a measure of self-regard in hospitalized psychiatric patients whose major symptomatology is depression.

2. Depression does not significantly affect perceptions of Ideal Self, Most Preferred Bible Character, or Least Preferred Bible Character.

3. Depression affects the choice of Most Preferred Bible Character but does not affect choice of Least Preferred Bible Character.

4. There is a measure of secondary depression in hospitalized psychiatric patients whose major symptomatology is not depression.

5. There is probable distortion in the perceptions of schizophrenic patients.

6. The sex variable is most consistently discriminating in causing significant differences in choice of Most and Least Preferred Bible Character, and in the total rank order of the ten selected Bible characters.

SELF PERCEPTIONS AND PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED BIBLE CHARACTERS: A STUDY OF DEPRESSED PSYCHIATRIC PATIENTS

By

William L. Hiemstra

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Guidance and Personnel Services

College of Education

1964

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

WILLIAM LOUIS HIEMSTRA

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Final Examination: July 23, 1964   College of Education

Thesis: Self Perceptions and Perceptions of Selected Bible Characters:
      A Study of Depressed Psychiatric Patients

Outline of Studies: Major Subject: Guidance and Personnel Services
                       Minor Subjects: Professional Education and Psychology

Biographical Items:

     Born: March 6, 1915, Clifton, New Jersey
     Undergraduate Studies: New York University, 1932-1934;
         Calvin College, 1935-1938, A. B. Degree, June, 1938;
     Graduate Studies: Westminster Theological Seminary
         (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania), 1938-1942, Th. B. Degree,
         May, 1941, Th. M. Degree, May, 1942; University of
         Mississippi, 1945-1947, M. A. Degree, June, 1947;
         Columbia University, 1948-1955; Michigan State University,
         1961-1964, Ph. D. Degree, August, 1964.

Experience:

     Pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Milton, Florida, 1943-1945;
     First Presbyterian Church, Water Valley, Mississippi, 1945-1948;
     First Reformed Church, Paterson, New Jersey, 1948-1950;
     Chaplain, Christian Sanatorium, Wyckoff, New Jersey, 1950-1957;
     Lecturer, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia,
         Pennsylvania, 1955-1957;
     Chaplain, Pine Rest Christian Hospital, Grand Rapids, Michigan,
         1957--
     Lecturer, Western Theological Seminary, Holland, Michigan,
         1958--

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

v

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The American Academy of Religion and Mental Health has called
attention to the dearth of relevant research on the relationships of
religion and mental health.

It has been assumed in connection with the Rogerian theory of
self concept that a high measure of self-regard or self-esteem is
essential to a healthy self concept and consequent mental health
(Rogers, 1951). This assumption is related to the theoretical formu-
lation of Carl Rogers (1951, p. 136) regarding the self concept which
he defines:

> The self-concept or self-structure may be thought of as an
> organized configuration of perceptions of the self which are
> admissible to awareness. It is composed of such elements
> as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities; the
> percepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and to
> the environment; the value qualities which are perceived as
> associated with experiences and objects; and goals and ideals
> which are perceived as having positive or negative valence.

Studies by Rogers (1951), Chodorkoff (1954), Raymaker (1956),
Chase (1956), Aspromonte (1959), and Gavales (1960) have shown that
psychiatric patients differ from normals in self concept. This re-
search will test if these findings apply to the population of a Protestant
religious sub-culture. In addition, this study aims to test the effect
of different self perceptions upon the perceptions of selected Bible
characters. This relationship is described as psychological affinity.

1

Purpose of the Study

The basic purpose of this study is to ascertain, within a religious sub-culture, if depressed hospitalized psychiatric patients differ in self concept from normals and nondepressed hospitalized psychiatric patients.

In addition this study seeks to discover if there are significant differences in the way in which the three groups perceive selected Bible characters.

The Need for the Study

A prerequisite to successful therapy with depressed psychiatric patients is an understanding of how these patients differ from normals and other psychiatric patients in their perceptions of self and others.

Although this study is similar to several earlier studies involving Self and Ideal Self relationships, this study is different from each in a significant way. Most of the research on self concept relationships among psychiatric patients was done in VA hospitals. This study tests psychiatric patients in a private church-related general psychiatric hospital.

With the exception of the study of Rosenzweig (1960) who studied depressed patients and normals, the other reported research studied psychotics, paranoid schizophrenics, and psychoneurotics without controlling for the effects of hospitalization. In this study newly admitted depressed patients were tested prior to receiving major chemotherapy, psychotherapy, or electro-stimulus therapy.

In Rosenzweig's study (1960) of depressed patients only a hospitalized control group was used. In this study a non-hospitalized normal control group is used as well as a hospitalized nondepressed group.

In all of the reported research cited in Chapter II only male subjects were studied in relation to measured self-regard. This study tests both male and female subjects to discover possible differences, on the basis of the sex variable, in self perceptions and in choices of selected Bible characters.

Although it has been demonstrated that personality needs determine the quality of relationship to a significant other, this relationship has not been empirically tested with regard to perceptions of selected Bible characters.

Research Hypotheses

In order to discover if depressed hospitalized psychiatric patients differ from normals and from nondepressed hospitalized psychiatric patients in self perceptions and in perceptions and choices of selected Bible characters, the following hypotheses were tested:

H_R: 1 The correlation of Actual Self and Ideal Self will be significantly greater for the normal group than for the depressed group; and within the hospitalized groups the correlation will be greater for the nondepressed than for the depressed group.

H_R: 2 There will be a positive relationship of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character for all Ss, but for the normal group this relationship will be significantly greater than for the depressed group; and within the hospitalized groups this relationship will be greater for the nondepressed than for the depressed group.

H_R: 3 The correlation of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character will be significantly greater than that of Actual Self and Most Preferred Bible Character for all Ss, but the difference will be greater for the depressed group than for the normal group; and within the hospitalized groups the difference for the depressed will be greater than that of the nondepressed group.

H_R: 4 The correlation of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character will be significantly greater than the correlation of Ideal Self and Least Preferred Bible Character for all Ss, but the difference will be greater for the normal group than for the depressed group; and within the hospitalized groups the difference will be greater for the nondepressed than for the depressed group.

H_R: 5 The correlation of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character will be greater than the correlation of Actual Self and Least Preferred Bible Character for all Ss, but the difference in correlation observations will be greater for the normal group than for the depressed group; and within the hospitalized groups the difference will be greater for the nondepressed than for the depressed group.

H_R: 6 The correlation of Actual Self and Most Preferred Bible Character will be significantly greater than the correlation of Actual Self and Least Preferred Bible Character for all Ss, but the difference will be greater for the normal group than for the depressed group; and within the hospitalized groups the difference will be greater for the nondepressed than for the depressed group.

H_R: 7 The correlation of Actual Self and Least Preferred Bible Character will be significantly greater for the depressed group than for the normal group; and within the hospitalized groups the correlation will be greater for the depressed than for the nondepressed group.

H_O: 8 There will be no significant difference in choice of Most Preferred Bible Character by the depressed group as compared with the normal group; and within the hospitalized groups there will be no significant difference in the choice made by depressed and nondepressed groups.

H_O: 9 There will be no significant difference in choice of Least Preferred Bible Character by the depressed group as compared with the normal group; and within the hospitalized groups there will be

no significant difference in the choice made by depressed and non-depressed groups.

Definition of Terms

Self perceptions describe the relationship of the empirically derived adjectival descriptions of Your Self As You See Yourself and Your Self As You Would Like To Be (see Schedules D and E of Appendix II).

Psychological affinity is used as the approximate equivalent of identification involving a dispositional attitude toward a significant other in real life. This term will be defined by the relationship between Most Preferred Bible Character (see Schedule B of Appendix II) and self perceptions. It is also used to describe the relationship between Least Preferred Bible Character (see Schedule C of Appendix II) and self perceptions.

The term Bible Characters refers to the 10 Bible Characters empirically derived (see Appendix I and Schedule A of Appendix II).

Psychiatric patients describes patients admitted between January 2 and April 30, 1964 (and who met the stated criteria for the sample) to Pine Rest Christian Hospital in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Depressed patients describes those patients whose major psychiatric symptom is depression, as determined by the judgment of the attending psychiatrist (see Schedule F of Appendix II).

Nondepressed patients describes those patients whose major psychiatric symptom is not depression, as determined by the judgment of the attending psychiatrist (see Schedule F of Appendix II).

Normals or Control Group are terms used to describe those Ss who are not hospitalized in a psychiatric hospital and who come from a similar religious sub-culture as the psychiatric Ss. They met the same criteria for sex, age, and education as do the psychiatric Ss.

Delimitations

1. This study will be limited to members of two Protestant denominations: the Christian Reformed Church and the Reformed Church in America, a Calvinistic religious sub-culture in which there is a high degree of interest in and familiarity with the Bible.

2. This study will be further limited to patients who were new admissions between January 2, 1964 and April 30, 1964 to Pine Rest Christian Hospital in Grand Rapids, Michigan, and who are members of the population described above. They were selected as they met the following criteria:

    (a) New admission, prior to major chemotherapy, psychotherapy or electro-stimulus therapy

    (b) Sex

        (1) 15 male depressed

        (2) 15 female depressed

        (3) 15 male nondepressed

        (4) 15 female nondepressed

3. This study will be limited to a normal control group of 30 (15 male and 15 female), a hospitalized depressed group of 30 (15 male and 15 female), and a hospitalized nondepressed group of 30 (15 male and 15 female) who meet the following criteria (in addition to the religious variable):

    (a) Age range 20-55 years

    (b) Education--8th grade to some college

Organization of the Thesis

The following is an outline of the thesis:

Chapter I presents an introduction to the study, purposes of the study, need of the study, research hypotheses, definition of terms,

delimitations of the study, and organization of the investigation.

Chapter II is concerned with a review of selected literature related to the problem.

Chapter III presents the methodology of the study, selection of the sample, instruments used, and analysis procedures.

Chapter IV contains the results and discussion of the investigation.

Chapter V is a summary of the study with recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Studies Related to Self Concept

Carl R. Rogers has pioneered in research on the self concept. In his article, "The Case of Mrs. Oak: A Research Analysis" (Rogers, 1951, pp. 47-165), he shows that changes occur in the relationship between the perceived and ideal self at different stages of therapy.

The research of Rogers and Dymond (1954) indicates that their client group applying for therapy showed a mean initial self-ideal r of -.01, while the control subjects who volunteered to take a part in research on personality showed a significantly different initial mean self-ideal r of +.58. The self-ideal r's were obtained through use of the Butler and Haigh Q sort.

Chodorkoff (1954) in research designed to test the theoretical formulations regarding Rogers' self concept found confirmation for the hypothesis that the greater the correspondence between the perceived self and the ideal self, the more adequate was the individual's personal adjustment.

Raymaker (1956) has also confirmed the hypothesis that discrepancy between self concept and ideal self concept is associated with adjustment. He found that persons who tend to show wide discrepancies between the way they see themselves and the way they like to be, seem to be characterized by feelings of self-dissatisfaction and tend to be maladjusted.

Sarbin and Rosenburgh (1955) found that normal, volunteer student Ss and student Ss who had been diagnosed as neurotic and

8

recommended for therapy showed significant differences in Self-Acceptance and in a Self-Criticality Index derived from Gough's Adjective Check List. The neurotic subjects were less self-accepting and more self-critical (Wylie, 1961, p. 205).

Tolor (1957) compared hospitalized neuropsychiatric patients and hospitalized medical patients. He concluded that "Emotionally disturbed patients appear to have a far less adequate self-concept in terms of self-differentiation and group identification than do normals."

In a study involving two groups Tamkin (1957) found that schizophrenic Ss had significantly lower self-acceptance scores on the Scott-Duke Questionnaire than did non-patient Ss (Wylie, 1961, p. 209).

In another study involving two groups Arthur H. Rogers (1958) found that paranoid schizophrenics had a significantly higher self ideal-self congruence than the normal group.

Ibelle challenges the results of much of the cited research which tested the Rogerian theory of the self concept. On the basis of his research on "Discrepancies Between Self-Concept and Ideal Self-Concepts in Paranoid Schizophrenics and Normals," Ibelle concludes (1960, p. 79):

> 1. with at least one well-defined group (paranoid schizophrenics), discrepancy between self and ideal "Q" sorts will not give an adequate reading on the state of a person's psychological health.

> 2. . . . the use of the self-ideal discrepancy as a sole and definitive indicator of an individual's need for psychological or psychiatric help is not warranted.

> 3. . . . the magnitude of the discrepancy between the self-reported self-concept and ideal self-concept may be an excellent gauge of the state of an individual's self-system.

The three studies last mentioned illustrate conflictual findings in testing schizophrenics in relation to a measure of self-regard.

This type of differing results is also seen in the research involving a comparison of three groups, to be reviewed subsequently.

In the research of Fagan and Guthrie (1959, p. 207), a conclusion is made that "schizophrenics differ most, not in their conception of the average other, but in their perception of themselves."

Aspromonte (1959), using Pearson product-moment correlations found that degree of illness in schizophrenia is positively related to the amount of self-distortion.

In the study of Worchel and Hillson (1958) it was observed that the mean self concept of the criminal is relatively favorable and significantly superior to that of the normal person. However, the mean self vs. ideal discrepancy in the criminal is significantly smaller than in the normal person.

Gavales (1960) reports that his research on "Relationships Between Self-Portrayal and Psychopathology" indicate that accuracy in self-portrayal is related to psychological health and distortion in the self-picture is associated with psychopathology.

Using 15 scales of Osgood's Semantic Differential Rosenzweig (1960) observed that 40 male depressed patients rated themselves lower on the evaluative factor than did normals.

In the following investigations an adjusted group was compared with two or more maladjusted groups:

Friedman (1955) found no significant difference in self-ideal correlations of paranoid schizophrenic and normal Ss (although schizophrenic Ss' r's were somewhat lower than those of normal subjects). Neurotic Ss gave self-ideal correlations significantly lower than either the schizophrenic or normal groups (Wylie, 1961, p. 211).

Chase (1956) found that psychotics in general and paranoid schizophrenics in particular had a significantly lower correlation between their self concept and ideal self concept than a group of normals.

Zuckerman, Baer, and Monashkin (1956) found that patients were less self-accepting than normals, but within the patient group there was no relation between adjustment and self-acceptance (Wylie, 1961, p. 211).

Corrie (1958) found significant differences between three groups (hospitalized schizophrenic, hospitalized psychoneurotic, and hospitalized tubercular non-psychiatric patients). Corrie also made a comparison of groups by means of t tests. These indicated schizophrenics to be more self-accepting than neurotics or normals and neurotics to be less self-accepting than normals.

Studies Related to Perception of Others

Thompson and Nishimura (1952, p. 310) found that "in monosex friendships, each person regards the other of the pair as conforming to his own ideal."

Fiedler, Warrington, and Blaisdell conclude (1952, p. 795): "We perceive those we like to be more similar to ourselves than those we dislike." They believe the results of their research (idem) "strongly suggest a relationship between the way individuals feel about others and how they perceive them."

Stock (1949) has shown that there is a definite relationship between the way one feels about one's self and one's attitudes towards others. He found that an individual who holds negative feelings about himself, also holds negative feelings about others.

Omwake's (1954, p. 446) more recent research supports Stock's results:

> The results support the hypothesis in that there is marked relationship between the way an individual sees himself and the way he sees others; those who accept themselves tend to be acceptant of others and to perceive others as accepting themselves; those who reject themselves hold a correspondingly low opinion of others and perceive others as being self-rejectant.

Mullen (1958, p. 90) found that within a non-psychiatric population, the depressed person does not project himself in such a way that he perceives those he does not like as more similar to himself than the person who is not depressed.

Chang and Block (1960) found that "the higher the degree of correspondence between one's ego ideal and one's parent, the greater the identification with that parent."

The research studies cited have dealt essentially with the process of identification or psychological affinity. The research of this study investigates the relationship between the conscious perception of a significant other (Most Preferred Bible Character) and the conscious perception of ideal self. In this study psychological affinity or identification is viewed as a construct involving projection and introjection.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Selection of the Sample

A. Subjects

The $\underline{S}$s for this study were drawn from members of two Protestant denominations: the Christian Reformed Church and the Reformed Church in America. These churches represent a religious sub-culture in which there is a high degree of interest in and familiarity with the Bible.

B. Hospitalized Sample

A sample of 60 hospitalized psychiatric patients who are members of the population described above was selected as they met the following criteria:

    (a) New admission, prior to major chemotherapy, electro-
           stimulus therapy or psychotherapy
    (b) Age range, 20-55
    (c) Education, 8th grade-some college
    (d) 30 Depressed (15 male + 15 female)
    (e) 30 Nondepressed (15 male + 15 female)
        (1) Diagnosis of depressed or nondepressed to be made by
             psychiatrist assigned to patient (see Appendix III).

C. Normal or Control Group Sample

A sample of 30 non-hospitalized subjects was selected (15 male + 15 female) from the normal population described above. This sample was the Couples Fellowship Club of the Grace Reformed Church and the Fellowship Club of the Riverside Christian Reformed Church of

Grand Rapids, Michigan. These organizations are <u>not</u> primarily oriented to Bible Study (since this research project is not related to degree of theological knowledge) in order to acquire a sample truly representative of the sub-culture population.

D. <u>Equating of Variables</u>

In addition to being equated on the variable of religious affiliation, the sample of the Normal Control Group was equated for the following (similar to hospital patients):

(a) Age range, 20-55
(b) Education, 8th grade-some college
(c) Sex, 15 male and 15 female

<u>Table 1</u> provides statistical data regarding ages of all <u>Ss</u>. <u>Table 2</u> provides statistical data regarding education for all <u>Ss</u>.

<u>Instruments Used</u>

1. This research study involved a preliminary project in order to develop empirically an adjective check list of 70 adjectives (see Appendix II, Schedules B, C, D. E). This adjective check list was developed in the following manner:

(a) Fifty adjectives were added to the 70 adjectives of an adjective check list developed by Block of the University of California. (The latter is described on p. 154 of Block, J. <u>The Q-sort Method in Personality Assessment and Psychiatric Research</u>. Springfield Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1961).

(b) The next step in the procedure of developing the adjective check list used in this study was to submit the list of 120 adjectives to three professional judges (clinical psychologist, counseling psychologist, pastoral counselor) with instructions to place the 120 adjectives into the following behavioral categories:

Table 1. Ages in Years for All Ss

	Normals	Depressed Patients	Nondepressed Patients
Men			
N	15	15	15
X̄	33.06	41.73	33.333
Sd	7.005	10.244	9.524
R	26 - 49	23 - 55	20 - 49
Women			
N	15	15	15
X̄	31.866	34.466	29.466
Sd	7.02	5.917	9.703
R	23 - 45	24 - 44	20 - 53
Totals: Men and Women			
N	30	30	30
X̄	32.47	38.1	31.4
Sd	6.917	9.011	9.648
R	23 - 49	23 - 55	20 - 53

Table 2. Education in Years for All S̲s

	Normals	Depressed Patients	Nondepressed Patients
Men			
N̲	15	15	15
X̄	12.73	11	10.866
Sd	1.165	2.725	2.07
R	11 - 14	8 - 16	8 - 14
Women			
N̲	15	15	15
X̄	12.266	11.2	12.53
Sd	3.723	1.254	1.363
R	8 - 16	8 - 12	10 - 16
Totals: Men and Women			
N̲	30	30	30
X̄	12.5	11.1	11.7
Sd	1.408	2.09	1.915
R	8 - 16	8 - 16	8 - 16

1. Dominant - Insensitive
2. Submissive - Dependent
3. Impulsive
4. Complaintive
5. Competent
6. Courageous
7. Sociable
8. Gracious
9. Vigorous
10. Depressive

(c) Those adjectives on which 2 of 3 or 3 of 3 professional judges agreed, regarding each as being properly related to each category were submitted to 6 lay judges (volunteer clerk - stenographers from the normal population) with the request that each exclude any adjective not belonging to the category.

(d) Adjectives were accepted as belonging in the category if 6 of 6, 5 of 6 or 4 of 6 lay judges agreed. In order to reduce the number of adjectives to 7 for each of the 10 categories, random elimination was used on those adjectives on which there was 4-2 agreement.

(e) The professional and lay judges also evaluated each of the 70 adjectives as "generally regarded as favorable" or "generally regarded as unfavorable." This allowed for categories with adjectival clusters to be regarded as generally positive or negative in character.

(f) The 70 adjectives were used as the adjective check list in the main research (see Appendix II) as well as the instrument providing 10 series of 7 adjectival descriptions related to categories used in the second phase of the preliminary project.

2. A second phase of the preliminary project was to submit 50 names of Bible characters with the 10 category personality descriptions containing 7 adjectives each to a sample of 68 persons (33 male + 35

female) from the same population to be sampled in the main research
(Sample form is given in Appendix I). The selected Ss were asked to
place one name beside each cluster of adjectival descriptions.
A frequency table was prepared; the Bible character receiving the
highest score was selected to be related to the category matching the
adjectival description. In the case of one tie, a coin was tossed to
eliminate the tie. As a result of the second phase of the preliminary
project the following Bible characters were matched with the ten cate-
gories in preparation for the main research.

Category	Bible Character
1. Dominant - Insensitive	Jezebel
2. Submissive - Dependent	Mary (Mother of Jesus)
3. Impulsive	Peter
4. Complaintive - Critical	Cain
5. Competent - Able	Daniel
6. Courageous - Brave	David
7. Sociable	Mary of Bethany
8. Gracious	Ruth
9. Vigorous	Paul
10. Depressive	Moses

Main Research

1. A face sheet containing an introduction, blanks for personal
data, and instructions in use of code was read and presented to each S
(see Appendix II).

2. The ten Bible characters produced by the second phase of
the preliminary project were ranked by all Ss according to psycho-
logical affinity. The following instructions were given (see Appendix II,
Schedule A): Please rank the following Bible characters in answer to
this question: "If it were possible, with which Bible characters would
you feel comfortable enough to have them visit in your home?" Rank
your choice from 1 - 10, from most desired to least desired, according
to your dominant feeling.

3. The adjective check list (obtained from the preliminary project and now in the main research in alphabetical order) with the caption, BIBLE CHARACTER No. 1 MOST PREFERRED was distributed to all S̲s̲ with the following instructions (see Appendix II, Schedule B):

"For the most preferred Bible character which you have just selected, please describe this MOST preferred character by using the adjective check list to be distributed. Simply follow this procedure: In front of those adjectives which you feel DO apply, mark a 1̲ (one); and mark 0̲ (zero) those adjectives which you feel do NOT describe this MOST PREFERRED Bible character. Please respond according to your dominant feeling."

4. The adjective check list (with similar instructions) with the heading BIBLE CHARACTER NO. 10 LEAST PREFERRED was distributed to all S̲s̲ (see Appendix II, Schedule C).

5. With appropriate similar instructions, S̲s̲ were asked to mark appropriately the adjective check list with the caption, YOUR SELF AS YOU SEE YOURSELF (see Appendix II, Schedule D).

6. With appropriate similar instructions, S̲s̲ were asked to mark appropriately the adjective check list with the caption, YOUR SELF AS YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE (see Appendix II, Schedule E).

7. Test Administrator's Responses to Resistances.

In anticipation that some S̲s̲ would be resistive to the forced choice technique of the scoring of 1 and 0 on the adjective check list, the following uniform responses were given to S̲s̲' resistances to the forced choice technique:

1st order response to resistance:

"I realize the task is a forced choice technique, but answer the items according to your dominant feeling."

2nd order response to resistance:

"Yes, I can appreciate the many distinctions or feelings one may have, but answer the items according to your dominant feeling."

8. The D (Depression) Scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory was administered to all Ss as a secondary criterion (see Appendix IV).

Table 3 provides statistical data regarding T scores on the D scale of the MMPI for all Ss.

9. As a primary criterion for the determination of depression or nondepression among the hospitalized patients, attending psychiatrists completed a diagnostic evaluation form (see Appendix III) within 48 hours after this was submitted to them. These forms were distributed to the psychiatrists immediately following the testing of each S.

Table 4 provides statistical data regarding diagnostic evaluations of depressed patients.

Table 5 provides statistical data regarding diagnostic evaluations of nondepressed patients.

Table 6 provides statistical data regarding a subanalysis of diagnostic evaluations of nondepressed patients.

Analysis Procedures

Inasmuch as Ss marked the adjective check list 1 or 0 in describing Most Preferred Bible Character, Least Preferred Bible Character, Your Self As You See Yourself and Your Self As You Would Like To Be (see Appendix II, Schedules B, C, D, E) the tetrachoric correlation coefficient (r_t) was computed according to the formula

$$k = \frac{bc}{ad} \quad \text{or} \quad k = \frac{ad}{bc}$$

Table 3. $\underline{T}$ Scores on the $\underline{D}$ Scale of the MMPI for All $\underline{S}$s

	Normals	Depressed Patients	Nondepressed Patients
		Men	
N	15	15	15
X̄	50.93	85.93	73.266
Sd	9.323	16.482	20.43
R	36 - 65	58 - 116	53 - 108
		Women	
N	15	15	15
X̄	49.13	90.66	63.866
Sd	5.392	6.71	14.407
R	42 - 59	80 - 100	32 - 84
		Totals: Men and Women	
N	30	30	30
X̄	50.	88.3	68.57
Sd	7.543	12.595	18.01
R	36 - 65	58 - 116	32 - 108

Table 4. Psychiatrists' Diagnostic Evaluations of Depressed Patients

Code	Psychiatrist	Diagnostic Scale of Depression			MMPI D Scale $\overline{T}$ Scores
		Ql.	Qt.	Ob.	
Men N = 15					
200	M. B.	4	3	3	89
201	S. B.	4	4	4	72
206	K. K.	3	3	2	80
210	R. B.	3	2	2	77
211	R. B.	3	3	2	58
213	S. B.	3	3	3	75
215	S. B.	3	4	4	116
216	K. K.	4	3	4	82
217	S. B.	3	3	3	82
218	S. B.	4	3	2	89
219	M. B.	3	3	3	108
224	M. B.	3	2	2	87
226	R. B.	3	3	3	108
227	M. B.	3	3	2	65
229	M. B.	4	3	3	101
	Totals	50	45	42	1289
	$\overline{X}$	3.33	3.	2.8	85.93
Women N = 15					
300	S. B.	3	3	3	88
302	R. B.	3	2	3	84
303	S. B.	3	3	3	84
306	R. B.	4	4	4	98
308	R. B.	3	3	3	98
317	R. B.	3	3	2	92
322	R. B.	4	3	3	100
323	R. B.	3	3	3	92
325	S. B.	3	3	3	96
326	K. K.	3	3	2	94
327	R. B.	4	4	4	88
330	F. W.	4	4	4	98
334	R. B.	4	3	4	88
336	S. B.	3	3	3	80
341	R. B.	4	4	4	80
	Totals	51	48	48	1360
	$\overline{X}$	3.4	3.2	3.2	90.66
N = 30	Totals	101	93	90	2649
	$\overline{X}$	3.366	3.1	3.	88.3

Legend: Ql. = Qualitative; Qt. = Quantitative; Ob. = Observability.
1 = None; 2 = Little; 3 = Some; 4 = Much.

Table 5. Psychiatrists' Diagnostic Evaluations of Nondepressed Patients

| Code | Psychiatrist | Diagnosis | Diagnostic Scale | | | MMPI D Scale |
			Ql.	Qt.	Ob.	T Score
		Men N = 15				
202	R. B.	Schizophrenia	4	4	3	63
203	S. B.	Anxiety	4	4	4	77
204	S. B.	Schizophrenia	4	4	4	108
205	F. W.	Adj. Reaction	2	2	1	53
207	R. B.	Soc. Personality	3	2	2	65
208	R. B.	Schizophrenia	4	4	4	60
209	R. B.	Schizophrenia	3	3	4	58
212	M. B.	Schizophrenia	3	3	3	99
214	F. W.	Adj. Reaction	3	3	3	104
221	R. B.	Schizophrenia	3	3	4	72
222	R. B.	Org. Br. Dam.	2	3	3	63
223	F. W.	Soc. Personality	3	3	1	34
225	M. B.	Schizophrenia	2	3	3	84
228	R. B.	Schizophrenia	4	3	2	89
230	M. B.	Schizophrenia	3	2	2	70
		Totals	47	46	43	1099
		X̄	3.133	3.06	2.866	73.266
		Women N = 15				
307	R. B.	Pers. Trait Dist.	3	3	2	67
310	S. B.	Adj. Reaction	3	3	2	65
314	S. B.	Adj. Reaction	3	3	3	65
316	F. W.	Manic	4	4	4	32
319	K. K.	Pers. Trait Dist.	4	3	3	53
320	S. B.	Adj. Reaction	3	2	2	51
324	R. B.	Hysteria	3	3	2	76
331	S. B.	Schizophrenia	4	4	4	84
332	R. B.	Schizophrenia	4	4	3	84
338	F. W.	Schizophrenia	4	4	4	63
343	K. K.	Pers. Trait Dist.	3	3	2	84
348	R. B.	Pers. Pattern Dist.	4	3	2	67
351	S. B.	Schizophrenia	4	4	2	53
352	R. B.	Hypomanic	4	4	4	59
354	S. B.	Pers. Trait Dist.	2	3	2	55
		Totals	52	50	41	958
		X̄	3.466	3.333	2.733	63.866
N = 30		Totals	99	96	84	2057
		X̄	3.3	3.2	2.8	68.57

Legend: Ql. = Qualitative; Gt. = Quantitative; Ob. = Observability.
1 = None; 2 = Little; 3 = Some; 4 = Much.

Table 6. Subanalysis of Psychiatrists' Diagnostic Evaluations of
Nondepressed Patients

Psychiatrist	MMPI D Scale T Score	Qualitative	Psychiatrist's Diagnosis Quantitative	Observability
Schizophrenia N = 13				
S. B.	84	4	4	4
R. B.	84	4	4	3
F. W.	63	4	4	4
S. B.	53	4	4	2
R. B.	63	4	4	3
S. B.	108	4	4	4
R. B.	60	4	4	4
R. B.	58	3	3	4
M. B.	99	3	3	3
R. B.	72	3	3	4
M. B.	84	2	3	3
R. B.	89	4	3	2
M. B.	70	3	2	2
Totals	987	46	45	42
X̄	75.92	3.538	3.46	3.23
Personality Trait Disturbance N = 4				
R. B.	67	3	3	2
K. K.	53	4	3	3
K. K.	84	3	3	2
S. B.	55	2	3	2
Totals	259	12	12	9
X̄	64.75	3	3	2.25
Adjustment Reaction N = 5				
S. B.	65	3	3	2
S. B.	65	3	3	3
S. B.	51	3	2	2
F. W.	53	2	2	1
F. W.	104	3	3	3
Totals	338	14	13	11
X̄	67.6	2.8	2.6	2.2

Legend: 1 = None; 2 = Little; 3 = Some; 4 = Much.

Table 6 - Continued

Psychiatrist	MMPI D Scale T Score	Psychiatrist's Diagnosis		
		Qualitative	Quantitative	Observability
Sociopathic Personality N = 2				
R. B.	65	3	2	2
F. W.	34	3	3	1
Totals	99	6	5	3
X̄	49.5	3	2.5	1.5
Manic N = 2				
F. W.	32	4	4	4
R. B.	59	4	4	4
Totals	91	8	8	8
X̄	45.5	4	4	4
Diagnosis -- Others N = 4				
Hysteria	76	3	3	2
Pers. Pattern Dist.	67	4	3	2
Anxiety	77	4	4	4
Org. Br. Damage	63	2	3	3
Totals	283	13	13	11
X̄	70.75	3.25	3.25	2.75

Summary

N	Diagnosis				
13	Schizophrenia	987	46	45	42
4	Per. Trait Dist	259	12	12	9
5	Adj. Reaction	338	14	13	11
2	Soc. Personality	99	6	5	3
2	Manic	91	8	8	8
4	Others	283	13	13	11
30	Totals	2057	99	96	84
	X̄	68.566	3.3	3.2	2.8

dependent on which was the larger (Edwards, 1960, p. 192). A sample scoring sheet is given in Appendix V.

As a base for additional statistical computations, a series of six tetrachoric correlation coefficients was computed for all Ss from the four adjective check lists.

Table 7 shows the r_t of Actual Self and Ideal Self.

Table 7. Tetrachoric Correlation Coefficients of Actual Self and Ideal Self

	Normal Group N = 30	Depressed Group N = 30	Nondepressed Group N = 30	Hospitalized Groups N = 60	All Ss N = 90
Men (N = 15)	$.75r_t$	$.34r_t$	$.52r_t$	$.43r_t$	
Women (N = 15)	$.69r_t$	$.08r_t$	$.53r_t$	$.31r_t$	
Men and Women (N = 30)	$.72r_t$	$.21r_t$	$.53r_t$	$.37r_t$	$.50r_t$

Table 8 shows the r_t of Most Preferred Bible Character and Ideal Self.

Table 8. Tetrachoric Correlation Coefficients of Most Preferred Bible Character and Ideal Self

	Normal Group N = 30	Depressed Group N = 30	Nondepressed Group N = 30	Hospitalized Groups N = 60	All Ss N = 90
Men (N = 15)	$.84r_t$	$.83r_t$	$.77r_t$	$.80r_t$	
Women (N = 15)	$.91r_t$	$.88r_t$	$.82r_t$	$.85r_t$	
Men and Women (N = 30)	$.88r_t$	$.85r_t$	$.79r_t$	$.83r_t$	$.84r_t$

Table 9 shows the r_t of Most Preferred Bible Character and Actual Self.

Table 9. Tetrachoric Correlation Coefficients of Most Preferred Bible Character and Actual Self

	Normal Group N = 30	Depressed Group N = 30	Nondepressed Group N = 30	Hospitalized Groups N = 60	All Ss N = 90
Men (N = 15)	.64r_t	.22r_t	.47r_t	.34r_t	
Women (N = 15)	.64r_t	.15r_t	.57r_t	.37r_t	
Men and Women (N = 30)	.64r_t	.18r_t	.52r_t	.36r_t	.46r_t

Table 10 shows the r_t of Least Preferred Bible Character and Ideal Self.

Table 10. Tetrachoric Correlation Coefficients of Least Preferred Bible Character and Ideal Self

	Normal Group N = 30	Depressed Group N = 30	Nondepressed Group N = 30	Hospitalized Groups N = 60	All Ss N = 90
Men (N = 15)	-.26r_t	-.39r_t	-.20r_t	-.30r_t	
Women (N = 15)	-.60r_t	-.51r_t	-.47r_t	-.49r_t	
Men and Women (N = 30)	-.44r_t	-.45r_t	-.34r_t	-.40r_t	-.41r_t

Table 11 shows the r_t of Least Preferred Bible Character and Actual Self.

Table 11. Tetrachoric Correlation Coefficients of Least Preferred Bible
Character and Actual Self

	Normal Group N = 30	Depressed Group N = 30	Nondepressed Group N = 30	Hospitalized Groups N = 60	All Ss N = 90
Men (N = 15)	-.13r_t	-.01r_t	-.13r_t	-.06r_t	
Women (N = 15)	-.37r_t	-.31r_t	-.29r_t	-.30r_t	
Men and Women (N = 30)	-.25r_t	-.16r_t	-.21r_t	-.18r_t	-.20r_t

Table 12 shows the r_t of Most Preferred and Least Preferred Bible
Character.

Table 12. Tetrachoric Correlation Coefficients of Most Preferred and
Least Preferred Bible Characters

	Normal Group N = 30	Depressed Group N = 30	Nondepressed Group N = 30	Hospitalized Groups N = 60	All Ss N = 90
Men (N = 15)	-.11r_t	-.34r_t	-.31r_t	-.33r_t	
Women (N = 15)	-.59r_t	-.58r_t	-.49r_t	-.54r_t	
Men and Women (N = 30)	-.37r_t	-.47r_t	-.40r_t	-.44r_t	-.41r_t

In connection with the testing of hypotheses $H_R:1$, $H_R:2$, $H_R:7$ in
which the groups were independent, the significance of the difference
between two correlation coefficients was determined by the use of the
$\underline{z}$ test which necessitated the $\underline{z}'$ transformation (Edwards, 1960, pp.
305-307).

A table constructed by F. P. Kilpatrick and D. A. Buchanan (Edwards, 1960, p. 503) was used to obtain $\underline{z}'$ values for r_t.

The standard error of the difference between two independent values of $\underline{z}'$ is given by

$$\sigma_{z_1' - z_2'} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1 - 3} + \frac{1}{n_2 - 3}}$$

The observed difference between the two $\underline{z}'$ values was divided by the standard error of the difference in order to obtain a normal deviate to be evaluated by reference to the table of the normal curve.

The formula used in testing these hypotheses, which were one-tailed tests of significance, is given by (Edwards, 1960, p. 306).

$$z = \frac{z_1' - z_2'}{\sigma_{z_1' - z_2'}}$$

The hypotheses $H_R:3$, $H_R:4$, and $H_R:6$, involve non-independent samples. Therefore a test developed by Harold Hotelling (Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 11, 271-283) was used. This test is non-directional. This test of significance for $\underline{r}$ differences of related samples is given by (Peatman, 1963, p. 309)

$$t = \frac{(r_{2g} - r_{1g}) \sqrt{(n-3)(1 + r_{1,2})}}{\sqrt{2(1 - r_{1g}^2 - r_{2g}^2 - r_{1,2}^2 + 2(r_{1g})(r_{2g})(r_{1,2})}}$$

Observations were made of the values of correlation coefficients at .05 level of significance in connection with $H_R:5$.

In connection with the analysis of $H_O:8$ and $H_O:9$, the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used (Siegel, 1956, pp. 202-212). The formula is given by

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^{N} d^2}{N^3 - N}$$

When a considerable number of ties were present, the formula used in computing r_s is given by

$$r_s = \frac{\Sigma x^2 + \Sigma y^2 - \Sigma d^2}{2\sqrt{\Sigma x^2 \ \Sigma y^2}}$$

where $\qquad T = \dfrac{t^3 - t}{12} \qquad\qquad$ and

$$\Sigma x^2 = \frac{N^3 - N}{12} - \Sigma T_x \qquad\qquad \text{and}$$

$$\Sigma y^2 = \frac{N^3 - N}{12} - \Sigma T_y$$

The critical values of r_s were obtained from Table P of Siegel (p. 284).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research data was subjected to statistical analysis according to the prescribed hypotheses with the following results:

H_R: 1 (a) the correlation of Actual Self and Ideal Self will be greater for the normal group than for the depressed group; and

(b) within the hospitalized groups the correlation will be greater for the nondepressed than for the depressed group.

The following z scores relate to hypothesis number one:

Table 13. z Scores on the Correlation of Actual Self and Ideal Self

			z
H_R:	ρ Normal	$> \rho$ Depressed	2.56*
H_R:	ρ Nondepressed	$> \rho$ Depressed	1.386
	Subanalyses		
H_R:	ρ Normal	$> \rho$ Nondepressed	1.17
H_R:	ρ Normal	$> \rho$ Hospitalized	1.534
H_R:	ρ Normal men	$> \rho$ Depressed men	1.517
H_R:	ρ Normal women	$> \rho$ Depressed women	1.882*
H_R:	ρ Nondepressed men	$> \rho$ Depressed men	.544
H_R:	ρ Nondepressed women	$> \rho$ Depressed women	1.25
H_R:	ρ Normal men	$> \rho$ Nondepressed men	.973
H_R:	ρ Normal women	$> \rho$ Nondepressed women	.632
H_R:	ρ Normal men	$> \rho$ Hospitalized men	1.478
H_R:	ρ Normal women	$> \rho$ Hospitalized women	1.518

$a = .05$ $z_{.95} = 1.645$

*Statistically significant at .05 level, one-tailed.

31

Inspection of results of testing hypothesis number one indicates there is a statistically significant difference in a measure of self-regard between the normal group and the depressed group (z 2.56). These results corroborate the findings of Rogers (1951), Chodorkoff (1954), Raymaker (1956), Chase (1956), Aspromonte (1959), and Gavales (1960).

In the subanalyses it is indicated that there is a greater disparity between Your Self As You See Yourself and Your Self As You Would Like To Be among the depressed women vs. normal (z 1.882) than among the depressed men vs. normal (z 1.517). The examination of psychiatrists' diagnostic evaluations and T scores of the MMPI D scale indicate that there is a greater measure of depression present among the depressed women sample (see Table 4). The mean for the depressed women on the diagnostic scale is Ql. 3.4, Qt. 3.2, Ob. 3.2 whereas that for depressed men is Ql. 3.33, Qt. 3., Ob. 2.8. The mean T score for the depressed women on the D scale of the MMPI is 90.66 whereas that for the depressed men is 85.93.

In connection with H_R: 1 (b) it is to be noted that p nondepressed > p depressed produced a z of 1.386 which is significant at .10 level but not at the .05 level. It would appear that there is an element of depression in hospitalized psychiatric patients whose primary symptomatology is not depression according to psychiatric diagnosis. This assumption is supported by the fact that on the D scale of the MMPI, a secondary criterion, the mean T score for the nondepressed group is 68.57. The mean T score for nondepressed women is 63.866, and the mean T score for nondepressed men is 73.266 (see Table 5). These findings confirm the report of Gottlieb and Tourney (1959) that secondary depressive symptoms are extremely common in schizophrenic patients.

H_R: 2 (a) There will be a positive relationship of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character for all Ss,

(b) but for the normal group this relationship will be

greater than for the depressed group;

(c) and within the hospitalized groups this relationship

will be greater for the nondepressed than for the

depressed group.

The following $\underline{z}$ scores relate to hypothesis number two.

Table 14. $\underline{z}$ Scores on the Correlation of Ideal Self and Most Preferred
Bible Character

			$\underline{z}$
H_R:	ρ Normal	$> \rho$ Depressed	.44
H_R:	ρ Nondepressed	$> \rho$ Depressed-not confirmed, by inspection $.79r_t$ is not $> .85\ r_t$	
		Subanalyses	
H_R:	ρ Normal	$> \rho$ Nondepressed	1.12
H_R:	ρ Normal	$> \rho$ Hospitalized	.803
H_R:	ρ Normal men	$> \rho$ Depressed men	.08
H_R:	ρ Normal women	$> \rho$ Depressed women	.372
H_R:	ρ Normal men	$> \rho$ Nondepressed men	.492
H_R:	ρ Normal women	$> \rho$ Nondepressed women	.909
H_R:	ρ Normal men	$> \rho$ Hospitalized men	.352
H_R:	ρ Normal women	$> \rho$ Hospitalized women	.784

$\alpha = .05$ $\underline{z}_{.95} = 1.645$

Inspection of the results obtained from testing hypothesis number
two show that there is a high positive correlation $(.84r_t)$ of Ideal Self
adjectival descriptions and Most Preferred Bible Character adjectival
descriptions for all $\underline{Ss}$. The lower measure of self-regard character-
izing the depressed group (see Table 13) does not appear to affect

significantly their perceptions of Ideal Self or Most Preferred Bible Character since the result of testing H_R: ρ normal > ρ depressed is $\underline{z}$ .44.

The fact that the result of testing H_R: 2 (c) is inverse from that predicted (.79r_t is not > .85r_t) suggests the possibility of distortion in the nondepressed group. This conjecture is supported by the fact that there were 13 patients in the nondepressed group who were diagnosed as schizophrenic (see Table 6). This evaluation is supported by the results of Aspromonte (1959) who found that the degree of illness in schizophrenia is positively related to the amount of self distortion and distortion in perceptions of others. In addition, see Walters (1964, p. 29).

H_R: 3 (a) The correlation of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character will be significantly greater than that of Actual Self and Most Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s,

(b) but the difference will be greater for the depressed group than for the normal group;

(c) and within the hospitalized groups the difference for the depressed will be greater than that of the non-depressed group.

The following $\underline{t}$ scores relate to hypothesis number three.

Table 15. $\underline{t}$ Scores on the Difference Between the Correlation of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character from that of Actual Self and Most Preferred Bible Character

Group	Obtained $\underline{t}$	$\underline{df}$	Sig. $\underline{t}$
All	6.554*	87	1.66
Hospitalized	5.135*	57	1.67
Depressed	4.713*	27	1.70
Nondepressed	2.406*	27	1.70
Normal	3.50*	27	1.70

*Statistically significant at .05 level, one-tailed.

Inspection of the results obtained from testing hypothesis number three indicate the predicted distance in correlations of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character from the correlations of Actual Self and Most Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s ($\underline{t}$ 6.554).

The fact that the difference was greater for the depressed group ($\underline{t}$ 4.713) than for the normal group ($\underline{t}$ 3.50) indicates the effect of the lower measure of self-regard among depressed patients (see H_R:1).

Although the score for the nondepressed group is statistically significant ($\underline{t}$ 2.406), the fact that the difference is less than that of the normal group ($\underline{t}$ 3.50) would indicate some measure of distortion as previously discussed in the discussion of the results of testing H_R:2.

H_R: 4 (a) The correlation of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character will be significantly greater than the correlation of Ideal Self and Least Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s,

(b) but the difference will be greater for the normal group than for the depressed group;

(c) and within the hospitalized groups the difference will be greater for the nondepressed than for the depressed group.

The following $\underline{t}$ scores relate to hypothesis number four:

Table 16. $\underline{t}$ Scores on the Difference Between the Correlation of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character from that of Ideal Self and Least Preferred Bible Character

Group	Obtained $\underline{t}$	df	Sig. t
All	12.91*	87	1.66
Hospitalized	9.835*	57	1.67
Depressed	7.521*	27	1.70
Nondepressed	5.729*	27	1.70
Normal	9.034*	27	1.70

*Statistically significant at .05 level, one-tailed.

Inspection of the results obtained from testing hypothesis number four shows the predicted difference in correlations of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character from the correlations of Ideal Self and Least Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s ($\underline{t}$ 12.91).

The significantly different measure of self-regard by the depressed group affects their perception of the Least Preferred Bible Character to some degree so that there is an expected difference between the $\underline{t}$ scores of the depressed group ($\underline{t}$ 7.521) from that of the normal group ($\underline{t}$ 9.034).

Distortion (as previously discussed) could account for the fact that the score for the nondepressed group is lower ($\underline{t}$ 5.729) than that for the depressed group ($\underline{t}$ 7.521).

H_R: 5 The correlation of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character will be greater than the correlation of Actual Self and Least Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s, but the difference in correlation observations will be greater for the normal group than for the depressed group; and within the hospitalized groups the difference will be greater for the nondepressed than for the depressed group.

The following observations are made in relation to hypothesis number five.

Table 17. Tetrachoric Correlation Coefficients of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character and that of Actual Self and Least Preferred Bible Character

N	Group	Ideal Self and Most Preferred	Actual Self and Least Preferred
90	All	.84r_t*	-.20r_t*
60	Hospitalized	.83r_t*	-.18r_t
30	Depressed	.85r_t*	-.16r_t
30	Nondepressed	.79r_t*	-.21r_t
30	Normal	.88r_t*	-.25r_t

*Statistically significant at .05 level, one-tailed.

The r_t of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s indicates that these are greater than the r_t of Actual Self and Least Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s. Observations also show that the r_t for the normal group is greater than that for the depressed group. However the r_t of the nondepressed group is not greater than that of the depressed group as was hypothesized.

Values of Correlation Coefficient at .05 level of significance.

df	P = .05, one-tailed
88	.171
58	.210
28	.306
28	.306
28	.306

H_R: 6 (a) The correlation of Actual Self and Most Preferred Bible Character will be significantly greater than the correlation of Actual Self and Least Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s,

(b) but the difference will be greater for the normal group than for the depressed group;

(c) and within the hospitalized groups the difference will be greater for the nondepressed than for the depressed group.

The following $\underline{t}$ scores relate to hypothesis number six.

Table 18. $\underline{t}$ Scores on the Difference Between the Correlation of Actual
Self and Most Preferred Bible Character from that of Actual
Self and Least Preferred Bible Character

Group	Obtained $\underline{t}$	$\underline{df}$	Sig. $\underline{t}$
All	4.13*	87	1.66
Hospitalized	2.477*	57	1.67
Depressed	1.052	27	1.70
Nondepressed	2.654*	27	1.70
Normal	3.637*	27	1.70

*Statistically significant at .05 level, one-tailed.

Inspection of the results obtained from testing hypothesis number
six shows that H_R: 6 (a), (b), and (c) can be accepted at the 95% level
of confidence.

The results also indicate that the adjective check list, Your Self
As You See Yourself (Actual Self), affords the best measure of dis-
crimination between the depressed and normal groups. This is sup-
ported by the observation that the $\underline{t}$ score for the depressed group is
1.052 which is below the significance level for the $\underline{t}$ test for non-
independent groups ($\underline{df}$ 27 = 1.70).

The $\underline{t}$ score for the nondepressed group (2.654) shows that this
group is in fact different from both the depressed group ($\underline{t}$ 1.052) and
the normal group ($\underline{t}$ 3.637).

H_R: 7 (a) The correlation of Actual Self and Least Preferred
Bible Character will be significantly greater for the
depressed group than for the normal group;

(b) and within the hospitalized groups the correlation will
be greater for the depressed than for the nondepressed
group.

The following $\underline{z}$ scores relate to hypothesis number seven:

Table 19. $\underline{z}$ Scores on the Correlation of Actual Self and Least Preferred Bible Character

			$\underline{z}$
H_R:	ρ Depressed	$> \rho$ Normal	.346
H_R:	ρ Depressed	$> \rho$ Nondepressed	.191
		Subanalyses	
H_R:	ρ Nondepressed	$> \rho$ Normal	.154
H_R:	ρ Hospitalized	$> \rho$ Normal	.312

$\alpha = .05$ $\underline{z}_{.95} = 1.645$

Inspection of the results obtained from testing hypothesis number seven show that even though the depressed group and the normal group differ significantly in measure of stated self-regard (see results of H_R:1) they do not differ significantly in perceptions of Least Preferred Bible Character. These findings are to be related to the results of testing H_O:9 in which the two groups do not differ significantly in choice of Least Preferred Bible Character.

The depressed group does not differ significantly from the non-depressed group in perceptions of Least Preferred Bible Character.

H_O: 8 was stated.

(a) There will be no significant difference in choice of Most Preferred Bible Character by the depressed group as compared with the normal group; and

(b) within the hospitalized groups there will be no significant difference in the choice made by the depressed and non-depressed groups.

The null hypothesis of hypotheses number eight (a) and (b) was accepted on the basis of testing, using the Spearman Rank Order

Correlation Coefficient test of statistical analysis.

Table 20 presents a Frequency Table (absolute check) of the specific choices of Most Preferred Bible Character for all Ss as supplementary information.

Table 21 gives the r_s for various groups.

Inspection of the results obtained from testing hypothesis number eight (see Table 21) indicate that there is no significant difference in choice of Most Preferred Bible Character by the depressed and normal groups ($.79r_s$) and for depressed and nondepressed groups ($.834r_s$). However, significant differences appear in the subanalyses.

The sex variable seems to cause a significant difference when all small groups are compared (see Table 21). Only when the N is increased to 90 by correlating the choice of All men ($N = 45$) and All women ($N = 45$) is there no significant difference ($.602r_s$). The same is true for the correlation of All hospitalized men ($N = 30$) and All hospitalized women ($N = 30$) producing $.722r_s$. It would appear that with the increase of N from different groups, choices cancel one another.

Depression affects the specific choice of Most Preferred Bible Character even though it does not affect the perception of the Most Preferred Bible Character (see H_R:2 and Table 14). The following correlations support the previous statement: Normal men and Depressed men $= .513r_s$ and Normal women and Depressed women $= .569r_s$.

Distortion plus depression would account for the significantly lower correlations regarding choice of Most Preferred Bible Character: Depressed men and Nondepressed men $= .431r_s$ and Depressed women and Nondepressed women $= .245r_s$.

H_O: 9 was stated:

(a) There will be no significant difference in choice of Least Preferred Bible Character by the depressed group as compared with the normal group; and

Table 20. Frequency Table: Choice of Most Preferred Bible Character (Absolute Check)

41

| | Totals | | | | | | | | | | | | Grand Totals | | |
	N M	N W	D M	D W	ND M	ND W	H M	H W	N M&W	D M&W	ND M&W	H M&W	All M	All W	All S'
Jezebel															
Mary (mother of Jesus)	1	4	4	7	4	5	8	12	5	11	9	20	9	16	25
Peter	5	1	2	2	3		5	2	6	4	3	7	10	3	13
Cain					1	1	1	1			2	2	1	1	2
Daniel	1		1	1		1	1	2	1	2	1	3	2	2	4
David	1		2		3	1	5	1	1	2	4	6	6	1	7
Mary of Bethany		1	1	1		1	1	2	1	2	1	3	1	3	4
Ruth	2	4	2	1		4	2	5	6	3	4	7	4	9	13
Paul	4	3	3	3	4	1	7	4	7	6	5	11	11	7	18
Moses	1	2				1		1	3		1	1	1	3	4
Totals	15	15	15	15	15	15	30	30	30	30	30	60	45	45	90

Legend:

Code		Description
N	=	Normal
M	=	Men
W	=	Women
D	=	Depressed
ND	=	Nondepressed
H	=	Hospitalized

Table 21. Spearmen Rank Order Correlation Coefficients: Choice of Most Preferred Bible Character

	N M	N W	N M&W	D M	D W	D M&W	ND M	H M	All Men
Normal Men(NM)									
Norman Women (NW)	$.521r_s$*								
Normal M&W (NM&W)									
Depressed Men (DM)	$.513r_s$*								
Depressed Women (DW)		$.569r_s$		$.341r_s$*					
Depressed Men & Women (DMW)			$.79r_s$						
Nondepressed Men (NDM)	$.474r_s$*			$.431r_s$*					
Nondepressed Women (NDW)		$.76r_s$			$.245r_s$*				
Nondepressed Men & Women (NDM&W)			$.668r_s$			$.834r_s$	$.125r_s$*		
Hospitalized Men (HM)	$.607r_s$								
Hospitalized Women (HW)		$.794r_s$							
Hospitalized Men and Women (HM&W)			$.78r_s$						
All Women (AW)									
All Men (AM)								$.722r_s$	$.602r_s$

N = 10; .05 level; one-tailed significant at .564; * = <u>Below Significance level.</u>

(b) within the hospitalized groups there will be no significant difference in the choice made by depressed and nondepressed groups.

The null hypothesis of hypothesis number nine (a) and (b) was accepted on the basis of testing, using the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient test of statistical analysis.

Table 22 presents a Frequency Table (absolute check) of the specific choice of Least Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s as supplementary information.

Table 23 gives the r_s for various groups.

Inspection of the results obtained from testing hypothesis number nine (see Table 23) indicate that there are no significant differences in choice of Least Preferred Bible Character for the Depressed and Normal groups ($.792r_s$) and for Depressed and Nondepressed groups ($.697r_s$).

The sex variable seems to affect the correlation when it is large ($\underline{N}$ = 90 or $\underline{N}$ = 60) but not when it is small ($\underline{N}$ = 30). Two correlations which approach the one-tailed significance level of .564 for $\underline{N}$ = 10 are: All men and All women = $.576r_s$ and All hospitalized men and All hospitalized women = $.578r_s$.

In the small group comparisons, controlling for the sex variable, only that of Depressed men and Nondepressed men is below the level of significance indicating a significant difference in choice ($.504r_s$).

Several factors may account for differences in the subanalyses of H_O: 8 and H_O: 9 (see Tables 21 and 23). The ten empirically derived Bible Characters which were to be ranked (see Appendix I and Schedule A of Appendix II) contained two strongly negative Bible Characters, "Jezebel" and "Cain, " so that there was not as much choice as was afforded for the Most Preferred Bible Character (see Table 22 - Frequency Table of Choices of Least Preferred Bible Character).

Table 22. Frequency Table: Choice of Least Preferred Bible Character (Absolute Check)

	N M	N W	D M	D W	ND M	ND W	H M	H W	N M&W	D M&W	ND M&W	H M&W	All M	All W	All S's
Jezebel	7	9	6	10	6	6	12	16	16	16	12	28	19	25	44
Mary (mother of Jesus)					1	1	1	1			2	2	1	1	2
Peter															
Cain	8	6	7	5	7	7	14	12	14	12	14	26	22	18	40
Daniel					1		1				1	1	1		1
David						1		1			1	1		1	1
Mary of Bethany			1				1			1		1	1		1
Ruth			1				1			1		1	1		1
Paul															
Moses															
Totals	15	15	15	15	15	15	30	30	30	30	30	60	45	45	90

Legend:

Code		Description
N	=	Normal
M	=	Men
W	=	Women
D	=	Depressed
ND	=	Nondepressed
H	=	Hospitalized

Table 23. Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients: Choice of Least Preferred Bible Character

	N M	N W	N M&W	D M	D W	D M&W	ND M	H M	All Men
Normal Men (NM)									
Normal Women (NW)	.975r_s								
Norman M&W (NM&W)									
Depressed Men (DM)	.792r_s								
Depressed Women (DW)		1.0r_s		.773r_s					
Depressed M&W (DM&W)			.792r_s						
Nondepressed Men (NDM)	.792r_s			.504r_s*					
Nondepressed W (NDW)		.773r_s			.773r_s		.752r_s		
Nondepressed M&W (NDM&W)			.731r_s			.697r_s			
Hospitalized Men (HM)	.747r_s								
Hospitalized Women (HW)		.792r_s						.578r_s	
Hospitalized M&W (HM&W)			.73r_s						
All Women (AW)									.576r_s
All Men (AM)									

N = 10; .05 level; one-tailed significant at .564; * = Below significance level.

In addition, the descriptive perceptions of the Least Preferred
Bible Character did not differ significantly among the three groups
(see Table 19).

In order to obtain additional data regarding the preference choices
of Bible Characters by the three groups, a Sums of Rank Order of
Ranked Bible Characters was prepared, using the Spearman Rank Order
Correlation Coefficient (r_s). The results are given in Table 24.

Inspection of the data in Table 24 shows that the sex variable is
significant in causing correlations below the significance level of
$.564r_s$ (.05 level, one-tailed) for all r_s where the rank order of male
Ss is compared with the rank order of female Ss. It is progressively
more true in regard to choice of Least Preferred Bible Character,
Most Preferred Bible Character, and the Sums of Rank Order that the
sex variable causes significant differences in choice.

Inasmuch as depression and distortion do cause differences in
choice of Most Preferred Bible Character, but do not do so in the
choice of Least Preferred Bible Character (and less so in the Sums of
Rank Order), it may be concluded that the selection of Most Preferred
Bible Character was most expressive of unique personality needs.
In the process of test administration it was noted that considerable
time and thought was given by each S to the selection of the Most Pre-
ferred Bible Character. Another factor in test administration which
may lend support to the highly discriminating function of Most Preferred
Bible Character is the fact that the adjective check list descriptive
of the Most Preferred Bible Character was given as the first in the
series of four.

Table 24. Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients: Sums of Rank Order for Preference of 10 Selected Bible Characters

	N M	N W	N M&W	D M	D W	D M&W	ND M	H M	All Men
Normal Men (NM)									
Normal Women (NW)	$.258r_s$*								
Normal Men & Women (NM&W)									
Depressed Men (DM)	$.891r_s$								
Depressed Women (DW)		$.912r_s$		$.358r_s$*					
Depressed Men & Women (DM&W)			$.875r_s$						
Nondepressed Men (NDM)	$.891r_s$			$.891r_s$					
Nondepressed Women (NDW)		$.761r_s$			$.77r_s$		$.564r_s$*		
Nondepressed M&W (NDM&W)			$.881r_s$			$.843r_s$			
Hospitalized Men (HM)	$.903r_s$							$.552r_s$*	
Hospitalized Women (HW)		$.833r_s$							
Hospitalized M&W (HM&W)			$.90r_s$						
All Women (AW)									$.334r_s$*
All Men (AM)									

N = 10; .05 level; one-tailed significant at .564; * = <u>Below</u> significance level.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

In this investigation an attempt was made to discover possible differences, on the basis of the Rogerian theory of the self concept, in a measure of self-regard (as measured by Actual Self and Ideal Self tetrachoric correlation coefficients) between normals, depressed patients, and nondepressed patients in a church-related general psychiatric hospital. The study also investigated if the three groups differed in perceptions and choices of Most Preferred Bible Character and Least Preferred Bible Character. Ss ranked ten selected Bible Characters (empirically derived from a preliminary project) in relation to psychological affinity.

The population used for this study was the membership of two Protestant denominations: the Christian Reformed Church and the Reformed Church in America. These churches represent a religious sub-culture in which there is a high degree of interest in and familiarity with the Bible.

A sample of 30 normal Ss (15 men and 15 women) was obtained from two Fellowship Clubs which were representative of the sub-culture population. Ss were selected from Fellowship Clubs because these groups are not primarily oriented to Bible study and this research was not related to the degree of theological knowledge possessed by the Ss. The normal Ss were equated for Age (20-55 years) and Education (8th grade - some college).

A sample of 60 psychiatric patients was selected from the newly admitted patients at Pine Rest Christian Hospital in Grand Rapids,

Michigan, who were similarly equated for Age and Education. Of this 60, 30 were depressed and 30 were nondepressed according to the diagnostic evaluation of the attending psychiatrist. Within each category there was an equal number of men and women.

As a secondary criterion all $\underline{S}$s were administered the $\underline{D}$ scale of the MMPI.

In a preliminary project an adjective check list of 70 adjectives was developed empirically from a revision of Block (1961, p. 154). A second phase of the preliminary project, using the "Guess Who?" technique, produced 10 selected Bible characters which were matched with the 10 category personality descriptions, each containing 7 adjectives.

In the main research all $\underline{S}$s ranked the 10 selected Bible Characters, from Most Preferred to Least Preferred, according to psychological affinity. $\underline{S}$s also marked, $\underline{1}$ and $\underline{0}$, the adjective check list in relation to perceptions of Bible Character No. 1 Most Preferred, Bible Character No. 10 Least Preferred, Your Self As You See Your Self, and Your Self As You Would Like To Be.

As a base for additional statistical computations, a series of six tetrachoric correlation coefficients was computed for all $\underline{S}$s from the four scored adjective check lists.

One-tailed tests with .05 level of significance were used as the level of significance for accepting or rejecting the hypotheses.

The $\underline{z}$ test was used to test the significance of the difference between two correlation coefficients in hypotheses involving independent groups. The $\underline{t}$ test was used to test the significance of the difference between two correlation coefficients in hypotheses involving non-independent groups. Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients were used to test for significant differences in choices of Most Preferred Bible Character and Least Preferred Bible Character.

Tables were used to indicate results and subanalyses were presented to provide supplementary information.

Eight hypotheses were subjected to statistical analysis with the following results:

The correlation of Actual Self and Ideal Self was greater for the normal group than for the depressed group ($\underline{z}$ 2.56) confirming the findings of Rogers (1951), Chodorkoff (1954), Raymaker (1956), Chase (1956), Aspromonte (1959), and Gavales (1960). However the correlation of Actual Self and Ideal Self was not significantly greater for the non-depressed group than for the depressed group ($\underline{z}$ 1.386).

There was a positive correlation of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s (.84r_t) but this relationship was not significantly greater for the normal group than for the depressed group ($\underline{z}$ .44), and the relationship was not greater for the nondepressed (.79r_t) than for the depressed group (.85r_t).

The correlation of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character was significantly greater than that of Actual Self and Most Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s ($\underline{t}$ 6.554). The difference was greater for the depressed group ($\underline{t}$ 4.713) than for the normal group ($\underline{t}$ 3.5C); and the difference was greater for the depressed group ($\underline{t}$ 4.713) than for the nondepressed group ($\underline{t}$ 2.406).

The correlation of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character was significantly greater than the correlation of Ideal Self and Least Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s ($\underline{t}$ 12.91); and the difference was greater for the normal group ($\underline{t}$ 9.034) than for the depressed group ($\underline{t}$ 7.521); but the difference was not greater for the nondepressed group ($\underline{t}$ 5.729) than for the depressed group ($\underline{t}$ 7.521).

The r_t of Ideal Self and Most Preferred Bible Character (.84r_t) for all $\underline{S}$s was greater than the r_t of Actual Self and Least Preferred Bible Character (-.20r_t) for all $\underline{S}$s. Observations also show that the

r_t of the normal group (.88r_t I.S. and M.P. and -.25r_t A. S. and L. P.) is greater than that for the depressed group (.85r_t I.S. and M.P. and -.16r_t A. S. and L. P.). However, the r_t of the nondepressed group (.79r_t I.S. and M.P. and -.21r_t A. S. and L.P.) is not greater than that of the depressed group as was hypothesized.

The correlation of Actual Self and Most Preferred Bible Character was significantly greater than the correlation of Actual Self and Least Preferred Bible Character for all $\underline{S}$s ($\underline{t}$ 4.13); and the difference was greater for the normal ($\underline{t}$ 3.637) than for the depressed group ($\underline{t}$ 1.052). The difference was greater for the nondepressed group ($\underline{t}$ 2.654) than for the depressed group ($\underline{t}$ 1.052).

The correlation of Actual Self and Least Preferred Bible Character was not significantly greater for the depressed group than for the normal group ($\underline{z}$ .346); and the correlation was not significantly greater for the depressed group than for the nondepressed group ($\underline{z}$ .191).

There was no significant difference in choice of Most Preferred Bible Character for the depressed and normal groups (.79r_s) and for the depressed and nondepressed groups (.834r_s). The sex variable causes a significant difference when all small groups are compared (see Table 21).

Depression affects the specific choice of Most Preferred Bible Character even though it does not affect significantly the perception of the Most Preferred Bible Character (compare Tables 14 and 21). The following correlations (r_s) on choice of Most Preferred Bible Character support the previous statement: Normal men and Depressed men = .513r_s and Normal women and Depressed women = .569r_s.

Distortion plus some depression would account for the following significantly lower correlations in choice of Most Preferred Bible Character: Depressed men and Nondepressed men = .431r_s and Depressed women and Nondepressed women = .245r_s.

There were no significant differences in choice of Least Preferred Bible Character for the depressed and normal groups ($.792r_s$), and for depressed and nondepressed groups ($.697r_s$). The sex variable affected the correlation when $\underline{N}$ was large, but not when it was small (see Table 23). Two correlations which are greater than the one-tailed, .05 significance level of $.564r_s$ for $\underline{N}$ = 10 are: All men and All women = $.576r_s$ and All hospitalized men and All hospitalized women = $.578r_s$.

In the small group comparisons, controlling for the sex variable, only that of Depressed men and Nondepressed men was below the level of significance, indicating a significant difference in choice of Least Preferred Bible Character ($.504r_s$).

The sex variable was significant in causing correlations below the significance level of $.564r_s$ on the Sums of Rank Order (see Table 24).

Recommendations for Further Research

1. A replication of this study could be done, achieving greater homogeneity in the nondepressed group by confining the sample to diagnosed Schizophrenics who score below 60 ($\underline{T}$ score) on the $\underline{D}$ scale of the MMPI in order to measure possible distortion in isolation from secondary depression.

2. A replication of this study could be done using the MMPI $\underline{D}$ scale as a primary criterion rather than psychiatrist's evaluation. This would also make possible a test of the significance of degree of depression as it affects self perceptions and perceptions of selected Bible characters.

3. A replication of this study could be performed using the statistical technique of Block's (1961) $\underline{Q}$-sort in order to determine the strength of the tetrachoric correlation coefficient (r_t) in discriminating between normals' and depressives' self perceptions and perceptions of selected Bible characters.

4. A comparative study could be made of theological students and persons without specialized theological training to determine if education affects self perceptions and perceptions of selected Bible characters.

5. A replication of this study could be done in a general Protestant population to ascertain if the sub-culture population of this study differs significantly.

6. A replication of this study could be made using the population of the Calvinistic Protestant religious sub-culture of the Netherlands in order to test for the effect of geographical and cultural environment in relation to self perceptions and perceptions of selected Bible characters.

7. A similar study could be made in various religious sub-cultures such as Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Hebrew, and Unitarian-Universalist, in order to discover if the variable of religious affiliation is significant in causing differences in self perceptions and perceptions of selected Bible characters.

In some of the suggested further research (especially in 7) it would be necessary to have separate preliminary projects for the development of an adjective check list and selected Bible characters.

REFERENCES

1. Aspromonte, A. Distortion of the self and others in schizophrenia.
   Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1959.

2. Block, J. An unprofitable application of the semantic differential.
   J. consult. Psychol., 1958, 22, 235-236.

3. Block, J. The Q-sort method in personality assessment and psy-
   chiatric research. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1961.

4. Chang, Judy, and Block, J. A study of identification in male homo-
   sexuals. J. consult. Psychol., 1960, 24, 307-310.

5. Chase, P. H. Concepts of self and concepts of others in adjusted
   and maladjusted hospital patients. Unpublished doctoral dissertation,
   Univer. of Colorado, 1956.

6. Chase, P. H. Self concepts in adjusted and maladjusted hospital
   patients. J. consult. Psychol., 1957, 21, 495-497.

7. Chodorkoff, B. Adjustment and the discrepancy between the per-
   ceived and ideal self. J. clin. Psychol., 1954, 10, 266-268.

8. Corrie, C. Aspiration, self acceptance, and acceptance of others
   in normal and neuropsychiatric groups. Unpublished doctoral disser-
   tation, The Florida State University, 1958.

9. Edwards, A. L. Statistical methods for the behavioral sciences.
   New York: Rinehart, 1960.

10. Fagan, M. J., and Guthrie, E. R. Perceptions of self and of
    normality in schizophrenics. J. clin. Psychol., 1959, 15, 203-207.

11. Fiedler, F. E., Warrington, W. C., and Blaisdell, F. J.
    Unconscious attitudes as correlates of sociometric choice in a
    social group. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1952, 47, 790-796.

12. Friedman, I. Phenomenal, ideal, and projected conceptions of self. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1955, 51, 611-615.

13. Gavales, D. Relationships between self-portrayal and psychopathology. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Univ. of Houston, 1960.

14. Gottlieb, J., and Tourney, G. The depressive illnesses: their diagnosis and treatment. J. chronic Diseases, 1959, 9, 234-248.

15. Ibelle, B. P., Discrepancies between self-concepts and ideal self-concepts in paranoid schizophrenics and normals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut, 1960.

16. Mullen, Esther. An investigation of some aspects of depression and its effect on the perception of the self and others in a non-psychiatric population. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1958.

17. Omwake, K. T. The relationship between acceptance of self and acceptance of others as shown by three personality inventories. J. consult. Psychol., 1954, 18, 443-446.

18. Peatman, J. G. Introduction to applied statistics. New York: Harper, 1963.

19. Raymaker, H., Jr. Relationships between the self-concept, self-ideal concept and maladjustment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1956.

20. Rogers, A. H. The self concept in paranoid schizophrenia. J. clin. Psychol., 1958, 14, 365-366.

21. Rogers, C. R. Client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951. (a)

22. Rogers, C. R. The case of Mrs. Oak: a research analysis. Psychol. Serv. Bull., 1951, 3, 47-165. (b)

23. Rogers, C. R., and Dymond, Rosalind F. (Eds.) Psychotherapy and personality change. Chicago: Univer. of Chicago Press, 1954.

24. Rosenzweig, S. The effects of failure and success on evaluation of self and others: a study of depressed patients and normals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1960.

25. Sarbin, T. R., and Rosenberg, B. G. Contributions to role-taking theory: IV. A method for obtaining a qualitative estimate of the self. J. soc. Psychol., 1955, 42, 71-81.

26. Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

27. Stock, D. An investigation into the interrelations between the self concept and feeling directed towards other persons and groups. J. consult. Psychol., 1949, 13, 176-180.

28. Tamkin, A. S. Selective recall in schizophrenia and its relation to ego strength. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1957, 55, 344-349.

29. Thompson, W. R., and Nishimura, Rhoda. Some determinants of friendship. J. Pers., 1952, 20, 305-314.

30. Tolor, A. Self-perceptions of neuropsychiatric patients on the W-A-Y Test. J. clin. Psychol., 1957, 13, 403-406.

31. Walters, O. S. Religion and psychopathology. Compr. Psychiat., 1964, 5, 29.

32. Worchel, P., and Hillson, J. S. The self-concept in the criminal: an exploration of Adlerian theory. J. Indiv. Psychol., 1958, 14 173-181.

33. Wylie, Ruth C. The self concept (A critical survey of pertinent research literature). Lincoln: Univer. of Nebraska Press, 1961.

34. Zuckerman, M., Baer, M., and Monashkin, I. Acceptance of self, parents, and people in patients and normals. J. clin. Psychol., 1956, 12, 327-332.

APPENDIX I

INSTRUMENT USED IN PRELIMINARY PROJECT

INSTRUCTIONS

The task you are asked to perform is part of a preliminary study which is being made prior to a major research project.

1. Please complete the following information, using appropriate (✔) check marks. DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME

AGE: _____ years

SEX: _____ Male _____Female

MARITAL STATUS: _____ Married, _____Single,

_____ Widow, _____Widower.

OCCUPATION: _____

CHURCH AFFILIATION: _____ Chr. Ref. _____ Ref.

_____ Prot. Ref._____ Other

EDUCATION: _____ Last grade attended.

2. On the sheet, "Guess Who" - place one name from the attached listing of Bible Characters which you believe best matches each separate description. Do not use a name more than once.

GUESS WHO?

Instructions: First read each separate cluster of adjectives, second, examine the complete listing of Bible characters which appear at the left, then place the ONE name which you believe best matches each description. Repeat for each cluster of adjectives.

Bible Characters	Description	
Joshua		
Hagar		
Peter		
Aaron		
Thomas	assertive-dominant, bossy, overly-confident, austere, dogmatic, insensitive, tyrannical.	_____
Elizabeth		
Joseph (Husband of Mary)		
Abel	submissive, dependent, obedient, quiet, agreeable, timid-meek, subdued.	_____
Naomi		
Sarah		
Jonah		
Esther	impulsive, hasty, hurried, impetuous, impatient, changeable, tactless.	_____
Abraham		
Samson		
Jonathan		
Delilah	critical, dissatisfied, whining, bitter, envious, resentful, touchy-irritable.	_____
Moses		
Absalom		
Samaritan woman		
Judas Iscariot	able, adequate, confident, intelligent, precise, self-assured (poised), sensible (level-headed).	_____
Andrew		
Mary (mother of Jesus)		
Ruth		
Barnabas	brave, daring, dauntless, determined, fearless, heroic, valiant.	_____
Leah		
John the Baptist		
Cain		
Rebekah	sociable, congenial, friendly, warm, affable, cooperative, cordial.	_____
Job		
Daniel		
Rahab		
Lot	considerate, kindly, pleasant, sincere, gentle, relaxed, sympathetic.	_____
David		
Jezebel		
Pontius Pilate		
Hannah	active, vigorous, energetic, forceful, intense, lively, industrious.	_____
Paul		

Mary of Bethany
Elijah
Miriam
Deborah
Queen of Sheba
Esau
Mary Magdalene
Jacob
Martha
Herodias
Eve
John (apostle)
Rachel

unhappy, worried (anxious), pessimistic, withdrawn (introverted), defensive (self-excusing), uninterested (indifferent), slow in speech and movement.

APPENDIX II

INSTRUMENTS USED IN MAIN RESEARCH

Code No._____

Introduction

I am asking your participation in this project in order to help solve some problems related to pastoral counseling. Your participation will be very beneficial to pastoral counselors.

This study is not concerned in any way with knowing your individual name. I am therefore assigning a coded number to each person. Please do not write your name on any sheet of paper given to you, but be sure to put the assigned number at the top right-hand corner of each sheet which is marked Code No._____.

We also are using this procedure because we need your free and honest participation. There are no right and wrong answers. Your answers to the items depend upon your personal feelings, and not upon how you think others would answer the items.

Now--are there any questions before we begin?

PERSONAL DATA

Please complete the following information. DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME!

AGE: _____ years

SEX: _____ Male _____ Female

MARITAL STATUS: _____ Married _____ Single _____ Widow

_____ Widower _____ Separated or Divorced

OCCUPATION: _____

CHURCH AFFILIATION: _____ Chr. Ref. _____ Ref.

_____ Prot. Ref. _____ Other

EDUCATION: _____ Last grade attended

Schedule A   Code No._____

RANKING OF BIBLE CHARACTERS

Instructions

Please rank the following Bible characters in answer to this question:
"IF IT WERE POSSIBLE, WITH WHICH BIBLE CHARACTER
WOULD YOU FEEL COMFORTABLE ENOUGH TO HAVE THEM VISIT
IN YOUR HOME?"

Rank your choice from 1 to 10, from most desired to least desired,
according to your dominant feeling.

Bible Characters		Rank Order
Jezebel	David	1.
Mary (mother of Jesus)	Mary of Bethany	2.
Peter	Ruth	3.
Cain	Paul	4.
Daniel	Moses	5.
		6.
		7.
		8.
		9.
		10.

Schedule B

BIBLE CHARACTER NO. 1 MOST PREFERRED

Instructions

For the MOST preferred Bible character which you have just selected, please describe this MOST preferred character by using the adjective check list to be distributed. Simply follow this procedure: In front of those adjectives which you feel DO apply, mark a 1 (one); and mark 0 (zero) those adjectives which you feel do NOT describe this MOST Preferred Bible character. Please respond according to your dominant feeling.

Schedule B   Code No._____

BIBLE CHARACTER <u>NO. 1</u> <u>MOST PREFERRED</u>
                                    Name of Character

_____ able		_____ impulsive
_____ active		_____ industrious
_____ adequate		_____ insensitive
_____ affable		_____ intelligent
_____ agreeable		_____ intense
_____ assertive, dominant		_____ kindly
_____ austere		_____ lively
_____ bitter		_____ obedient
_____ bossy		_____ overly-confident
_____ brave		_____ pessimistic
_____ changeable		_____ pleasant
_____ confident		_____ precise
_____ congenial		_____ quiet
_____ considerate		_____ relaxed
_____ cooperative		_____ resentful
_____ cordial		_____ self-assured, poised
_____ critical		_____ sensible, level-headed
_____ daring		_____ sincere
_____ dauntless		_____ slow in speech and movement
_____ defensive-self-excusing		_____ sociable
_____ dependent		_____ subdued
_____ determined		_____ submissive
_____ dissatisfied		_____ sympathetic
_____ dogmatic		_____ tactless
_____ energetic		_____ timid, meek
_____ envious		_____ touchy, irritable
_____ fearless		_____ tyrannical
_____ forceful		_____ unhappy

_____ friendly

_____ gentle

_____ hasty

_____ heroic

_____ hurried

_____ impatient

_____ impetuous

_____ uninterested

_____ valiant

_____ vigorous

_____ warm

_____ whiny

_____ withdrawn

_____ worried, anxious

BIBLE CHARACTER NO. 10 LEAST PREFERRED

Instructions

For the LEAST preferred Bible character which you have just selected, please describe this LEAST preferred character by using the adjective check list to be distributed. Simply follow this procedure: In front of those adjectives which you feel DO apply mark a 1 (one), and mark 0 (zero) those adjectives which you feel do NOT describe this LEAST Preferred Bible character. Again, respond according to your dominant feeling.

Schedule C   Code No._____

BIBLE CHARACTER No. 10 LEAST PREFERRED_____
                                                    Name of Character

_____ able		_____ impulsive
_____ active		_____ industrious
_____ adequate		_____ insensitive
_____ affable		_____ intelligent
_____ agreeable		_____ intense
_____ assertive, dominant		_____ kindly
_____ austere		_____ lively
_____ bitter		_____ obedient
_____ bossy		_____ overly-confident
_____ brave		_____ pessimistic
_____ changeable		_____ pleasant
_____ confident		_____ precise
_____ congenial		_____ quiet
_____ considerate		_____ relaxed
_____ cooperative		_____ resentful
_____ cordial		_____ self-assured, poised
_____ critical		_____ sensible, level-headed
_____ daring		_____ sincere
_____ dauntless		_____ slow in speech and movement
_____ defensive-self-excusing		_____ sociable
_____ dependent		_____ subdued
_____ determined		_____ submissive
_____ dissatisfied		_____ sympathetic
_____ dogmatic		_____ tactless
_____ energetic		_____ timid, meek
_____ envious		_____ touchy, irritable
_____ fearless		_____ tyrannical

_____ forceful

_____ friendly

_____ gentle

_____ hasty

_____ heroic

_____ hurried

_____ impatient

_____ impetuous

_____ unhappy

_____ uninterested, indifferent

_____ valiant

_____ vigorous

_____ warm

_____ whiny

_____ withdrawn

_____ worried, anxious

Schedule D

YOUR SELF AS YOU SEE YOUR SELF

Instructions

Now we would like you to use the adjective check list to be distributed
to describe YOUR SELF AS YOU SEE YOUR SELF. If you feel that
an adjective does apply to you, mark 1 (one), if it does NOT apply to
to YOUR SELF AS YOU SEE YOUR SELF, mark 0 (zero). Respond
according to your dominant feeling.

Schedule D   Code No._____

YOUR SELF AS YOU SEE YOUR SELF

_____ able	_____ impulsive
_____ active	_____ industrious
_____ adequate	_____ insensitive
_____ affable	_____ intelligent
_____ agreeable	_____ intense
_____ assertive, dominant	_____ kindly
_____ austere	_____ lively
_____ bitter	_____ obedient
_____ bossy	_____ overly-confident
_____ brave	_____ pessimistic
_____ changeable	_____ pleasant
_____ confident	_____ precise
_____ congenial	_____ quiet
_____ considerate	_____ relaxed
_____ cooperative	_____ resentful
_____ cordial	_____ self-assured, poised
_____ critical	_____ sensible, level-headed
_____ daring	_____ sincere
_____ dauntless	_____ slow in speech and movement
_____ defensive-self-excusing	_____ sociable
_____ dependent	_____ subdued
_____ determined	_____ submissive
_____ dissatisfied	_____ sympathetic
_____ dogmatic	_____ tactless
_____ energetic	_____ timid, meek
_____ envious	_____ touchy, irritable
_____ fearless	_____ tyrannical
_____ forceful	_____ unhappy

_____ friendly

_____ gentle

_____ hasty

_____ heroic

_____ hurried

_____ impatient

_____ impetuous

_____ uninterested, indifferent

_____ valiant

_____ vigorous

_____ warm

_____ whiny

_____ withdrawn

_____ worried, anxious

Schedule E

YOUR SELF AS YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE

Instructions

Finally, we would like you to use the adjective check list to be distributed for describing **YOUR SELF AS YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE.** If you feel that an adjective **DOES** apply, mark 1 (one), if it does **NOT** apply to **YOUR SELF AS YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE**, mark 0 (zero). Again, respond according to your dominant feeling.

Schedule E   Code No._____

YOUR SELF AS YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE

_____ able

_____ active

_____ adequate

_____ affable

_____ agreeable

_____ assertive, dominant

_____ austere

_____ bitter

_____ bossy

_____ brave

_____ changeable

_____ confident

_____ congenial

_____ considerate

_____ cooperative

_____ cordial

_____ critical

_____ daring

_____ dauntless

_____ defensive self-excusing

_____ dependent

_____ determined

_____ dissatisfied

_____ dogmatic

_____ energetic

_____ envious

_____ fearless

_____ impulsive

_____ industrious

_____ insensitive

_____ intelligent

_____ intense

_____ kindly

_____ lively

_____ obedient

_____ overly-confident

_____ pessimistic

_____ pleasant

_____ precise

_____ quiet

_____ relaxed

_____ resentful

_____ self-assured, poised

_____ sensible, level-headed

_____ sincere

_____ slow in speech and movement

_____ sociable

_____ subdued

_____ submissive

_____ sympathetic

_____ tactless

_____ timid, meek

_____ touchy, irritable

_____ tyrannical

_____ forceful

_____ friendly

_____ gentle

_____ hasty

_____ heroic

_____ hurried

_____ impatient

_____ impetuous

_____ unhappy

_____ uninterested, indifferent

_____ valiant

_____ vigorous

_____ warm

_____ whiny

_____ withdrawn, introverted

_____ worried, anxious

APPENDIX III

INSTRUMENT USED BY PSYCHIATRISTS FOR
DIAGNOSTIC EVALUATION

Date_____

To: Psychiatrist - Pine Rest Christian Hospital

From: Chaplain W. L. Hiemstra

Subject: Your research participation

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Judgment of individuals for diagnostic reasons varies in complexity. Both quantitative and qualitative aspects of symptomatology are involved. For example, one case of depression may have a wide spreading effect, almost pervading the total personality (quantitative) but it may not necessarily be an intense depression (qualitative). On the other hand, an individual may feel profoundly or intensely depressed, but the sympto- matology may only have a relatively narrow spreading effect upon the personality. Therefore it is possible to have many symptoms but not feel intensely depressed, or to have few symptoms but feel profoundly depressed.

In addition to the quantitative and qualitative aspects of sympto- matology, the dimension of observability is also involved. For example, in some cases schizophrenia is highly observable but in other instances this condition is primarily inferred without much visibility. In connection with the latter possibility an individual may suppress, deny, or "hide" direct symptom expression with or without insight but the patient's incon- sistent behavior, including verbal remarks or history, may nevertheless lead to the judgment of schizophrenia. Moreover, with this same type of circumstances both the quantitative and qualitative aspects are involved.

Many other factors are involved in establishing a diagnostic con- clusion. Various dimensions or variables are involved. But in this study please attempt to make your diagnosis in terms of the above aspects: qualitative, quantitative, observability vs. non-observability aspects of the symptomatology of the patient.

Page 2.   Code No._____

Patient's Name_____

P. R. C. H. No._____

Date Admitted_____

Attending Psychiatrist_____

After evaluating the patient, please complete the following tasks

by making a check mark (✓) where judged applicable:

A. QUALITATIVE (degree of intensity or disturbance of symptomatology
            as judged by psychiatrist)

        1. None _____
        2. Little _____
        3. Some _____
        4. Much _____

B. QUANTITATIVE (number of symptoms affecting entire person as
            judged by psychiatrist)

        1. None _____
        2. Little _____
        3. Some _____
        4. Much _____

C. OBSERVABILITY (degree of visibility of symptomatology as judged
            by psychiatrist)

        1. None _____
        2. Little _____
        3. Some _____
        4. Much _____

D. DIAGNOSTIC CATEGORY:

        1. Adjustment reaction _____

        2. Depression _____

        3. Personality Trait Disturbance _____

        4. Schizophrenia _____

        5. Sociopathic Personality _____

        6. Other (specify) _____

APPENDIX IV

D SCALE OF MINNESOTA MULTIPHASIC
PERSONALITY INVENTORY

Code No._____

INDIVIDUAL INVENTORY

This inventory consists of numbered statements. Read each statement and decide whether it is <u>true as applied to you</u> or <u>false as applied to you.</u>

You are to mark your answers to the left of each statement. If a statement is **TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE**, as applied to you, check (✓) the space in the column head <u>T</u>. If a statement is **FALSE or NOT USUALLY TRUE**, as applied to you, check (✓) the space in the column headed <u>F</u>.

Remember to give YOUR OWN opinion of yourself. <u>Do not leave any blank space if you can avoid it.</u> Erase completely any answer you wish to change. Remember, try to make <u>some</u> answer to every statement.

T   F

 —   —   1. I have a good appetite.

 —   —   2. I am easily awakened by noise.

 —   —   3. My daily life is full of things that keep me interested.

 —   —   4. I am about as able to work as I ever was.

 —   —   5. I am very seldom troubled by constipation.

 —   —   6. At times I feel like swearing.

 —   —   7. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job.

 —   —   8. I seldom worry about my health.

 —   —   9. At times I feel like smashing things.

 —   —   10. I have had periods of days, weeks, or months when I couldn't take care of things because I couldn't "get going."

 —   —   11. My sleep is fitful and disturbed.

 —   —   12. My judgment is better than it ever was.

 —   —   13. I am in just as good physical health as most of my friends.

 —   —   14. I prefer to pass by school friends, or people I know but have not seen for a long time, unless they speak to me first.

 —   —   15. I am a good mixer.

 —   —   16. Everything is turning out just like the prophets of the Bible said it would.

 —   —   17. I sometimes keep on at a thing until others lose their patience with me.

 —   —   18. I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be.

 —   —   19. I sometimes tease animals.

 —   —   20. I am certainly lacking in self-confidence.

 —   —   21. I usually feel that life is worth-while.

 —   —   22. It takes a lot of argument to convince most people of the truth.

 —   —   23. I go to church almost every week.

 —   —   24. I believe in the second coming of Christ.

 —   —   25. I don't seem to care what happens to me.

 —   —   26. I am happy most of the time.

T   F

27. I seem to be about as capable and smart as most others around me.

28. I have never vomited blood or coughed up blood.

29. I do not worry about catching diseases.

30. Criticism or scolding hurts me terribly.

31. I certainly feel useless at times.

32. At times I feel like picking a fist fight with someone.

33. Most nights I go to sleep without thoughts or ideas bothering me.

34. During the past few years I have been well most of the time.

35. I have never had a fit or convulsion.

36. I am neither gaining or losing weight.

37. I cry easily.

38. I cannot understand what I read as well as I used to.

39. I have never felt better in my life than I do now.

40. My memory seems to be all right.

41. I am afraid of losing my mind.

42. I feel weak all over much of the time.

43. Sometimes, when embarrassed, I break out in a sweat which annoys me greatly.

44. I do not have spells of hay fever or asthma.

45. I enjoy many different kinds of play and recreation.

46. I like to flirt.

47. I have at times stood in the way of people who were trying to do something, not because it amounted to much but because of the principle of the thing.

48. I brood a great deal.

49. I dream frequently about things that are best kept to myself.

50. I believe I am no more nervous than most others.

51. Sometimes without any reason or even when things are going wrong I feel excitedly happy, "on top of the world."

T	F	
_	_	52. I have difficulty in starting to do things.
_	_	53. I sweat very easily even on cool days.
_	_	54. When I leave home I do not worry about whether the door is locked and the windows closed.
_	_	55. I do not blame a person for taking advantage of someone who lays himself open to it.
_	_	56. At times I am full of energy.
_	_	57. Once in a while I laugh at a dirty joke.
_	_	58. I am troubled by attacks of nausea and vomiting.
_	_	59. I work under a great deal of tension.
_	_	60. I have periods in which I feel unusually cheerful without any special reason.

APPENDIX V

SAMPLE SCORING SHEET USED IN THE COMPUTATION
OF TETRACHORIC CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

Age_____

Education_____

Occupation_____

Church_____

Marital Status_____

Code No._____

MMPI D - T Score_____

Most Preferred

Ideal Self

	1	0	
1			
0			

Actual Self

Ideal Self

	1	0	
1			
0			

Least Preferred

Actual Self

	1	0	
1			
0			

Most Preferred

Actual Self

	1	0	
1			
0			

Least Preferred

Ideal Self

	1	0	
1			
0			

Most Preferred

Least Preferred

	1	0	
1			
0			

Bible Character
Rank Order

Most ___ _____

___

___

___

___

___

___

___

___

Least ___ _____

Age_____

Education_____

Occupation_____

Church_____

Marital Status_____

Code No._____

MMPI D - T Score_____

Most Preferred

Ideal Self (1, 0) × (1, 0)

Most Preferred

Actual Self (1, 0) × (1, 0)

Actual Self

Ideal Self (1, 0) × (1, 0)

Least Preferred

Ideal Self (1, 0) × (1, 0)

Least Preferred

Actual Self (1, 0) × (1, 0)

Most Preferred

Least Preferred (1, 0) × (1, 0)

Bible Character
Rank Order

Most ___ _____

___

___

___

___

___

___

___

___

Least ___ _____