

ABSTRACT

PROJECTED SEX-BLAME AND RELIGIOSITY IN COLLEGE MEN

by Edward J. Daly

College men who blamed a woman for sexual relations (sex-blame projectors) in the course of a story completion task were compared on a variety of relevant variables with other men who did not complete the story in this manner. From the total sample of 120 college men, 31 were classified as sex-blame projectors.

In exploring hypotheses derived from Alperson's finding that such projection in this population was associated with Catholicism ($p < .001$), the participants were also asked to respond to the Mosher Forced-Choice Guilt Scale, the California F-Scale of Authoritarianism, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, the Hurley Preferred Qualities Survey, a variation of the Fichter scale of religiosity, and to various questions about their background and socio-economic level. They also wrote a short essay on the meaning of religion in

their lives. Data were analyzed by χ^2 -tests and one-tailed Mann-Whitney U tests.

It was found as hypothesized that the projectors had significantly lower self-concepts and felt significantly less sex guilt in general than did the non-projectors. This is consistent with theories which hold that defensive reactions to transgression serve as anxiety-reducers as opposed to theories which emphasize the importance of a harsh superego as a punisher for transgression.

Also as hypothesized, the projectors had more training in religious schools and saw their parents, and especially their mothers, as more religiously involved than did the non-projectors.

At variance with expectations were the findings that the projectors were not significantly more authoritarian than the non-projectors, did not view themselves as significantly more religious, and did not experience less hostile or moral guilt than the non-projectors. Only two men out of 120 projected blame for anger upon a woman in their completions to another story stem which had a hostility theme. A possible explanation for these findings is that young men may be selecting from their religions only those prescriptions which fit their current personality needs, while tending to reject the religious establishment in general. Rejection of the establishment was commonly mentioned in the religious essays. A

supporting inference can be drawn from the ratings of personal religiosity, where only 39% of the men rated their religious involvement as active or regular.

The same kind of consideration may explain the findings that, contrary to an underlying notion in this research, Catholic men did not project sexual blame in significantly greater numbers than non-Catholic men in general, although there was a strong tendency in that direction. Further, some projectors were found even among men of extremely divergent religious belief systems. Other findings were that the Catholic men were not significantly more authoritarian than the non-Catholics, and tended to score higher in guilt and self-concept than that group.

A fringe benefit from this research developed from attempts to cope with the frustration induced by the administration of the group of personality questionnaires. In group de-briefing sessions, the anger was elicited, and the men were told that they could request that their records be destroyed. Despite assurances that there would be no penalty for such action, and that research credit would be given in any case, not one man made such a request. Another finding was that the median self-concept of these men was at the 20th percentile of the norms used by Fitts in his Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.

Edward J. Daly

Suggestions were made for improving the current procedures of sampling the student population from which the sample was taken.

PROJECTED SEX-BLAME AND RELIGIOSITY
IN COLLEGE MEN

By

Edward J. Daly

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychology

1968

G 53012

1/15/69

To

Tim and Ann

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I don't know how to measure the effect that many of my friends have had on this project, and mentioning specifics reflects only in a very pale way what they have given.

It is clear, however, that John Hurley has been so interested that in many ways he shared the labor. He also coped beautifully with even my unclear anxieties in times of particular stress.

It is also clear that Dozier Thornton and Norm Abeles offered suggestions which made the research more meaningful and more interesting than it would otherwise have been.

I know that Bill Kell's value had less to do with specifics and more to do with my awareness that he was with me and supporting me in the endeavor.

My wife, Marie, who typed her fingers to the bone somewhere along the way, was a source of constant help, encouragement, and enthusiasm. She was especially helpful in questioning the ambiguities in the original draft, and so in forcing me to tighten the thinking in it.

Dick Does and Mary Sue Larsen were my mind-reading co-raters. Their obvious willingness to help made the asking easier.

Paul Laemmle and Karen Kamerschen made contributions of which they may not be aware.

Finally, the unsung, and in many cases anonymous, heroes of the piece, the Ss, deserve special commendation for $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours of uninterrupted giving of themselves.

All these people helped me, and I thank them for the giving.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF APPENDICES	vii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHOD	9
Subjects	9
Measures	10
Story Completion Test	10
Mosher Guilt Scale	11
Opinion Survey	11
Tennessee Self-Concept Scale	12
Preferred Qualities of Children	13
Family Data Questionnaire	13
Religious Background	15
Procedure	15
Instructions	15
De-Briefing	16
III. RESULTS	18
Reliabilities	18
Ratings of the Sex Story	18
Ratings of the Hostility Story	18
Ratings of the Essay on Religious Background	20
Hypothesis Testing	21
F-Score	21
Parental Religiosity	22

Chapter	Page
Personal Religiosity	25
Religious Education	26
Self-Concept	27
Sexual Guilt	28
Hostile and Moral Guilt	28
Other Findings	29
Association Between Religion and Projection of Sex Blame	29
Background Variables	29
Response Set	30
Preferred Qualities of Children	30
IV. DISCUSSION	32
Summary of Hypothesis Testing	32
General Findings	33
Religious Implications	36
A Divergent Finding	40
Suggestions for Future Work	43
V. SUMMARY	46
REFERENCES	49
APPENDICES	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Inter-rater Reliability of Religious Essay	19
2. Personal Religiosity: Association Between Self-Rating and Essay Rating	20
3. Association Between Sample Groups and Authoritarianism (F-Scale)	22
4. Perceived Parental Religiosity vs. Projected Sex Blame	23
5. Perceived Parental Religiosity vs. Projected Sex Blame	23
6. Perceived Maternal Religiosity vs. Projected Sex Blame	24
7. Perceived Paternal Religiosity vs. Projected Sex Blame	24
8. Years in Religious Schools vs. Projected Sex Blame	26
9. Association Between Sample Groups and Self-Concept	27
10. Association Between Sample Groups and Sexual Guilt	28
11. Distribution of Religious Affiliations	37

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
I. Additional Tables of Associations	51
II. Measures	59
III. Summary of Scores	83

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In a recent study of expressive style in undergraduate males, Alperson (1967) elicited completions to stories with dependent, aggressive, and sexual themes. In this process she discovered a group of men who completed the sexual theme by indicating transgression followed by projection of the blame upon the female figure who was featured in the story stem. Of 27 males who did this, 21 identified themselves as being Catholics. Of the 93 who indicated either withdrawal from the story situation, transgression with self-blame, or transgression without guilt, 11 were Catholics and 82 were not. The association between declared Catholicism and projected blame is statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 46.5$, $p < .001$). There was no evidence of this kind of projection in stories dealing with the expression of hostility, although anger was often expressed toward a woman in the stories.

There are several ways of accounting for the necessity for placing blame upon the woman in the fantasied sexual situation. We could say, as Miller and Swanson suggest (1960), that the sexual

impulse, blocked in its expression, simply breaks through any resistance to temptation in fantasy, and that the consequent overwhelming guilt must be handled by such a primitive mechanism as denial, repression, or projection. The projectors, according to this line of reasoning, would be considered high in guilt and in conscience development. This is said to represent a well-internalized sense of guilt.

An allied explanation is that the guilt is not wholly displaced, but that it is so great that it must be shared.

It is possible, however, to find other explanations. Sullivan (1956) has described a kind of person who might use projection in such an instance in his exposition of the paranoid dynamism, which he sees as, "rooted in (1) an awareness of (obvious) inferiority of some kind, which then necessitates (2) transfer of blame onto others" (Sullivan, 1956, p. 145). He goes on to say that this constitutes a paranoid slant on life, not a full-blown paranoid state. He does not delimit in any way the etiology of the inferiority feelings, nor does he specify that the driving force behind the projection must be guilt. It could be, alternatively, guilt, shame, fear, or anxiety aroused by the realization of a damaged self-system. Moreover, Hoffman (1964) cites evidence from research which involved free responses to transgression stories that self-blame, or internalized guilt, is positively correlated with experimental resistance to temptation, avoidance of

delinquent acts, and the development of moral judgment. If then, one were high in guilt, he would not be as likely to transgress at all as another person low in guilt. On the other hand, given that one has transgressed, shame, fear, or anxiety could be sufficiently intense to necessitate projection of blame, and these feelings are generally considered to reflect a lower level of moral judgment than is internalized guilt (Hoffman, 1964).

While externalization responses such as projection can develop in various ways, the disparate number of Catholic boys who displaced their guilt leads one to wonder whether the conscience of these men in sexual matters is located in the Confessional. This notion suggests a two-step process of displacement: first, as Miller and Swanson (1960) have conjectured, the availability of confession may reduce resistance to temptation; then, after transgression, Catholic boys may very well fear the Confessional, and distort reality in order to avoid censure there. This is consistent with Kavanaugh's declaration (1967) that, "In reducing a profound area of human experience to a set of rules, we somehow manage to take away the conscience of the young Catholic and substitute the sexual hang-up." In this kind of person, projection of blame would be used against the fear of external, rather than internal punishment, and it

would be expected to occur most in the sexual area, where no direct expression is permitted outside of marriage.

In this context one might also consider the implications of this prohibition from the standpoint of ego and superego development. Ego functions improve, according to Sanford (1962, p. 278), "as they are performed with success in increasingly difficult situations. A major requirement is that tasks calling for a wide variety of ego performance be assigned to the individual, but in situations that are not so difficult or anxiety-provoking that he is forced to make use of primitive defensive devices." He says further that, "as the ego develops, it becomes increasingly able to integrate conscience within itself, taking over functions that once were performed automatically in accordance with the training of childhood" (Sanford, 1962, p. 278). Further, he sees authoritarian discipline as restrictive of ego growth in that the ego is not given the opportunity for handling a variety of situations. From this reasoning it is clear that ego and conscience development in the sexual area are inhibited culturally, and that in an authoritarian the sexual value system in particular may be poorly-internalized. This effect should be especially pronounced in male adolescents where it is pushed by changes in body chemistry and by the male's typical resistance to conformity.

Some research which seems particularly relevant to the fear-induced projection of blame has been reported by Adorno (1950): He found that the projection of taboo impulses and the presence of an externalized superego are characteristics of ethnocentrics. Rothstein (1960) has since found the projection of sexual desires to be true of authoritarian college men in an experimental situation.

Since it makes intuitive sense that ethnocentrism might, in turn, correlate positively with the dogmatic severity of one's religion, Adorno and others have investigated this possibility. They found that Catholics are not significantly more ethnocentric than Protestants, but that, in a small sample situation, middle-class Catholic men were significantly more ethnocentric than middle-class Protestant men. He also found ethnocentrism positively correlated with regularity of church attendance and with parental religiosity. Subsequently, Jones (1958) found that those who have high F-scores are significantly more likely to be Protestant or Catholic rather than Jewish or "none," and to be significantly more likely to attend church regularly. Byrne (1966) reports other research which indicates an F-scale hierarchy from "no religious affiliation" at the low end, through an intermediate area of Jewish, Methodist, Presbyterian, and miscellaneous Protestant, to Baptist, Episcopalian and Catholic at the high end.

Brown (1965) has found extrapunitiveness, another characteristic of the authoritarian personality, to be significantly higher in Catholics than in Methodists. Adorno also found suggestibility significantly related to authoritarianism, and it is interesting in this context that Mosher (1965) has found that males who showed little sexual guilt on his Incomplete Sentence Test, were more influenced by cues of fear-induction or fear-reduction related to the probability of external punishment than were males who were high in sexual guilt.

All these studies, taken as a group, suggest that Alperson's projectors of sexual blame may be a relatively pure sample of authoritarian personalities. This would also be consistent with the Piers and Singer (1953, p. 36) conception of guilt and shame, wherein "guilt transfers the demands of society through early, primitive parental images" and the subsequent social conformity is one of submission, whereas shame can become a response in the process of comparing and competing with peers, and the social conformity achieved will be essentially one of identification. Shame, rather than guilt, would be the feeling of an authoritarian raised in an authoritarian system. The process of comparing and competing has been noted by Bronfenbrenner (1962) in the Soviet schools. As fostered by any parochialism, and perhaps by parochial schools, it

could lead to the feelings of inferiority which Sullivan refers to as well as to the desired opposite. This conclusion is particularly interesting in view of the fact that religiosity and education in religious schools have been thought to contribute to conscience formation.

This has been a statement of some of the theoretical viewpoints and research findings about people who use the mechanism of projection. From this statement, eight hypotheses were formed about the men who project sex blame in their completions to Alper-son's sex story. These hypotheses constitute the basis for this research, and throughout them and this study, the term "projector," when unqualified, means "projector of sex blame":

I. The projectors will have a higher F-score than the non-projectors.

II. The projectors will have more religious parents than the non-projectors.

III. The projectors will see themselves as more religious than the non-projectors.

IV. The projectors will have attended church more regularly than the non-projectors.

V. The projectors will have attended religious schools longer than the non-projectors.

VI. The projectors will have a lower self-concept than the non-projectors.

VII. The projectors will show less sexual guilt than non-projectors.

VIII. The projectors will show less hostile and moral guilt than the non-projectors.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The sample of subjects was, insofar as possible, a replication of Alperson's sample. This represented an attempt to obtain the projection of sexual guilt which she observed. Therefore, the 120 Ss were men between 17 and 20 years old (that is, 17-0 months through 20-11 months), and from unbroken homes. They were drawn from 166 male volunteers who were enrolled in a beginning course in Psychology at Michigan State University in the Fall and Winter of 1967-1968. That is, 39 of the volunteers who participated in this research did not meet the specifications of the sample, and another 7 presented data which were unscorable in one way or another. Only 8 of the 128 students who volunteered for Alperson's study did not meet the sample criteria. In this respect the present sample proved to be unexpectedly divergent from Alperson's sample.

Measures

Story Completion Test

Four stories were used, of which only two were germane to this study. One was a sex story designed by Bandura and Walters (1959), as modified by Alperson for her college population. In this story, the male hero is invited by the neighborhood "Brigitte Bardot" to visit with her awhile. The completion was scored simply in two ways: (1) Did the hero feel that he had transgressed sexually with the girl; and (2) did the hero project his part of the blame for transgression upon the girl? Both these conditions were necessary for classification of a man as a projector in the Alperson study within her criterion of a dependent style of expressing sexuality.

The second relevant story stem concerns aggression, and was devised for this study. While Alperson did not report the projection of aggression, the stories which she used may not have been good elicitors of it, and it was felt that a story stem analogous to that of the sex story might be more effective. This story was included in order to investigate the possibility that the projectors of sex blame might also project hostility. It is in the nature of a pilot study. The aggression story stem has no validity other than face validity. No hypotheses rest on it. Two of Alperson's dependency stories were given to the Ss before the sex and aggression stories

in order to provide practice in writing story completions. These completions were not scored.

Mosher Guilt Scale

Mosher originally developed this scale as a sentence completion test using stems and a scoring system derived from the psychoanalytic conception of guilt. Subsequently he modified it both as a true-false and as a forced-choice instrument, constructing these variations to control for social desirability of the response. In a rather extensive analysis of the three forms (1966) using a multitrait-multimethod procedure, he found the forced-choice method to be the most reliable and to have the highest convergent validity of the three scales. It consists of 79 pairs of stems, 28 of which are related to sex, 29 to hostility, and 22 to moral conflict. These subscales can be used and scored separately or in combination with one another.

Opinion Survey

This was the third revision of the California F-Scale. While this measure of authoritarianism was conceived by the Adorno group (1964), the revision used in this particular study is that described by Byrne (1966).

Tennessee Self-Concept Scale

Out of the wealth of information provided by the 100 questions of this 13-minute instrument, only two factors were scored. These are called, by Fitts (1965), the Total P (Self-Esteem) score, and the T/F (True-False ratio). The reported test-retest reliabilities of these scores are 0.92, and 0.82 respectively.

The large body of data supporting the validity of this Scale can be divided into evidence concerning content, discrimination between groups, correlation with other measures, and changes in score during the course of therapy. Fitts (1965) makes a convincing case for this instrument in all these categories. The Scale does, for example, discriminate ($p < .001$) in the expected directions between a group of psychiatric patients, a normative group, and a collection of people judged to have well-integrated personalities. That is, the Total P score was found to increase, and the T/F ratio to decrease along this continuum. Moreover, these kinds of changes were found to occur during the course of psychotherapy.

Persons with "high Total P scores tend to like themselves, to feel that they are persons of value and worth, to have confidence in themselves, and to act accordingly. People with low scores are doubtful about their own worth; see themselves as undesirable; often feel anxious, depressed, and unhappy; and have little faith or

confidence in themselves" (Fitts, 1965, p. 2). While extremely high scores are said to be found only among very disturbed people, there is a significant negative correlation ($p < .05$) between Total P and every major MMPI scale except for Mf and Ma.

The T/F is meaningful as a result of the careful counterbalancing of questions in the instrument. People with an affirmative response set have a high ratio of true to false answers.

Preferred Qualities of Children

This instrument was originally designed by Hurley (1968) to measure the extent of parental preference for conformity as opposed to self-expression in children. Ss in this study were asked to rank order their preferences for the list of qualities in both a boy and a girl of 8 years of age. No hypotheses are dependent upon this instrument.

Family Data Questionnaire

Besides the usual personal data, this questionnaire elicited specific information about socio-economic level, church and school attendance, and perceived personal and parental religiosity.

The socio-economic indicators were the classifications of father's job and education cited by Miller and Swanson (1960, p. 62). These authors claim the same multiple correlation, 0.92, "between

occupation, education and our subjective ratings when we used the multiple regression weights (0.36 and 0.22 respectively) from the (Hollingshead and Myers) study in New Haven."

The measure of religiosity is essentially that devised by Fichter (1953), which is based on his study of white, Southern Catholics, and which classifies Catholics as nuclear, modal, marginal, or dormant. He found that of the approximately 14,800 Ss in his sample, 48% fell into the nuclear or modal categories, and 52% into the other two. His marginal group tended not to attend religious services regularly, not to receive the sacraments, and not to send their children to parochial schools. Their religious thinking was characterized by beliefs in such practicalities as that the end does justify the means, that God will understand a modified morality, that the parishes should not be tightly-knit communities, and that blind obedience to the church is not essential to salvation.

In the present study, Fichter's classifications of nuclear, modal, marginal, and dormant are coded as "a," "b," and "c," and "d" respectively. Since a few Ss indicated that they had never been exposed to any religion, their involvement was rated "0." This additional category was also used in rating the religious essays.

Religious Background

Each S wrote a short essay on the meaning of religion in his life. This was designed as a measure of religiosity independent of that obtained in the Family Data Questionnaire.

Procedure

All data were obtained from groups of 10-26 Ss in 1½-hour periods. Individual numbered booklets containing the story stems, Guilt Scale, Opinion Survey, Self-Concept Scale, Preferred Qualities Survey, Family Data Questionnaire, and essay on Religious Background were presented in that order.

Instructions

The introductory verbal message was this paraphrase of the instructions used by Alperson:

We are interested in finding out what men your age are like. The booklet which you have just received contains four stories which we would like you to finish. Read each story in your booklet, then finish the story, starting where the story leaves off. You have the rest of the blank page on which to write your story ending. Be sure that you limit yourself to this one page. When you have completed the first story, please indicate that you are finished by raising your hand. We want to make sure that everyone is through at the same time. This is not an English class. Don't worry about spelling. There are no right or wrong answers; you can say anything you want in your stories, and use any language you want. No one at the University, besides the experimenter, will see your stories. Please read the first story beginning and then finish the story, telling what

happens and how it turns out, and what the people in your story are thinking and feeling.

Alperson's procedure of limiting story completions to seven minutes, and to one page of writing, was also used.

The other instructions appeared on the scales, and are shown with them in Appendix II.

De-Briefing

Since some of the questions asked in this study were of a highly personal nature, and since some of the choices posed by the Guilt Scale are frustration-inducing, a rather elaborate de-briefing procedure was employed. The various scales were numbered and handled in such a way that they could be collated by Subject. Therefore, it was not necessary to this study that any man sign his name to any instrument. However, Ss were told as they completed the last instrument that there might be a follow-up study in this area, and that if they wished to participate they could sign their names to the religious essay. Seventy-three out of the 166 men tested did identify themselves in this way.

The actual de-briefing of each group took this form:

Thanks for helping me in this research. All of you will receive research credit slips for your work here. But I know that sometimes when you volunteer for these experiments, you don't quite know what you're getting into, and that you sometimes come out wishing you had never got involved. So I want

you to feel free to refuse to let me use your materials if you want to. All you have to do is tell me your wish as you leave, and I'll destroy them.

Now, if you have any questions about this study, or any feelings left over from this session, or from parts of it, I'd like to hear them.

In the absence of a response, further attempts were made to elicit reactions. Only one group could not be persuaded to respond. Most comments had to do with when and in what manner results would be available. One criticism was made of the Self-Concept Scale. All other assaults, and they were many, were levelled at the Guilt Scale, and were handled, with apparent satisfaction to the Ss, by hearing and understanding the objections and by emphasizing the realization that S's own experience may have been only a distant approximation to either of any particular pair of choices.

Not a single S requested that his materials be destroyed.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Reliabilities

Ratings of the Sex Story

In 70 of the 120 stories, there was no doubt at all about the rating. In most of these there was no transgression: the hero simply said "hello" and walked away or he talked awhile, decided that Sally was a nice girl, and made a date for another time. In other cases there was transgression followed by either sheer delight or accepted guilt. In a few stories the hero was clearly raped. The remaining 50 stories, which were more difficult to assess, were scored also, and then one of Alperson's raters was asked to score them independently. Forty-eight of the ratings were identical. Alternate Ss were substituted for the two other cases. In Alperson's study, the co-raters reached 95% agreement in rating this same story.

Ratings of the Hostility Story

There were only two instances in which any part of the blame was projected upon the girl friend, and both the Ss involved also

Table 1. Inter-rater Reliability of Religious Essay

S	Involvement Rating Given by	
	Rater 1	Rater 2
8	c	c
14	a	a
18	d	d
28	d	d
38	b	b
43	d	0
47	d	0
51	c	d
52	d	0
78	c	c
86	b	a
89	b	a
91	c	c
104	c	d
106	0	0
107	b	a
117	c	d
118	c	0
125	a	a
127	c	c
129	d	0
130	b	a
135	c	c
138	d	d
140	c	d
142	b	b
147	b	b
149	b	c
154	0	0
160	c	c

projected sex blame. In the other 118 cases, anger was levelled freely at the parents, and no attempt was made to even share that anger.

Ratings of the Essay on Religious Background

The essays on religious background were rated on the four elements of the scale of perceived personal religiosity and the fifth element of no religion at all. As can be inferred from Table 1, on a random sample of 30 essays 97% agreement was reached with another rater on the involved versus non-involved dichotomy; that is, on the combinations ab versus cd0. Table 2 shows the association ($p < .001$) between self-ratings and the essay ratings of personal religious involvement.

Table 2. Personal Religiosity: Association Between Self-Rating and Essay-Rating

Essay Rating	Self-Rating		Totals
	ab	cd0	
ab	32	14	46
cd0	16	58	74
Totals	48	72	120

$\chi^2 = 25.2$ ($p < .001$) using Yates correction. 75% agreement.

Hypothesis Testing

The χ^2 -test and the Mann-Whitney U test (Siegel, 1956) were used as appropriate in order to avoid the assumptions of interval-scales and homogeneity of variance implicit in the use of t-tests. There is little reason to believe that the variance along the dimensions in question among men who use one particular defense mechanism is the same as that among those who use all others. Then too, while Catholics may be thought of in some contexts as a homogeneous group, the "all-others" category with whom they are compared in this study can probably not be considered homogeneous with respect to religious background or characteristics. Since all hypotheses were directional, one-tailed tests were used in conjunction with the Mann-Whitney U-test.

F-Score

The hypothesis that projectors have a higher F-score than non-projectors was not supported. In fact, as is shown in Table 3, the association was little better than that of chance. There was a slightly stronger association between Catholicism and high F-scores. However, the most significant finding in this area was a tendency ($p < .06$) for Ss to be more authoritarian (high F) if they rated themselves as religiously involved rather than uninvolved. This tendency

was stronger among Catholics, of whom 47% said that they were involved, than among others, of whom only a third claimed involvement. None of the nine Jewish men felt that they were involved in the practice of their religion.

Table 3. Association Between Sample Groups and Authoritarianism (F-Scale)

Compared Groups	U	Z	1-tailed <u>p</u>
Projectors vs. Non-Projectors	1382.5	0.02	<.50
Catholics vs. Non-Catholics	1631.0	0.68	<.25
Catholic Projectors vs. Catholic Non-Projectors	252.5	0.88	<.19
Catholic Involved vs. Catholic Non-Involved	241.5	1.56	<u>≤</u> .06
Non-Catholic Involved vs. Non-Catholic Non-Involved	449.0	1.02	<.16

Parental Religiosity

The hypothesis that projectors have more religious parents than non-projectors found strong support. When both parents were rated "b" (modal) or higher, the association between projection of

fantasied sexual blame and parental religiosity was statistically significant ($\underline{p} < .01$). This is shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Perceived Parental Religiosity vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Perceived Parental Religiosity		Totals
	< bb	bb or higher	
Projectors	8	23	31
Non-Projectors	49	40	89
Totals	57	63	120

$\chi^2 = 6.77$ ($\underline{p} < .01$) using Yates correction.

Moreover, when the standard of parental religiosity is lowered to an average of "b," that is, to allow "ac" scores, the association, as is indicated in Table 5, is still significant.

Table 5. Perceived Parental Religiosity vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Perceived Parental Religiosity		Totals
	< ac, ca	ac, ca or higher	
Projectors	6	25	31
Non-Projectors	44	45	89
Totals	50	70	120

$\chi^2 = 7.36$ ($\underline{p} < .01$) using Yates correction.

Of related interest is the relative significance of maternal and paternal religiosity. As Table 6 indicates, the former is strongly associated with projection ($\underline{p} < .005$), while Table 7 shows that the latter is less clearly associated ($\underline{p} < .07$).

Table 6. Perceived Maternal Religiosity vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Perceived Maternal Religiosity			Totals
	a	b	c, d, 0	
Projectors	17	10	4	31
Non-Projectors	22	35	32	89
Totals	39	45	36	120

$$\chi^2 = 10.74 (\underline{p} < .005) \text{ At } df = 2.$$

Table 7. Perceived Paternal Religiosity vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Perceived Paternal Religiosity			Totals
	a	b	c, d, 0	
Projectors	8	15	8	31
Non-Projectors	16	29	44	89
Totals	24	44	52	120

$$\chi^2 = 5.42 (\underline{p} < .07) \text{ At } df = 2.$$

As is indicated in these tables, it was necessary to combine some ratings in order to meet the requirements of the χ^2 -test. However, if the data are not combined in any way, maternal religiosity is still associated with projection of fantasied sexual guilt at the .025 level ($\chi^2 = 11.42$, $df = 4$), while paternal religiosity is less-clearly associated ($\chi^2 = 5.88$, $df = 4$, $p < .25$).

While these trends apply across projectors and non-projectors of fantasied sexual blame, they are not nearly so significant among the Catholic subjects as a separate group. The association between parental religiosity and projection among Catholics is somewhere between $p < .06$ and $p < .20$, depending upon the criterion of religiosity upon which the sample is dichotomized. The association with maternal religiosity is in the same direction ($p < .07$), but the association between perceived paternal religiosity and fantasied projection of sexual blame is not as great as chance expectancy.

Personal Religiosity

The hypothesis of regularity of church attendance is subsumed under that of personal religiosity. Of itself, the former is said to be of restricted research value (Fichter, 1953), and so it was not investigated specifically. While the evidence is in the direction of support for the hypothesis of an association between

fantasied projection of sexual blame and reported personal religiosity, it does not reach statistical significance. As is shown in Appendix I, this is true not only of projectors as compared with non-projectors, but also of Catholic projectors compared with Catholic non-projectors and of "other" projectors compared with "other" non-projectors. It is also true whether the self-ratings or the essay ratings are used as the measure of religiosity.

Religious Education

There was, however, an association ($p < .05$) between fantasied projection of sexual blame and a history of religious education, as shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Years in Religious Schools vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Years in Religious Schools		Totals
	Zero	1 or More	
Projectors	14	17	31
Non-Projectors	60	29	89
Totals	74	46	120

$\chi^2 = 3.93$ ($p < .05$) using Yates correction.

As is shown in Appendix I, this association was not nearly so strong ($p < .25$) among Catholic projectors as compared with Catholic

non-projectors, indicating that the finding under this hypothesis may be an artifact of the prevalence of Catholics among projectors and of the Catholic tradition of religious education.

Self-Concept

As is shown in Table 9, the hypothesized association between low self-concept and the fantasied projection of sexual blame received considerable ($p < .005$) support.

Table 9. Association Between Sample Groups and Self-Concept

Compared Groups	U	Z	1-tailed p
Projectors vs. Non-Projectors	950.0	2.57	.005
Catholics vs. Non-Catholics	1583.5	0.94	< .20
Catholic Projectors vs. Catholic Non-Projectors	207.5	1.77	< .04

Moreover, Catholic projectors were also found to have lower self-concepts than Catholic non-projectors ($p < .04$). On the other hand, Catholics as a whole had somewhat higher self-concepts than non-Catholics. The difference was not, however, statistically significant.

Sexual Guilt

Projectors of fantasied sexual blame did show less sexual guilt ($p < .04$) than did non-projectors. This is shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Association Between Sample Groups and Sexual Guilt

Compared Groups	U	Z	1-tailed <u>p</u>
Projectors vs. Non-Projectors	1098.0	1.75	< .04
Catholics vs. Non-Catholics	1448.0	-1.60	< .06
Catholic Projectors vs. Catholic Non-Projectors	213.5	1.70	< .05

Catholic projectors were also found ($p < .05$) to exhibit lower sexual guilt than Catholic non-projectors. However, Catholic Ss as a group showed more sexual guilt ($p < .06$) than did the non-Catholic Ss.

Hostile and Moral Guilt

Although the relationship between either hostile guilt or moral guilt and fantasied projection of sexual blame was in the hypothesized direction, the associations failed to reach statistical significance. Relevant data are shown in Appendix I. The former seems especially appropriate in view of the fact that only two of the

120 Ss showed evidence of fantasied projection of hostile blame.

That is, there were only two projectors of hostile blame, and so the sample was more homogeneous with respect to guilt scores than was the case with sexual guilt.

Other Findings

Association Between Religion and Projection of Sex Blame

Whereas Alperson found a clear association ($p < .001$) between Catholicism and the projection of sexual blame in her study, this association did not reach statistical significance in the present sample. There was, however, as is shown in Appendix I, a strong tendency ($p < .08$) in that direction.

Background Variables

As is shown in Appendix I, there was no statistical difference between the projectors and the non-projectors of fantasied sexual blame in socio-economic level, size of home community (urban vs. rural), or age. Nor was there a significant difference on any of these dimensions between the Catholic projectors and the Catholic non-projectors.

Response Set

Since there has been some criticism that the F-Scale is subject to response bias (e. g. Byrne, 1966), the T/F scores of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale were compared with F-Scores. A χ^2 -test of association revealed no significant correlation between F-Score and affirmative response set ($\chi^2 = 0.52$; $p < .50$). This is also shown in Appendix I. Moreover, there were no significant associations across Ss (total or Catholic) between degree of religious involvement (involved or uninvolved) and response set.

Preferred Qualities of Children

Chi-square tests of association were run between projectors and non-projectors of fantasied sexual blame on the scores for eight year old BOY and GIRL separately. No statistically significant differences were found. Similar results were obtained when projectors were compared with non-projectors on whether they scored GIRL higher than BOY on the one hand, or equal to or lower than him on the other. A comparison of Catholics with non-Catholics on the scores of BOY and GIRL separately, also revealed no significant associations.

Across all Ss, however, there was a preference ($\chi^2 = 25.16$, $p < .001$) to score GIRL ($\bar{X} = 27.7$) higher than BOY ($\bar{X} = 21.6$) on the

Good Slave versus Expressive Person Index. That is, the male Ss prefer more conformity and less self-expression in eight year old girls than they do in eight year old boys.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Summary of Hypothesis Testing

It was predicted that in contrast to the non-projectors, the projectors of sex-blame would have more-religious parents, would have attended religious schools longer, and would have lower self-concepts and less sexual guilt. These predictions, which were stated in Hypotheses II, V, VI, and VII respectively, found statistically significant support.

Hypothesis VIII, which predicted that the projectors would show less hostile and moral guilt than the non-projectors, received some support, but it was not statistically significant.

Receiving no statistically reliable support were Hypotheses I and III (including IV), which made predictions about the relative authoritarianism and personal religiosity of the projectors and non-projectors. In general, however, those Ss who rated themselves toward the more-involved end of the religiosity scale did tend to score higher in authoritarianism than those who rated themselves lower.

General Findings

Results of this study support several of the theoretical positions on which the research was based. One such position is that of Mosher, who suggested an interaction between fear and guilt in inhibiting unacceptable behavior. He found that Ss low in sexual guilt are more influenced than the more guilty Ss by cues of fear-induction and fear-reduction. This notion, which formed part of the argument for Hypothesis VII, is supported here by the negative association between sexual guilt and the projection of fantasied sexual blame. That is, the low-guilt projectors can be seen as so influenced by internal cues associated with fear, anxiety, or shame that they were forced to rid themselves of the blame for transgression. Statistically fewer high-guilt Ss were so influenced. Perhaps, as Hoffman (1964) suggests, these latter Ss tend simply to avoid transgression, both in fantasy and in fact. These findings also oppose the position of Miller and Swanson which argues that such projection is the result of overwhelming guilt, and the results argue for the use of projection more generally, as Sullivan suggests, as protection against awareness of a damaged self-system.

Further support for Sullivan's argument arises from the finding that the projectors of fantasied sexual blame do tend to have

lower self-concepts than those who do not project this blame. That is, Hypothesis VI is also supported.

As well as these several theories handle these results, there is a theory similar to Sullivan's, which does a more explicit job of unifying them. Based on prior work by Aronfreed (1966), Vogel (1967) has conceptualized transgression responses on a continuum from internalized to externalized responses. Guilt is handled in this framework as a phenomenological feeling associated with certain kinds of internalized responses. Aronfreed views both internalized and externalized responses as learned in various ways and through specific disciplinary techniques. Further, all these responses are considered to serve the single function of reduction of anxiety. In this framework the hypotheses concerning guilt and self-concept could have been rephrased in this way: Are adolescent men in a fantasied non-detection sexual situation more likely to use an externalized response (such as projection) if they are externalizers (e. g. low in guilt) on the one hand or if they are internalizers (e. g. high in guilt) on the other? It seems like no surprise at all that the results should support the hypotheses as stated in this way.

From a slightly different viewpoint one can see that high-guilty Ss require such externalized defenses as projection to a lesser extent than low-guilty Ss because they can reduce their anxiety by punishing themselves to some degree.

The projectors of sexual guilt in this study share characteristics other than low sexual guilt and a low self-concept: that is, they also see their parents, and especially their mothers, as relatively involved in their own religions, and they tend to have attended religious schools. These findings support Hypotheses II and V respectively. The relative importance of these characteristics to the prediction of the projection of fantasied sexual blame differs, however, for Ss of high and low guilt. In comparison with non-projectors, low-guilt projectors also have lower self-concepts, religious educations, and more religious parents, in decreasing order of difference in percentage of occurrence. High-guilt projectors, on the other hand, are differentiated from non-projectors chiefly by a negative correlation between self-concept and authoritarianism, and then by their religious educations and more-religious parents.

The low-guilt projectors are apparently those who feel the greatest need for security. They show a slightly greater tendency than their non-projecting counterparts toward the negative correlation between self-concept and authoritarianism, but the low self-concept is a far more important part of their syndrome. This is especially true among Catholics.

High-guilty projectors, on the other hand, apparently fall into two major categories; those who, like the low-guilty projectors,

have a low self-concept but also a greater identification with the guilt-inducing authority, and those others who have perhaps rejected the values of the guilt-inducer, but whose high, but new self-systems are still so fragile that they must be protected by projection. Moreover, in view of the sizeable number (9) of high-guilt Ss who do project, it seems clear that despite self-punishment or guilt, some anxiety remains to be reduced. Projection is apparently used, therefore, as an anxiety-reduction, or ego defense, mechanism, but not specifically as a guilt-reducer. That is, it is not used as a defense against having to punish oneself with a harsh superego.

Religious Implications

This study was undertaken with the notion that the few non-Catholics who did project sexual blame in Alperson's study might belong to denominations having belief systems and structures similar to those of Catholicism. A further notion was that the Catholics who did not project blame might not be so devoted to their religion as the projectors.

It is now clear that despite Alperson's finding of a remarkably high association ($p < .001$) between Catholicism and the projection of fantasied sexual blame, this characteristic and the dynamic elements underlying it are not the exclusive property of followers of Catholicism. In fact, as Table 11 shows, almost as high a percentage

Table 11. Distribution of Religious Affiliations

Denomination	Rokeach Scale Ranking	Projectors	Non- Projectors	Totals	% Projectors
Catholic	0	18	33	51	35
Armenian Orthodox			1	1	0
Episcopalian	4		2	2	0
Lutheran	10	4	8	12	33
Presbyterian	14	4	8	12	33
Methodist	15	2	8	10	20
Congrega- tionalist			1	1	0
Church of Christ			3	3	0
Baptist	17	1	2	3	33
Protestant			11	11	0
Mormon			1	1	0
Jewish		2	7	9	22
Buddhist			1	1	0
None	18		3	3	0
Totals		31	89	120	

of projectors was found in the present study among Lutherans, Presbyterians and other groups as among Catholics. One ready explanation might be that these belief systems are similar in some way. Rokeach (1960), however, has ranked religions along an 18-point continuum of belief similarity from Catholic = 0 at one end through Baptist = 17 near the other. The non-Christian religions carry the scale to its completion. While the placement on this continuum of the unranked religions is arbitrary, it is clear that the projectors in the present study almost span Rokeach's belief continuum.

A larger sampling from the individual non-Catholic religions would give a more reliable indication of the strength of these findings.

Notably absent from among the projectors, however, were those Ss who said they had no religion or who designated themselves, simply, as Protestants.

While the religions of the projectors differ in belief systems, they agree in general upon proscriptions against sexual pleasures outside of marriage. Since this proscription is so general, why do all Ss not project the blame for sexual transgression? To begin, it is clear in the story completions that many of the non-projectors of sexual blame have already resolved this conflict area in a mature fashion, at least in fantasy.

But what of those who have not? To answer this, one can fall back upon that individuality in each man's experience which leads him to rely on one defense mechanism rather than another, and to be more concerned about one area of feeling than another. At some given time he may be concerned, for example, about dependency. In order to protect himself against the threat of independence, he might then emphasize in importance his church's dogmas regarding honoring his parents. On the other hand, if he has trouble controlling his aggressive feelings, he might espouse turning the other cheek. That is, he is able to extract from his religion whatever dogma fits his dynamics, and most religions provide dogmas which can be employed against having to feel the basic human conflicts. While sexuality presents a rather common conflict, it is also clear in the story completions that many young men use withdrawal or denial to escape the conflict.

If there is so much reliance on the various churches to protect a man from his conflicts, why was there so little association in this study between the projection of sexual blame and authoritarianism? That is, why was Hypothesis I not supported? The relative importance ($p < .06$ in Catholics) of general religious involvement among the high F-scores might provide a clue here. College men are in the process of rebelling in many ways, and it has been found

(Sanford, 1962) that with few exceptions, freshmen who score high in authoritarianism on their entrance examinations show dramatic decreases in F-score during their college careers. Perhaps they tend to hang onto those religious elements which serve a current function and also to the old and useful defense mechanisms, while objecting to the larger body of dogma or to the religious establishment in general. This line of reasoning may also be employed to explain the failure of support for Hypothesis III.

A Divergent Finding

While the present study tends to support Alperson's finding of an association between Catholicism and the projection of sexual guilt, the strength of this association in the two studies is so different as to require some consideration at this point. It is so divergent that it could be expected to occur less than one time in one hundred samples from the same population. This finding is surprising in view of the fact that the samples were taken from the same course at the same university less than $1\frac{1}{2}$ years apart. The criteria for inclusion in the study were identical, the same sex story was used in order to induce projection of blame, and one of the story raters was common to both studies. It is true that the sex of the experimenter was different in the two studies, and it is also clear from the considerably greater number of rejected Ss (39 vs. 8) in the

present study that the groups which volunteered to participate were, somehow, different.

With respect to the data, the most striking divergence between the two samples is in the notably lower ratio between Catholic and non-Catholic non-projectors found by Alperson. It seems unlikely that recent changes in the Catholic Church could have already produced a change in the defense style of young Catholic men, or that the sex of the administrator may have had such an important differential effect; it seems more likely that this divergence may have resulted from difficulties in sampling this population, and it is difficult to say which sample is more valid.

At the end of Fall term, when about a third of the sample was collected, all classes in Psychology 151 were held in Anthony Hall, and research participants registered on a bulletin board there. The research data were collected at Olds Hall, about a mile away. Of the Ss who participated at this time, 29% were discarded as over age or as coming from broken homes. Fifty percent were Catholics, and 12% were identifiable as non-Caucasian.

The remainder of the sample was collected at the beginning of Winter term in two parts. At this time the classes in Psychology 151 were held at four separate locations, of which two were in the Wilson and Fee dormitory complexes. Sign-up sheets were circulated

in these latter two classes, and the research data were collected in those two complexes. Of the men who participated in Wilson Hall, only 12% were discarded as over age or from broken homes, and only 21% were Catholics. Of the participants in Fee Hall, 13% were discarded and 60% were Catholics. No non-Caucasians participated in either of these complexes, although some of them live there and attend classes there.

Besides these clear differences in the three samples, one particular research finding leads to the question of how the element of self-selection among the Ss might have affected the results of this study. It was found that while the range of scores was covered, the median self-concept (P) of Ss in this study was at the twentieth percentile of Fitts' normative group. This group is said to be over-represented in college students, and Fitts (1965) found no significant differences among the scores of the various demographic groups which constituted his normative sample.

It is possible that students in Psychology 151 do have lower-than-normative self-concepts. It also seems possible either that potential Ss with high self-concepts tend not to participate in research projects, or that this study had a preferential "pull" upon students with low self-concepts. While any argument here is conjectural, it was found that despite the fact that participation in research is a

course "requirement," 5% of the students in one Fall term lecture section did not so participate, and that an additional 4% accumulated fewer than the "required" number of research credits.

Fitts (1965) has found a low negative correlation between self-concept and authoritarianism, and in view of the tendency in that direction among the projectors in this study, it is possible that the process of self-selection has also truncated the data on authoritarianism at the low end of the scale.

In view of these findings, it is suggested that the students in Psychology 151 be assigned in a random fashion to various research projects and that the requirement be a firm one.

Suggestions for Future Work

One result of this study which was identical with Alperson's is that no projectors of sexual blame rated themselves as without religion. Moreover, in the present study no projectors listed their denomination simply as Protestant. An interesting follow-up study might be the identification of elements common to the specific religious beliefs, rather than the religions, of the projectors.

An allied investigation could grow out of the previously expressed speculation that the Ss in the present study might be clinging to those religious beliefs which serve a current function (and to the old and useful defense mechanisms) while objecting to the larger

body of dogma or to the religious establishment in general. Such a study could be made by identifying specific conflict areas from the Edwards Personal Preference Survey and correlating these areas with paraphrases of ecclesiastical thought ranked in order of personal importance. For example, a need for order might correlate with "Cleanliness is next to Godliness." A need for abasement might correlate with "Blessed are the meek," A need for dependence might correlate with "Honor thy father and thy mother," and so forth.

Another kind of study suggested by the present one is an attempt to correlate early experiences with the tendency to project sexual blame. One approach is the retrospective investigation of parental postures in such areas as love, rejection, strictness, and punitiveness. While an analysis of Alperson's data reveals no significant correlation between the projection of sexual blame and retrospective feelings about parental love or rejection, Coopersmith (1968) has found relationships between high self-esteem and parental behavior characterized by a deep interest in the children, non-punitive treatment, respect for the children's views, and expected adherence to well-defined rules of behavior. Such elements of parental behavior bear investigation especially in view of the high association in the present study ($p < .005$) between low self-concept and the projection of sexual blame.

Further, it would be interesting to discover whether results similar to those of the present study would be found among older college men and among married men. Young college girls, according to an informal pilot study by Alperson, were extremely guarded in their completions to a sex story. It is possible, however, that a procedure such as group discussion of the value of research, of safeguards of anonymity, and of other elements of confidentiality might reduce their defensiveness sufficiently to permit a meaningful investigation of the projection of sex-blame among them.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

College men who blamed a woman for sexual relations (sex-blame projectors) in the course of a story completion task were compared on a variety of relevant variables with other men who did not complete the story in this manner. From the total sample of 120 college men, 31 were classified as sex-blame projectors.

In exploring hypotheses derived from Alperson's finding that such projection in this population was associated with Catholicism ($p < .001$), the participants were also asked to respond to the Mosher Forced-Choice Guilt Scale, the California F-Scale of Authoritarianism, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, the Hurley Preferred Qualities Survey, a variation of the Fichter scale of religiosity, and to various questions about their background and socio-economic level. They also wrote a short essay on the meaning of religion in their lives. Data were analyzed by χ^2 -tests and one-tailed Mann-Whitney U tests.

It was found as hypothesized that the projectors had significantly lower self-concepts and felt significantly less guilt in general

than did the non-projectors. This is consistent with theories which hold that defensive reactions to transgression serve as anxiety-reducers as opposed to theories which emphasize the importance of a harsh superego as a punisher for transgression.

Also as hypothesized, the projectors had more training in religious schools and saw their parents, and especially their mothers, as more religiously involved than did the non-projectors.

At variance with expectations were the findings that the projectors were not significantly more authoritarian than the non-projectors, did not view themselves as significantly more religious, and did not experience less hostile or moral guilt than the non-projectors. Only two men out of 120 projected blame for anger upon a woman in their completions to another story stem which had a hostility theme. A possible explanation for these findings is that young men may be selecting from their religions only those proscriptions which fit their current personality needs, while tending to reject the religious establishment in general. Rejection of the establishment was commonly mentioned in the religious essays. A supporting inference can be drawn from the ratings of personal religiosity, where only 39% of the men rated their religious involvement as active or regular.

The same kind of consideration may explain the findings that, contrary to an underlying notion in this research, Catholic men did not project sexual blame in significantly greater numbers than non-Catholic men in general, although there was a strong tendency in that direction. Further, some projectors were found even among men of extremely divergent religious belief systems. Other findings were that the Catholic men were not significantly more authoritarian than the non-Catholics, and tended to score higher in guilt and self-concept than that group.

A fringe benefit from this research developed from attempts to cope with the frustration induced by the administration of the group of personality questionnaires. In group de-briefing sessions, the anger was elicited, and the men were told that they could request that their records be destroyed. Despite assurances that there would be no penalty for such action, and that research credit would be given in any case, not one man made such a request. Another finding was that the median self-concept of these men was at the 20th percentile of the norms used by Fitts in his Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.

Suggestions were made for improving the current procedures of sampling the student population from which the sample was taken.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Adorno, T. W. The authoritarian personality, Science Editions, 1964.
- Alperson, Erma. Expressive style and perceived parental acceptance-rejection. Unpubl. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State Univ., 1967.
- Aronfreed, J. Punishment control of children's behavior. Oral presentation American Psychological Association, 1966.
- Bandura, A. & Walters, R. H. Adolescent aggression. New York: Ronald Press, 1959.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. Soviet methods of character education: some implications for research. Amer. Psychol., 1962, 17.
- Brown, L. B. Aggression and denominational membership. Brit. J. Soc. & Clin. Psychol., 1965, 4(3), 175-178.
- Byrne, Donn. An introduction to personality. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Coopersmith, S. Studies in self-esteem. Scientific American, 1968, 218(2), 96.
- Fichter, J. H. The marginal catholic: an institutional approach. Social Forces, 1953, 32, 167-172.
- Fitts, W. H. Tennessee self-concept scale, Counselor Recordings and Tests: Nashville, Tenn., 1965.
- Hoffman, M. L. & Hoffman, Lois W. Review of child development research. New York: Russell Sage, 1964.

- Hurley, J. R. & Randolph, C. C. The attribute preference inventory. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State Univ., 1968.
- Jones, M. B. Religious values and authoritarian tendency. J. Soc. Psychol., 1958, 48, 83-89.
- Kavanaugh, James. A modern priest looks at his outdated church. New York: Trident (Simon & Schuster), 1967.
- Miller, D. R. & Swanson, G. E. Inner conflict and defense. New York: Holt, 1960.
- Mosher, D. L. Interaction of fear and guilt in inhibiting unacceptable behavior. J. Consult. Psychol., 1965, 29(2), 161-167.
- Mosher, D. L. The development and multitrait-multimethod matrix analysis of three measures of three aspects of guilt. J. Consult. Psychol., 1966, 30(1), 25-29.
- Piers, G. & Singer, M. B. Shame and guilt. Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1953.
- Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind: investigations into the nature of belief systems and personality systems. Basic Books: New York, 1960.
- Rothstein, R. Authoritarianism and men's reactions to sexuality and affection in women. J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1960, 61, 329-334.
- Sanford, N. The american college. Wiley: New York, 1962.
- Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Sullivan, H. S. Clinical studies in psychiatry. New York: Norton, 1956.
- Vogel, B. S. Amoral responses to transgression. Unpubl. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State Univ., 1967.

APPENDIX I

ADDITIONAL TABLES OF ASSOCIATIONS

Table 12a. Years in Religious Schools vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Years in Religious Schools		Totals
	Zero	1 or More	
Catholic Projectors	3	15	18
Catholic Non-Projectors	12	21	33
Totals	15	36	51

$\chi^2 = 1.22$ ($\underline{p} < .25$) using Yates correction.

Table 12b. Years in Religious Schools vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Years in Religious Schools		Totals
	< 8 Years	8 Years or More	
Catholic Projectors	6	12	18
Catholic Non-Projectors	17	16	33
Totals	23	28	51

$\chi^2 = 0.90$ ($\underline{p} < .35$) using Yates correction.

Table 13. Moral Guilt vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Moral Guilt Score		Totals
	< +7	+7 and Over	
Projectors	19	12	31
Non-Projectors	40	49	89
Totals	59	61	120

$\chi^2 = 1.85$ ($p < .10$) using Yates correction.

Table 14. Hostile Guilt vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Hostile Guilt Score		Totals
	< +7	+7 and Over	
Projectors	18	13	31
Non-Projectors	40	49	89
Totals	58	62	120

$\chi^2 = 1.10$ ($p < .30$) using Yates correction

Table 15. Total Guilt vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Total Guilt Score		Totals
	< +9	+9 and Over	
Projectors	19	12	31
Non-Projectors	40	49	89
Totals	59	61	120

$\chi^2 = 1.84$ ($p < .10$) using Yates correction.

Table 16. Catholicism vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Projectors	Non-Projectors	Totals
Catholics	18	33	51
Non-Catholics	13	56	69
Totals	31	89	120

$\chi^2 = 3.34$ ($p < .08$) using Yates correction.

Table 17a. Socio-economic Status vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Socio-economic Score		Totals
	< 1.90	1.90 and Over	
Projectors	15	16	31
Non-Projectors	45	44	89
Totals	60	60	120

$\chi^2 = 0.044$ ($p < .90$)

Table 17b. Socio-economic Status vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Socio-economic Score		Totals
	< 2.2	2.2 and Over	
Projectors	8	10	18
Non-Projectors	18	15	33
Totals	26	25	51

$\chi^2 = 0.48$ ($p < .50$)

Table 18a. Type of Home Community vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Rural	Urban	Totals
Projectors	6	25	31
Non-Projectors	20	69	89
Totals	26	94	120

$$\chi^2 = 0.13 (\underline{p} < .75)$$

Table 18b. Type of Home Community vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Rural	Urban	Totals
Catholic Projectors	4	14	18
Catholic Non-Projectors	5	28	33
Totals	9	42	51

$$\chi^2 = 0.40 (\underline{p} < .60)$$

Table 19a. Age vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Age		Totals
	< 18 yrs. 10 mo.	18 yrs. 10 mo. or Over	
Projectors	12	19	31
Non-Projectors	44	45	89
Totals	56	64	120

$$\chi^2 = 1.06 (\underline{p} < .35)$$

Table 19b. Age vs. Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Age		Totals
	< 19 yrs.	19 yrs. or Over	
Catholic Projectors	9	9	18
Catholic Non-Projectors	16	17	33
Totals	25	26	51

$$\chi^2 = 0.01 (\underline{p} < .95)$$

Table 20. True/False Fitts Ratio vs. California F-Score

F-Score	T/F		Totals
	< 1.04	1.04 and Over	
< 114	34	27	61
114 and Over	28	31	59
Totals	62	58	120

$$\chi^2 = 0.52 (\underline{p} < .50) \text{ using Yates correction.}$$

Table 21a. Association Between Personal Religiosity and Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Perceived Personal Religiosity		Totals
	ab	cd0	
Projectors	13	18	31
Non-Projectors	34	55	89
Totals	47	73	120

$$\chi^2 = 0.135 (\underline{p} < .75)$$

Table 21b. Association Between Personal Religiosity and Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Perceived Personal Religiosity		Totals
	ab	cd0	
Catholic Projectors	10	8	18
Catholic Non-Projectors	14	19	33
Totals	24	27	51

$$\chi^2 = 0.806 (\underline{p} < .40)$$

Table 21c. Association Between Personal Religiosity and Projected Sex Blame

<u>Ss</u>	Perceived Personal Religiosity		Totals
	ab	cd0	
Non-Catholic Projectors	3	10	13
Non-Catholic Non-Projectors	20	36	56
Totals	23	46	69

$$\chi^2 = 0.707 (\underline{p} < .45)$$

APPENDIX II

MEASURES

STORY COMPLETIONS

Instructions

We are interested in finding out what men your age are like. The booklet which you have just received contains four stories which we would like you to finish. Read each story in your booklet, then finish the story, starting where the story leaves off. You have the rest of the blank page on which to write your story ending. Be sure that you limit yourself to this one page. When you have completed the first story, please indicate that you are finished by raising your hand. We want to make sure that everyone is through at the same time. This is not an English class. Don't worry about spelling. There are no right or wrong answers; you can say anything you want in your stories, and use any language you want. No one at the University, besides the experimenter, will see your stories. Please read the first story beginning and then finish the story, telling what happens and how it turns out, and what the people in your story are thinking and feeling.

Story 1

Jerry has been dating Susan, an extremely attractive coed, for almost a year. He feels that they have much in common and is seriously considering marrying her. Jerry values his mother's judgment and when Jerry tells his mother of his plans to marry Susan, she remains silent and looks greatly disappointed. When Jerry asks her what's wrong, she informs him that Susan is not only of a different faith than theirs but has a reputation for being promiscuous. She suggests that he weigh his decision to marry Susan more carefully.

Story 2

Don admires his father and has always felt close to him. When he graduated from college two years ago he went to work for his father. His father was so pleased when Don joined his Realty Company that he promised him that sometime in the future he would hand over the business to him. Last week one of his father's business associates made Don a job offer--a full partnership--in a very large and lucrative Insurance Agency.

Story 3

One night about 10 o'clock, Ted is walking home from a friend's house. As a general rule he is expected to be home by 11 on week nights. He sees Sally sitting all alone on the front steps of her house. Sally is known as the girl in the neighborhood who looks most like Brigitte Bardot. She does a lot of dating and has a reputation for being sexy. Sally asks Ted if he would like to talk with her for awhile. She says that she's all alone because her parents have gone to Chicago for several days.

Story 4

Fred and his college sweetheart have been planning to work this summer at the same resort. That way they can earn a substantial amount of money and still see quite a bit of one another. Fred and Barbara will drive up in his car and he will be able to keep it at the resort. Suddenly, Fred's parents, who have usually been pretty reasonable, decide that it doesn't smell like such a good arrangement. They have suggested to Fred that he work in town for a friend of the family this summer instead. Fred and Barbara had a date this evening, during which he mentioned his folks' idea. Barbara had an uneasy feeling about it, and they decided that they preferred the resort idea. Fred's parents have waited up for them in order to settle the issue. They are surprised that the young folks have rejected their idea, and blurt out their suspicions.

MOSHER F-C INVENTORY

This questionnaire consists of a number of pairs of statements or opinions which have been given by college men in response to the "Mosher Incomplete Sentences Test": These men were asked to complete phrases such as "When I tell a lie..." and "To kill in war..." to make a sentence which expressed their real feelings about the stem. This questionnaire consists of the stems to which they responded and a pair of their responses which are lettered A and B.

You are to read the stem and the pair of completions and decide which you most agree with or which is most characteristic of you. Your choice, in each instance, should be in terms of what you believe, how you feel, or how you would react, and not in terms of how you think you should believe, feel, or respond. This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. Your choices should be a description of your own personal beliefs, feelings, or reactions.

In some instances you may discover that you believe both completions or neither completion to be characteristic of you. In such cases select the one you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you are concerned. Be sure to find an answer for every choice. Do not omit an item even though it is very difficult for you to decide; just select the more characteristic member of the pair. Encircle the letter, A or B, which you most agree with.

1. When I tell a lie...
A. it hurts.
B. I make it a good one.
2. To kill in war...
A. is a job to be done.
B. is a shame but sometimes a necessity.
3. Women who curse...
A. are normal.
B. make me sick.
4. When anger builds inside me...
A. I usually explode.
B. I keep my mouth shut.

5. If I killed someone in self-defense, I...
 - A. would feel no anguish.
 - B. think it would trouble me the rest of my life.
6. I punish myself...
 - A. for the evil I do.
 - B. very seldom for other people do it for me.
7. If in the future I committed adultery...
 - A. I won't feel bad about it.
 - B. it would be sinful.
8. Obscene literature...
 - A. is a sinful and corrupt business.
 - B. is fascinating reading.
9. "Dirty" jokes in mixed company...
 - A. are common in our town.
 - B. should be avoided.
10. As a child, sex play...
 - A. never entered my mind.
 - B. is quite wide spread.
11. I detest myself for...
 - A. my sins and failures.
 - B. for not having more exciting sexual experiences.
12. Sex relations before marriage...
 - A. ruin many a happy couple.
 - B. are good in my opinion.
13. If in the future I committed adultery...
 - A. I wouldn't tell anyone.
 - B. I would probably feel bad about it.
14. When I have sexual desires...
 - A. I usually try to curb them.
 - B. I generally satisfy them.
15. If I killed someone in self-defense, I...
 - A. wouldn't enjoy it.
 - B. I'd be glad to be alive.
16. Unusual sex practices...
 - A. might be interesting.
 - B. don't interest me.

17. If I felt like murdering someone...
 - A. I would be ashamed of myself.
 - B. I would try to commit the perfect crime.
18. If I hated my parents...
 - A. I would hate myself.
 - B. I would rebel at their every wish.
19. After an outburst of anger...
 - A. I usually feel quite a bit better.
 - B. I am sorry and say so.
20. I punish myself...
 - A. never.
 - B. by feeling nervous and depressed.
21. Prostitution...
 - A. is a must.
 - B. breeds only evil.
22. If I killed someone in self-defense, I...
 - A. would still be troubled by my conscience.
 - B. would consider myself lucky.
23. When I tell a lie...
 - A. I'm angry with myself.
 - B. I mix it with truth and serve it like a Martini.
24. As a child, sex play...
 - A. is not good for mental and emotional well being.
 - B. is natural and innocent.
25. When someone swears at me...
 - A. I swear back.
 - B. it usually bothers me even if I don't show it.
26. When I was younger, fighting...
 - A. was always a thrill.
 - B. disgusted me.
27. As a child, sex play...
 - A. was a big taboo and I was deathly afraid of it.
 - B. was common without guilt feelings.
28. After an argument...
 - A. I feel mean.
 - B. I am sorry for my actions.

29. "Dirty" jokes in mixed company...
A. are not proper.
B. are exciting and amusing.
30. Unusual sex practices...
A. are awful and unthinkable.
B. are not so unusual to me.
31. When I have sex dreams...
A. I cannot remember them in the morning.
B. I wake up happy.
32. When I was younger, fighting...
A. never appealed to me.
B. was fun and frequent.
33. One should not...
A. knowingly sin.
B. try to follow absolutes.
34. To kill in war...
A. is good and meritable.
B. would be sickening to me.
35. I detest myself for...
A. nothing, I love life.
B. not being more nearly perfect.
36. "Dirty" jokes in mixed company...
A. are lots of fun.
B. are coarse to say the least.
37. Petting...
A. is something that should be controlled.
B. is a form of education.
38. After an argument...
A. I usually feel better.
B. I am disgusted that I allowed myself to become involved.
39. Obscene literature...
A. should be freely published.
B. helps people become sexual perverts.
40. I regret...
A. my sexual experiences.
B. nothing I've ever done.

41. A guilty conscience...
 - A. does not bother me much.
 - B. is worse than a sickness to me.
42. If I felt like murdering someone...
 - A. it would be for good reason.
 - B. I'd think I was crazy.
43. Arguments leave me feeling...
 - A. that it was a waste of time.
 - B. smarter.
44. After a childhood fight, I felt...
 - A. miserable and made up afterwards.
 - B. like a hero.
45. When anger builds inside me...
 - A. I do my best to suppress it.
 - B. I have to blow off some steam.
46. Unusual sex practices...
 - A. are O.K. as long as they're heterosexual.
 - B. usually aren't pleasurable because you have preconceived feelings about their being wrong.
47. I regret...
 - A. getting caught, but nothing else.
 - B. all my sins.
48. When I tell a lie...
 - A. my conscience bothers me.
 - B. I wonder whether I'll get away with it.
49. Sex relations before marriage...
 - A. are practiced too much to be wrong.
 - B. in my opinion, should not be practiced.
50. As a child, sex play...
 - A. is dangerous.
 - B. is not harmful but does create sexual pleasure.
51. When caught in the act...
 - A. I try to bluff my way out.
 - B. truth is the best policy.
52. As a child, sex play...
 - A. was indulged in.
 - B. is immature and ridiculous.
53. When I tell a lie...
 - A. it is an exception or rather an odd occurrence.
 - B. I tell a lie.

54. If I hated my parents...
A. I would be wrong, foolish, and feel guilty.
B. they would know it that's for sure.
55. If I robbed a bank...
A. I would give up I suppose.
B. I probably would get away with it.
56. Arguments leave me feeling...
A. proud, they certainly are worthwhile.
B. depressed and disgusted.
57. When I have sexual desires...
A. they are quite strong.
B. I attempt to repress them.
58. Sin and failure...
A. are two situations we try to avoid.
B. do not depress me for long.
59. Sex relations before marriage...
A. help people to adjust.
B. should not be recommended.
60. When anger builds inside me...
A. I feel like killing somebody.
B. I get sick.
61. If I robbed a bank...
A. I would live like a king.
B. I should get caught.
62. Masturbation...
A. is a habit that should be controlled.
B. is very common.
63. After an argument...
A. I feel proud in victory and understanding in defeat.
B. I am sorry and see no reason to stay mad.
64. Sin and failure...
A. are the works of the Devil.
B. have not bothered me yet.
65. If I committed a homosexual act...
A. it would be my business.
B. it would show weakness in me.
66. When anger builds inside me...
A. I always express it.
B. I usually take it out on myself.

67. Prostitution...
A. is a sign of moral decay in society.
B. is acceptable and needed by some people.
68. Capital punishment...
A. should be abolished.
B. is a necessity.
69. Sex relations before marriage...
A. are O.K. if both partners are in agreement.
B. are dangerous.
70. I tried to make amends...
A. for all my misdeeds, but I can't forget them.
B. but not if I could help it.
71. After a childhood fight, I felt...
A. sorry.
B. mad and irritable.
72. I detest myself for...
A. nothing, and only rarely dislike myself.
B. thoughts I sometime have.
73. Arguments leave me feeling...
A. satisfied usually.
B. exhausted.
74. Masturbation...
A. is all right.
B. should not be practiced.
75. After an argument...
A. I usually feel good if I won.
B. it is best to apologize to clear the air.
76. I hate...
A. sin.
B. moralists and "do gooders."
77. Sex...
A. is a beautiful gift of God not to be cheapened.
B. is good and enjoyable.
78. Capital punishment...
A. is not used often enough.
B. is legal murder, it is inhuman.
79. Prostitution...
A. should be legalized.
B. cannot really afford enjoyment.

OPINION SURVEY

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many other people feel the same as you do.

On these sheets please mark each statement as provided according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one. Circle number 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, or 7 depending on how you feel in each case, using the following system:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. I disagree very much. | 5. I agree a little. |
| 2. I disagree on the whole. | 6. I agree on the whole. |
| 3. I disagree a little. | 7. I agree very much. |

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 2. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 3. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 4. The business man and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 5. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 6. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down. |

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. I disagree very much. | 5. I agree a little. |
| 2. I disagree on the whole. | 6. I agree on the whole. |
| 3. I disagree a little. | 7. I agree very much. |

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 7. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 8. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 9. Nobody ever learned anything really important except through suffering. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 10. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 11. An insult to our honor should always be punished. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 12. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 13. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 14. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked, and feeble-minded people. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 15. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 16. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 17. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 18. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places. |

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. I disagree very much. | 5. I agree a little. |
| 2. I disagree on the whole. | 6. I agree on the whole. |
| 3. I disagree a little. | 7. I agree very much. |

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 19. People can be divided into two distinct classes:
the weak and the strong. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 20. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology
can explain a lot of things. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 21. Wars and social troubles may someday be ended
by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the
whole world. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 22. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we
have enough will power. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 23. The true American way of life is disappearing so
fast that force may be necessary to preserve it. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 24. Most people don't realize how much our lives
are controlled by plots hatched in secret places. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 25. Human nature being what it is, there will always
be war and conflict. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 26. Familiarity breeds contempt. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 27. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people
move around and mix together so much, a person
has to protect himself especially carefully
against catching an infection or disease from them. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 28. Nowadays more and more people are prying into
matters that should remain personal and private. |
| 1 2 3 5 6 7 | 29. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans
was tame compared to some of the goings on in
this country, even in places where people might
least expect it. |

PLEASE NOTE:

Pages 72-78, "Tennessee Scale",
©1965 by William F. Fitts not
microfilmed at request of author.
Available for consultation at
Michigan State University Library.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

TENNESSEE SCALE

Instructions

The statements in this booklet are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any item! Read each statement carefully; then select one of the five responses listed below. On your answer sheet, put a circle around the response you chose.

As you start, be sure that your answer sheet and this booklet are lined up evenly so that the item numbers match each other.

Remember, put a circle around the response number you have chosen for each statement.

	Completely	Mostly	Partly false	Mostly	Completely
Responses:	false	false	and	true	true
			partly true		
	1	2	3	4	5

You will find these response numbers repeated at the bottom of each page to help you remember them.

	<u>Item No.</u>
1. I have a healthy body	1
3. I am an attractive person	3
5. I consider myself a sloppy person	5
19. I am a decent sort of person	19
21. I am an honest person	21
23. I am a bad person	23
37. I am a cheerful person	37
39. I am a calm and easy going person	39
41. I am a nobody	41
55. I have a family that would always help in any kind of trouble	55
57. I am a member of a happy family	57
59. My friends have no confidence in me	59
73. I am a friendly person	73
75. I am popular with men	75
77. I am not interested in what other people do	77
91. I do not always tell the truth	91
93. I get angry sometimes	93

Responses:	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Item No.</u>
2. I like to look nice and neat all the time	2
4. I am full of aches and pains	4
6. I am a sick person	6
20. I am a religious person	20
22. I am a moral failure	22
24. I am a morally weak person	24
38. I have a lot of self-control	38
40. I am a hateful person	40
42. I am losing my mind	42
56. I am an important person to my friends and family	56
58. I am not loved by my family	58
60. I feel that my family doesn't trust me	60
74. I am popular with women	74
76. I am mad at the whole world	76
78. I am hard to be friendly with	78
92. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about ...	92
94. Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross	94

Responses:	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Item No.</u>
7. I am neither too fat nor too thin	7
9. I like my looks just the way they are	9
11. I would like to change some parts of my body	11
25. I am satisfied with my moral behavior	25
27. I am satisfied with my relationship to God	27
29. I ought to go to church more	29
43. I am satisfied to be just what I am	43
45. I am just as nice as I should be	45
47. I despise myself	47
61. I am satisfied with my family relationships	61
63. I understand my family as well as I should	63
65. I should trust my family more	65
79. I am as sociable as I want to be	79
81. I try to please others, but I don't overdo it	81
83. I am no good at all from a social standpoint	83
95. I do not like everyone I know	95
97. Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke	97

	Completely	Mostly	Partly false	Mostly	Completely
	false	false	and	true	true
Responses:			partly true		
	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Item No.</u>
8. I am neither too tall nor too short	8
10. I don't feel as well as I should	10
12. I should have more sex appeal	12
26. I am as religious as I want to be	26
28. I wish I could be more trustworthy	28
30. I shouldn't tell so many lies	30
44. I am as smart as I want to be	44
46. I am not the person I would like to be	46
48. I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do	48
62. I treat my parents as well as I should (Use past tense if parents are not living)	62
64. I am too sensitive to things my family say	64
66. I should love my family more	66
80. I am satisfied with the way I treat other people	80
82. I should be more polite to others	82
84. I ought to get along better with other people	84
96. I gossip a little at times	96
98. At times I feel like swearing	98

Responses:	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Item No.</u>
13. I take good care of myself physically	13
15. I try to be careful about my appearance	15
17. I often act like I am "all thumbs"	17
31. I am true to my religion in my everyday life	31
33. I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong	33
35. I sometimes do very bad things	35
49. I can always take care of myself in any situation	49
51. I take the blame for things without getting mad	51
53. I do things without thinking about them first	53
67. I try to play fair with my friends and family	67
69. I take a real interest in my family	69
71. I give in to my parents. (Use past tense if parents are not living)	71
85. I try to understand the other fellow's point of view	85
87. I get along well with other people	87
89. I do not forgive others easily	89
99. I would rather win than lose in a game	99

Responses:	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Item No.</u>
14. I feel good most of the time	14
16. I do poorly in sports and games	16
18. I am a poor sleeper	18
32. I do what is right most of the time	32
34. I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead	34
36. I have trouble doing the things that are right	36
50. I solve my problems quite easily	50
52. I change my mind a lot	52
54. I try to run away from my problems	54
68. I do my share of work at home	68
70. I quarrel with my family	70
72. I do not act like my family thinks I should	72
86. I see good points in all the people I meet	86
88. I do not feel at ease with other people	88
90. I find it hard to talk with strangers	90
100. Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today	100

	Completely	Mostly	Partly false	Mostly	Completely
Responses:	false	false	and	true	true
			partly true		
	1	2	3	4	5

PREFERRED QUALITIES OF CHILDREN

Instructions

After reading completely through the qualities or characteristics of children, as listed below, assign number "1" to the quality or attribute which you believe would be the most desirable quality in this list for an 8 year-old child. Then assign "2" to the attribute which you regard as second most important, "3" to the third most important and so on until you have assigned a number to all ten of these listed qualities. You may, of course, change your mind or correct any assigned numbers as you go along. Please assign a number to each of these ten attributes, even if you find it quite difficult to make some choices. No tie scores, please.

<u>BOY</u>		<u>GIRL</u>
_____	Responsible and Trustworthy	_____ A
_____	Neat and Clean	_____ B
_____	Curious	_____ C
_____	Interacts Well with Others	_____ D
_____	Considerate and Cooperative	_____ E
_____	Assertive and Self-Reliant	_____ F
_____	Able to Make Friends	_____ G
_____	Respectful Toward Adults	_____ H
_____	Fun-Loving and Carefree	_____ I
_____	Imaginative and Creative	_____ J

FAMILY DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

Married or Single _____ Birthdate _____
mo. yr. date Age _____

[illegible]

Last Grade Completed

Religion:	You	Mother	Father
-----------	-----	--------	--------

Denomination _____

Attendance--check one:

- | | | | | |
|-----|---|-------|-------|-------|
| (a) | active church
worker; dedicated
parishioner | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| (b) | regular church
attender; as faithful
as most others | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| (c) | show expected
patterns; not much
real involvement | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| (d) | "given up"--but haven't
joined other church ... | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Father's Job--check one:

- (a) professional, proprietor or executive of large organization _____
- (b) proprietor or executive of smaller organization _____
- (c) independent "neighborhood" businessman _____
- (d) office worker _____
- (e) skilled worker _____
- (f) semi-skilled worker _____
- (g) unskilled worker _____

Father's Education--check one:

- (a) graduate work or professional school _____
- (b) college graduate _____
- (c) 1-3 years of college _____
- (d) business college graduate _____
- (e) high school graduate _____
- (f) 10-11 years of school _____
- (g) 7-9 years of school _____
- (h) less than 7 years of school _____

Are your parents:

Married and living together? _____

Separated or divorced? (Date) .. _____

Deceased? (Date) _____

Approximate hometown population ... _____

Would you call it urban or rural? ... _____

Description of father's occupation:

RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND

Please use this page to describe freely how your religious orientation or background has influenced you in relating to the world around you and the people in it. Do some features of your religious training seem of great importance to you? If so, what are they? Does this orientation influence your ways of evaluating or relating to others? If so, how? How pleased or dissatisfied are you with this religious background? These are some of the issues which your response might include, but please express your thoughts as freely as possible without regard to language or style of expression.

APPENDIX III

SUMMARY OF SCORES

S	Proj.	Denom.	M or S	F	Mosher				Tennessee			Child		S-Econ.	Age	Religiosity			U or R	Parochial Education		Essay Rating
					M	S	H	T	SC	P+N	T/F	B	G			S	M	F		Age	Yrs.	
1		Prot.		127	- 9	-27	- 6	- 42	34	296	1.59	25	28	3.10	18-11	d	d	d	R			d
2		Cath.		72	-13	-33	+22	- 24	34	353	1.00	8	8	0.94	19-8	b	a	0	U			c
3	X	Cath.		111	-10	-20	- 4	- 34	39	256	1.52	24	32	2.10	19-7	b	a	c	U	6-18	(12) Cath.	c
4	X	Meth.		105	+ 7	-23	+ 2	- 14	40	270	1.24	8	32	1.38	19-7	c	b	b	U			b
5	X	Cath.		127	-16	- 5	- 9	- 30	43	251	1.38	20	19	1.38	19-10	c	a	b	U	6-16	(10) Cath.	a
6	X	Presby.		104	- 1	- 5	-18	- 24	44	339	0.95	29	34	1.16	18-10	a	a	a	U			b
7		Meth.		114	- 2	-16	+15	- 3	39	353	1.02	20	15	1.38	19-1	a	c	b	U			a
8		None		86	- 2	-34	+10	- 26	43	277	1.21	6	10	0.58	18-4	0	0	0	U			0
9		Cath.		93	+12	+11	+25	+48	46	326	0.89	30	25	2.90	20-10	c	c	0	U	6-14	(8) Cath.	d
10		Cath.		124	+ 7	+22	- 6	+23	39	285	1.45	21	30	1.60	18-5	b	b	c	U	6-13	(7) Cath.	c
11		Presby.		125	+16	- 2	+ 7	+21	41	287	1.31	26	33	1.16	18-2	d	c	d	R			d
12		Cath.		110	+22	+ 7	+ 5	+ 34	40	271	1.46	19	34	1.60	20-3	b	b	c	U	5-11	(6) Cath.	b
13	X	Cath.		119	- 7	-15	+ 2	- 20	42	296	1.10	17	31	0.94	19-1	b	a	b	R	14-18	(4)	b
14		Cath.		139	-10	- 5	+ 5	- 10	43	325	1.02	37	37	3.26	20-2	b	b	b	U	5-17	(12) Cath.	a
15	X	Cath.		121	+ 7	+ 4	+ 3	+ 14	32	288	1.86	36	36	2.68	19-9	c	b	b	U	6-18	(12) Cath.	b
16		Cath.	M	97	-10	-25	- 4	- 39	30	353	1.15	13	15	2.26	19-9	0	c	c	U			0
17		Cath.		92	-28	-35	-39	-102	40	351	1.08	23	27	2.46	18-0	c	a	a	U	9-17	(8) Cath.	d
18		Cath.		125	+24	+13	+ 6	+43	43	309	0.84	33	32	2.46	19-4	b	a	a	U	6-18	(12) Cath.	a
19		Cath.		139	- 8	+ 4	+ 8	+ 4	33	351	1.03	33	38	1.60	20-3	c	a	b	U	7-14	(7) Cath.	a
20		Jew.		78	-15	-36	- 4	- 55	42	330	0.64	8	8	1.96	19-2	c	c	b	U	(4) Heb.		c
21		Prot.		139	+25	+16	+42	+ 83	39	366	0.98	34	34	1.38	20-0	b	b	b	R			a
22		Cath.		96	+ 6	+ 2	+ 1	+ 9	37	311	0.64	24	23	1.60	18-8	c	a	a	U	15-18	(4) Cath.	c
23	X	Cath.		84	-28	-31	-21	- 80	35	344	0.82	27	32	3.26	19-11	d	b	b	U	7	(1) Cath.	d
24		Cath.		140	+11	+24	-11	+ 24	39	395	0.80	37	37	2.68	20-2	c	b	b	U	6-14	(8) Cath.	d
25		Cath.		119	+37	+27	+37	+101	25	382	1.34	33	38	2.04	20-11	b	b	b	R			b
26		None		56	+19	-33	0	- 14	35	236	0.82	8	8	4.06	18-5	d	c	d	U			d
27	X	Cath.		139	+25	-25	+28	+ 28	29	284	0.79	30	25	1.74	18-9	b	b	c	U			a
28		Congreg.		71	-22	-43	-18	- 83	42	308	0.69	12	18	1.16	20-5	d	c	d	5-16U 16-20R			d
29		Meth.		158	+23	+15	+39	+ 77	32	317	0.89	14	23	2.32	19-6	c	d	d	R			c
30		Cath.		94	-28	-37	- 7	- 72	40	320	1.38	3	23	1.74	20-7	d	c	d	U			d

S	Proj.	Denom.	M or S	Mosher			Tennessee		Child		S-Econ.	Age	Religiosity		U or R	Parochial Education		Essay Rating
				M	S	H	T	SC	P+N	T/F			S	M		Age	Yrs. Rel.	
31	X	Cath.	134	-11	-34	-23	-68	37	392	1.21	2.68	20-8	c	a	a	14-18	(4) Cath.	c
32		Luth.	109	-1	-1	+25	+23	39	315	0.79	1.38	17-10	b	a	b			c
33		Jew.	75	+31	+20	+37	+88	26	264	1.00	0.80	18-7	d	c	d			d
34		Prot.	107	+23	+10	+35	+68	40	286	0.92	1.60	18-8	b	b	b			a
35		Buddhist	140	+26	+19	+15	+60	36	299	0.76	2.04	18-10	c	c	b			0
36		Prot.	114	+15	+6	+12	+33	39	341	0.82	1.38	18-7	b	b	b			c
37		Cath.	81	+18	+5	+6	+29	31	351	1.03	1.38	18-4	d	c	a	5-17	(12) Cath.	c
38		Presby.	91	+25	+32	+34	+91	29	326	0.89	2.10	19-10	a	c	c			a
39		Christian Scientist	113	-9	-27	+22	-14	35	300	2.44	0.58	18-10	c	b	c			b
40		Cath.	133	-9	0	+13	+4	32	327	0.91	1.38	19-0	d	b	b	7-18	(12) Cath.	c
41		Jew.	92	-24	-26	+13	-37	46	281	1.18	2.46	18-3	d	a	a			d
42		Presby.	122	+16	-21	+7	+2	31	300	1.40	2.40	19-2	c	a	c			c
43	X	Cath.	117	+23	+16	-2	+37	39	284	1.00	2.32	19-0	b	b	b	6-17	(12) Cath.	c
44		Cath.	151	-17	+14	+4	+1	40	307	1.26	1.90	18-11	d	d	d			c
45	X	Cath.	104	+1	-12	-15	-26	39	327	0.97	1.60	19-6	c	a	a	6-12	(6) Cath.	d
46	X	Jew.	116	-13	-13	-4	-30	39	313	1.18	1.60	19-8	c	b	b			d
47		Armenian Orthodox	118	+3	-1	+7	+9	33	329	0.91	0.58	18-2	c	b	c			c
48		Church of Christ	106	+25	+26	+28	+79	25	396	1.02	1.60	19-6	b	a	b			c
49		Presby.	136	+6	-17	+5	-6	35	361	1.00	2.54	19-1	d	b	c			c
50		Prot.	103	-31	-42	-25	-98	43	317	0.92	1.16	18-9	b	b	b			b
51		None	120	+6	-1	-24	-19	39	337	0.94	2.10	18-9	0	0	0			0
52		Prot.	138	+31	+32	+14	+77	45	360	1.00	1.88	18-3	b	b	b			b
53		Meth.	116	+23	-6	+42	+59	43	250	1.79	2.68	18-7	c	d	d			b
54		Prot.	111	+25	+26	+31	+82	34	313	1.24	2.90	18-9	a	a	a			b
55		Presby.	101	+11	-17	+15	+9	41	308	0.97	0.94	18-10	c	b	a			c
56	X	Cath.	109	+20	+25	+32	+77	42	332	1.31	1.38	18-7	b	b	b	6-17	(12) Cath.	a
57		Cath.	98	-20	-11	+13	-18	40	341	0.88	2.54	18-6	b	b	b	6-13	(8) Cath.	b
58		Jew.	109	+5	-6	-7	-8	31	314	1.13	1.82	18-8	c	c	c			c
59		Cath.	96	-1	+4	+8	+11	40	305	0.80	2.90	18-2	c	b	b	6-17	(12) Cath.	c
60		Cath.	144	+7	+15	+15	+37	39	324	1.06	1.60	18-6	c	b	b	6-17	(12) Cath.	b

S	Proj.	Denom.	M or S	F	Mosher				Tennessee			Child		S-Econ.	Age	Religiosity			U or R	Parochial Education		Essay Rating
					M	S	H	T	SC	P+N	T/F	B	G			S	M	F		Age	Yrs. Rel.	
61	X	Luth.		131	+ 9	-19	+ 5	- 5	44	300	1.81	23	30	2.32	19-6	c	c	c	R			c
62		Luth.		162	+28	+16	+ 5	+ 49	34	343	1.68	37	39	1.02	18-7	a	a	a	U			a
63		Jew.		123	-28	-36	-18	- 82	46	322	1.26	9	17	1.96	18-5	d	c	c	U		9-13 (4) Heb.	c
64		Prot.		124	+36	+15	+23	+ 74	41	329	1.24	29	31	1.66	18-8	b	a	a	U			c
65	X	Presby.		140	+30	+21	+36	+ 87	40	315	1.56	19	25	1.38	18-10	c	a	a	U			c
66		Luth.		139	+20	+25	+23	+ 68	37	296	0.96	8	28	3.12	18-2	c	c	c	U			b
67		Luth.		95	+ 9	-19	-13	- 23	42	308	1.61	15	25	2.32	18-0	d	a	c	U			d
68		Presby.		115	+15	-20	+29	+ 24	42	324	1.21	23	39	0.94	18-7	c	a	b	U			c
69		Christian		109	+25	+34	+13	+ 72	35	332	1.30	12	27	0.94	20-10	a	b	0	U			a
70		None		116	- 7	-16	-10	- 33	37	305	1.54	28	37	2.10	18-10	0	0	0	U			0
71	X	Cath.		96	+19	+18	- 7	+ 30	35	407	0.88	19	16	3.34	18-10	b	a	b	U		6-18 (12) Cath.	b
72	X	Luth.		105	+31	- 9	+33	+ 55	38	270	1.12	21	33	2.32	18-2	c	c	d	U			b
73		Jew.		135	-17	-36	- 7	- 60	39	354	1.00	20	28	1.96	18-9	c	c	c	U			c
74		Latter Day Saints		118	+10	-27	+ 4	- 13	36	327	1.38	9	5	2.68	18-10	a	a	d	U			a
75		Cath.		136	+20	+33	+ 5	+ 58	26	386	0.95	28	33	1.60	18-0	b	b	b	U			a
76		Prot.		126	+36	+16	+10	+ 62	50	343	0.86	26	31	0.80	18-8	b	b	b	U			b
77		Cath.		158	+20	+ 3	+ 4	+ 27	34	358	1.69	28	30	2.10	19-1	b	a	a	U			b
78		Luth.		116	+ 9	- 5	+ 7	+ 11	40	339	0.95	17	33	2.54	19-8	c	d	d	U			c
79		Jew.		123	-13	+ 4	-18	- 27	37	307	1.44	29	39	3.40	18-7	c	c	c	U			c
80	X	Jew.	M	109	+10	-14	+14	+ 10	33	306	1.07	16	17	0.58	18-1	c	a	c	U			c
81		Meth.		122	+19	+20	+24	+ 63	34	283	0.88	11	23	1.96	18-11	c	c	c	R			c
82		Meth.		121	-13	-40	-21	- 74	46	302	0.78	29	39	0.58	20-3	c	b	c	U			c
83		Bapt.		131	+16	+22	+20	+ 58	28	347	1.06	26	26	2.90	18-2	a	a	a	U			a
84		Meth.		123	+33	+ 8	+45	+ 86	40	334	1.20	23	28	0.58	18-6	b	b	b	R			b
85		Bapt.		127	+28	+ 4	+16	+ 48	37	324	0.94	37	37	3.04	19-10	b	b	b	R			b
86		Luth.		133	+32	+26	+31	+ 89	25	398	1.23	34	34	2.40	18-5	a	a	a	R		9-13 (5) Luth.	a
87		Luth.		104	+ 5	-15	- 8	- 18	36	339	0.90	26	28	0.58	18-7	d	a	c	U			c
88	X	Cath.		107	-14	-23	-27	- 64	43	297	0.91	12	41	2.54	18-2	c	b	d	U		9-10 (2) Cath.	c
89		Prot.		90	- 4	+ 5	-16	- 15	43	364	1.00	13	39	1.38	18-10	c	c	c	U			0
90	X	Bapt.		109	- 9	-33	-12	- 54	42	245	0.84	13	34	2.10	19-7	d	c	c	U			d

S	Proj.	Denom.	M or S	F	Mosher				Tennessee			Child		S-Econ.	Age	Religiosity			U or R	Parochial Education		Essay Rating	
					M	S	H	T	SC	P+N	T/F	B	G			S	M	F		Age	Yrs.		Rel.
91		Cath.		97	+18	+22	+7	+47	33	307	0.88	15	19	0.80	18-7	b	a	a	U	6-18	(12)	Cath.	b
92	X	Cath.		126	+24	+37	+17	+78	38	315	1.44	32	30	1.02	18-7	b	a	a	U	7-18	(12)	Cath.	b
93		Cath.		100	+4	-34	-8	-38	38	296	0.64	11	17	3.04	18-8	c	b	c	U	6-14	(8)	Cath.	c
94		Cath.		110	-5	-11	-3	-19	50	323	1.72	30	31	1.74	19-5	c	a	c	R	13	(1)	Cath.	0
95	X	Cath.		111	+5	+7	+18	+30	34	363	1.11	13	18	1.88	18-11	b	b	b	U				c
96		Luth.		100	+24	-9	+41	+74	35	312	1.07	35	37	1.46	19-9	c	c	c	U				c
97		Cath.		112	+4	+14	-30	-12	37	303	1.20	17	20	0.94	19-0	d	b	d	U	6-18	(12)	Cath.	c
98		Cath.		80	+16	+11	+18	+45	40	334	1.17	19	28	2.68	18-6	a	b	c	U	6-17	(12)	Cath.	c
99		Luth.		126	+9	-6	0	+3	37	300	1.03	22	28	2.68	18-4	b	b	b	R				d
100	X	Cath.		90	-29	-28	-11	-68	47	283	0.66	6	11	2.68	18-2	c	a	a	U	5-17	(12)	Cath.	c
101		Presby.		95	+25	-10	+36	+51	29	359	0.83	22	28	1.16	19-9	b	b	b	U				c
102		Cath.		97	+14	+8	+12	+34	39	296	1.41	17	30	2.32	19-1	b	b	b	U				c
103	X	Cath.		113	-2	-15	+10	-7	31	327	1.80	14	37	2.32	18-11	c	a	b	U	7-18	(12)	Cath.	d
104	X	Cath.		141	+17	+3	-4	+16	26	324	1.04	34	31	2.68	19-4	b	a	b	R	6-14	(8)	Cath.	b
105	X	Meth.		115	+1	-25	+14	-10	42	277	0.94	24	24	0.58	18-4	c	c	c	U				b
106		Cath.		105	+12	+6	+4	+22	39	271	0.81	15	34	2.90	18-4	c	b	b	U				a
107		Cath.		105	-4	-20	+12	-12	37	353	1.26	39	39	2.90	18-4	c	b	b	U				a
108		Presby.		102	-7	-40	-10	-57	37	344	1.33	14	25	0.80	19-0	c	c	c	U				b
109	X	Luth.		123	-1	-22	-12	-35	42	288	1.07	12	12	3.04	18-9	d	a	b	R	12-14	(3)	Luth.	c
110		Cath.		81	-16	-12	+9	-19	40	337	1.21	7	39	3.18	18-7	d	c	d	U				0
111		Cath.		106	+17	+33	+23	+73	39	313	0.85	34	34	2.40	19-5	b	b	b	U	6-14	(8)	Cath.	b
112	X	Cath.		70	-6	-25	+29	-2	39	315	0.91	13	23	1.60	19-1	d	a	a	U	8-18	(11)	Cath.	0
113		Episc.		121	-12	-36	+7	-41	43	243	1.00	23	36	3.04	19-0	d	b	c	U				d
114	X	Presby.		109	-8	-24	-23	-55	40	308	1.89	19	27	2.32	18-6	b	a	a	U				c
115	X	Presby		129	+12	-26	+20	+6	37	332	1.03	9	24	1.16	18-10	c	b	b	U				b
116	X	Cath.		122	+6	+1	+9	+16	40	310	1.56	5	30	2.68	18-8	a	a	a	U	6-18	(12)	Cath.	c
117		Meth.		103	+5	+7	+4	+16	41	349	0.73	39	39	0.94	20-3	c	a	a	R	11-14	(3)	Meth.	c
118		Cath.		131	0	+19	+17	+36	37	335	0.79	13	37	1.24	18-2	b	a	b	U				c
119		Episc.		109	+13	-9	+30	+34	36	310	1.64	23	32	1.88	18-4	c	b	c	U				c
120		Meth.		68	-9	-36	0	-45	39	317	1.00	5	8	0.94	19-0	d	c	a	U				d

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293105437416