

INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again -- beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
A Xerox Education Company

73-14,380

MUÑOZ, John A., 1942-
THE RELATIONSHIP OF DENIAL-OF-COMPLEX-FEELINGS,
AND REPRESSION-SENSITIZATION TO BEHAVIOR IN A
WHITE, NON-PREJUDICED POPULATION.

The City University of New York, Ph.D., 1973
Psychology, clinical

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

The Relationship of Denial-Of-Complex-
Feelings, And Repression-Sensitization
To Behavior In A White, Non-Prejudiced
Population

by

John A. Munoz

A dissertation submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Psychology in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York.

1972

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

January 12, 1973
date

Savran L. Pottin
Chairman of Examining Committee

January 16, 1973
date

Florence L. D'Annunzio
Executive Officer

Harold Wilensky, Ph.D.

Mary Collins, Ph.D.

Supervisory Committee

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have
indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

Acknowledgements

I am extremely grateful to many people for their guidance, encouragement, and assistance in the course of this study.

I am especially grateful to Dr. Lawrence Plotkin who has seen me through the many difficult obstacles which have come up in this study. His guidance, enthusiasm, and support are truly appreciated.

Dr. Harold Wilensky was especially helpful during the initial planning stages. His continued support, encouragement, and assistance, also, deserve special thanks.

Dr. Mary Collins' enthusiasm and guidance in the early stages, and her continuous support in the more difficult times will always be remembered.

The Graduate Faculty in the Clinical Psychology Program will always be remembered fondly and with appreciation for their concern and involvement.

The students who took part in the study were inspiring not only because of their dedication to the pursuit of knowledge, but, also, because so many evidenced a desire to break down existing racial barriers.

Special thanks are due the citizens of the City of New York who support a free higher education system. This made

it possible for me to get an education.

Finally, I am deeply grateful to my wife, Mona, because her love, patience, and advice not only made the dissertation possible and bearable, but helped the writer keep it in its proper relation to other, more important, goals.

Special mention, also, to John and Susan, my children, for helping me to play and keep my mind off the dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION 1

Consistency of behavior and ethnic attitudes (1)--
 Inconsistency between behavior and attitudes (3)--Study
 of the intervening variables (6)--The tolerant personality
 (12)--Denial-of-Complex Feelings (20)-Repression-Sensitiza-
 tion (29)--Development of RS scale (31)--Parental Antecedents
 (33)--Social desirability and the RS scale (35)--Adjustments
 and the RS scale (35)--Conclusions of Repression-Sensitiza-
 tion (36)--Statement of hypotheses (38)

CHAPTER II. METHOD 39

Subjects (39)--Instruments and their administration (40)--
 Telephone contact with tolerant students (42)--Recording
 and analysis of telephone conversation (44)--Group Meeting
 (44)--Behavioral measures (45)

CHAPTER III. RESULTS 46

Hypothesis I (46)--Hypothesis II (46)--Repression-Sensitiza-
 tion and general prejudice (53)--Analysis of response on
 phone (55)

CHAPTER IV. DISCUSSION 60

Repression-Sensitization and Denial-of-Complex-Feelings
 (60)--Personality variables and behavior (61)--Differences
 of previous studies (62)--Demand characteristics (64)--The
 tolerant personality (67)--Significant results (68)

APPENDIX I 72

APPENDIX II 93

APPENDIX III 96

BIBLIOGRAPHY 102

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of Tolerant Subjects on Repression-Sensitization and Denial-of-Complex-Feelings(N=118)	47
2. Signing Statement as a Function of Level of Denial-of-Complex-Feelings: Chi-Square Analysis.	49
3. Agreement to Attend on Phone as Function of DCF Scores: Chi-Square Analysis	51
4. Attendance After Agreeing to Attend as a Function of DCF Scores: Chi-Square Analysis	52
5. Attendance vs. non-Attendance as a Function of DCF Scores: Chi-Square Analysis.	54
6. Agreement to Attend on Phone as Function of General Prejudice Scores: Chi-Square Analysis .	56
7. Attendance as a Function of the Immediate Response of Those Who Agreed to Attend: Chi-Square Analysis	57
8. Attendance of Subjects That Agreed to Attend on the Phone as a Function of Whether They Expressed Reservations on Phone: Chi-Square Analysis . .	59

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The present study seeks to explore the personality link between expressed racial attitudes and overt behavior. It will focus solely on subjects who express unprejudiced attitudes toward blacks but who differ along a personality dimension, the denial-of-complex-feelings towards blacks. It is hypothesized that there will be a direct relationship between denial-of-complex-feelings and overt behavior consistent with expressed racial attitudes. It is also hypothesized that the denial-of-complex-feelings will be related to the repression-sensitization dimension. The following sections of this chapter will review the relevant areas of ethnic prejudice, consistency of behavior and the tolerant personality, the characteristics of the tolerant personality, the measure of prejudice, and repression-sensitization.

Consistency of behavior and ethnic attitudes

Allport (1954) points out that man has a natural propensity towards prejudice because he is always forming generalizations, concepts and categories whose content is really an oversimplification of experience. His definition

of prejudice is typical of most: "Ethnic prejudice is an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization." (p.11). Harding, et al (1954) define it as "... a tendency or cluster of tendencies to react in negative or unfavorable ways to another individual or to a group of other individuals." (p.1002). They regard the problem of the relationship between intergroup attitudes and intergroup behavior as a crucial one and bemoan the fact that so little has been done. In addressing the problem of consistency between expressed attitudes and behavior, they call for a greater differentiation of those individuals that express prejudiced attitudes.

An investigation of the tolerant personality may give us just as much insight into the problem of consistency. Unfortunately, we can learn little about the tolerant personality by turning to the literature. We know less about tolerance than intolerance (Allport 1954). Blumer's (1958) comprehensive review makes clear that a great part of the search focuses on the measurement of attitudes, and also, their relation to behavior with little focus, however, on the tolerant personality. Even such classic and in-depth studies as Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson and Sanford (1950), and Bettelheim and Janowitz (1964 & 1965) pay relatively little attention to the tolerant personality, though we will see later that their articulations of the tolerant personality are the most complete to be found in any scientific studies.

There have been many studies in the areas of racial attitudes that have shown that such attitudes are not reasonably valid guides for predicting behavior (LaPiere, 1934; Kutner, Wilkins & Yarrow, 1952; Brookover & Holland, 1952; DeFries & Ford, 1968; Fendrich, 1967; Warner & DeFleur, 1969). Intervening situational variables must be taken into account. Such interactional concepts as norms, roles, group memberships, reference groups, social distance and social constraint and subcultures pose contingent conditions which can affect the predictability of behavior from attitudes. First, we will review some of the classic studies that established the fact that there is a discrepancy between attitudes and behavior, and then the ones that try to explore the intervening variables that may account for this.

Inconsistency between behavior and attitudes

LaPiere (1934) made a tour of the United States with a Chinese couple. They were accommodated by 250 restaurants, hotels and similar types of establishments. They were refused service only once because of race. Afterwards, LaPiere sent a letter and a questionnaire to all the establishments that they had visited. Basically, he asked for a statement of policy regarding the accommodation of Chinese clients. Over 90% said that they had a policy of non-acceptance.

Kutner, Wilkins, and Yarrow (1952) conducted a

similar study in which three young women (two white and one black) went into eleven restaurants in a fashionable, Northeastern, suburban community. The two white women would go in first and then the black woman would follow, saying that she belonged to a party already seated. In all cases, they were treated with utmost courtesy. Two weeks later, letters were sent out trying to make reservations for a social affair which would include blacks. None of the restaurant managers answered this letter. An attempt to make the reservation by 'phone also failed, but many of the managers were uncomfortable and avoided giving a categorical no. It may be concluded that in a direct and personal face-to-face confrontation, discriminatory treatment is minimized.

In another field study (Lohman & Reitzes, 1954), 151 residents of an urban neighborhood were selected. They were also members of a union which had a clear and well implemented policy of granting blacks complete equality on the job. At the same time, the neighborhood was predominantly white and actively resisting black penetration by means of a property owners association. The subjects were involved in both organizations. Each of the organizations provided the members with a set of well-formulated reasons and justifications, norms and beliefs which could be used as guides to action when specific action opportunities occurred. High involvement in the collective existence of the neighborhood (e.g., membership

in various groups) was highly related to rejection of blacks in the neighborhood; in the same way, high involvement in the activities of the union was related to high acceptance of blacks on the job. However, acceptance or rejection of blacks did not generalize across organizations

A dissociated quality, a lack of ability or willingness to reconcile discrepant beliefs when it came to race were also evident in a survey in a small Midwestern community (Brookover & Holland, 1952). The members of this town persistently expressed highly intolerant views although they could only have had the most minimal of contacts with Jews or blacks. The specific situation seemed to be what determined behavior. For example, there were some people who scored as quite tolerant on an attitude scale and, in fact, were actively tolerant and had gained rights for blacks in a particular situation; however, in other situations they expressed anti-minority opinions and acted on them within the context of belonging to some group. The authors conclude:

"... It is impossible to predict from a knowledge of verbal expressions by Maple County respondents how the same respondent will behave toward specific members of a minority group. The particularity of situation, role, and specificity of image all lead to this inability to predict in Maple County. For adequate prediction it would be necessary to know the specific images which the majority people have for the minority persons or groups and in what

specific types of situations
behavior is likely to occur."
(p.202)

Study of the intervening variables

DeFleur & Westie (1958) selected two groups of undergraduate students. One group highly rejected blacks on an attitude scale, and the other showed little rejection. As part of some related research, these subjects had been asked to tell stories to photo slides of interracial couples. They had to give projective interpretations of what was happening in the pictures - all of which portrayed neutral scenes. The subjects were told that another set of photographs were needed. Were they willing to be photographed with a black of the opposite sex?

Regardless of their answer, they were then given a "standard photograph release agreement" and asked to sign their name next to each use that they would permit to be made of their photos. These uses ranged through 7 alternatives, from use for laboratory experiments where they would be seen only by professional sociologists to use in a nationwide publicity campaign advocating racial integration. Some prejudiced subjects signed all without hesitation; and, some unprejudiced signed none.

Since for the present study, the writer is only interested in discrepant behavior of unprejudiced or low prejudice subjects, no further consideration of, nor discussion

of the prejudiced subjects will take place, unless necessary to illustrate a point about low prejudice subjects. Nine of twenty-three low prejudice subjects acted in a discrepant manner. That is, they tended not to sign. Seventy-two percent of all the subjects admitted that before signing a particular person or group did come to mind. DeFleur and Westie conclude that the beliefs of an individual about the attitudes, norms and values held by his reference groups, significant others, peer groups, and the like may be important determinants of behavior.

DeFriesse & Ford (1968) interviewed 400 whites, in a middle class urban neighborhood. This was in a border state where open occupancy had become a bitter controversy. No blacks had been able to move into such neighborhoods. All the interviewees took a test to measure their attitudes and were asked to sign either one of two statements: one was a public declaration of willingness to have blacks as neighbors and to support such a movement, the other was a declaration against such a possibility. The subjects were told that the investigators would feel free to use it in any way "... we wish, including publicizing through news media." The least prejudiced were more likely to sign for open occupancy than the more prejudiced; however, the results which interest us were that the least prejudiced were as likely to sign the statement for open

occupancy as to sign the statement against.

According to the subjects, their reference groups were of little importance. However, they were asked to indicate what their reference groups thought about open occupancy. When these results were looked into, it was apparent that what a subject thought the reference groups thought about open occupancy was as good a predictor of how he would act as the attitudes he had expressed. The subjects were unconscious of, or unwilling to admit the power that these groups (immediate family, co-workers, neighbors, etc.) had over their behavior. Using a combination of influence of reference groups and attitudes, it was found that behavior could be more accurately predicted than using only one of the measures.

DeFries & Ford's (1968) method would seem to be superior to DeFleur & Westie's in the sense that signature of the document is not a commitment for future behavior, but as soon as the investigators walk out of the door, the signee is on the hook; there is no future opportunity for backing out. Of the 114 least prejudiced subjects only 14 were willing to sign the statement for, 13 signed the statement against, and 87 refused to sign any statement.

Fendrich (1967) investigated the relationships between reference group support, racial attitudes, and observed behavior. He ascertained his subjects' attitudes toward blacks, and also, how they thought some reference groups (closest)

friends of the same sex, opposite sex, roomates or spouse, parents, and older person that they respected) would behave toward blacks in several situations. The subjects were asked whether they were willing to attend small group discussions (scheduled for the near future) with members of the campus chapter of the NAACP. Before the scheduled meeting, the subjects were again contacted, this time over the 'phone by an NAACP representative, to determine whether they still intended to go. Their answers were recorded; it was also noted whether they actually went, and whether they agreed to go to any subsequent meetings. Those that went so far as to agree to go when contacted by the NAACP representative, were regarded as showing behavior consistent with their low prejudice attitudes, and those that refused at this stage, or a previous one, were regarded as acting in a manner discrepant with their attitudes. Of those with favorable racial attitudes (96 in all) only 28 agreed to go. Of these 28, 25 had strong reference group support, 3 had weak. It was concluded at a level of statistical significance that the low prejudiced that had strong reference group support were more likely to show consistent behavior than those that had weak support. However, it should be noted that of the 64 subjects that had low prejudice and strong reference group support, 39 did not show consistent behavior. It had been established here, and in other studies (Linn, 1965; Warner &

DeFleur, 1969), that reference groups are important. However, it is apparent that these 39 may very well have been influenced by some other factor.

Lindzey (1950) states that we should not expect one single factor to explain prejudice:

"... with each of the two groups there was sufficient variation in both personality factors and general background factors to imply that consideration of a multiplicity of factors would be necessary to enable adequate prediction." (p.32)

The question of attitudes and overt behavior must be approached in a way that recognizes the complexity of the situation, and that avoids generalization.

Linn (1965) proposed that the attitude scale and the behavioral measure must be directly comparable. If the behavioral measure is the level of signed agreement to pose for a picture with a black, then the attitude scale must have similar items in it. He administered racial attitude questionnaires to his subjects, which included 7 items which inquired whether they were willing to be photographed with a black of the opposite sex. These items were identical to DeFleur & Westie's items for the "standard photograph release agreement". Four weeks later, they were asked to volunteer for the construction of a TAT revolving around interracial couples, and to sign the "standard photograph release agreement". They were then asked

to make an appointment for a picture-taking session. Though 50% expressed a high willingness to be photographed when the items were presented as part of an attitude scale, only 8% actually agreed to go through with it when the situation was real.

Warner & DeFleur (1969) ascertained the racial attitudes of their subjects by administering a "Public Information Questionnaire" dealing with such topics as, war, poverty, politics, blacks, etc. The purpose of the questionnaire was therefore disguised. The subjects were subsequently sent a letter asking them to sign a pledge committing them to engage in one activity involving a black. There were six different versions of this letter: the varieties of behavior ranged from contributing money to a black organization to dating a black. Three of these activities could be done without reducing social distance between black and white, the other three threatened the maintenance of the established rules of social distance. Half of all the subjects, were told that their decision would be made public, and half that it would be held in strict confidence.

It was found that the least prejudiced subjects were significantly more consistent in their behavior when there was low social constraint (behavior would not be publicized) and where usual social distance would be maintained. A great deal

of inconsistency resulted from conditions in which they were directly disclosing their acts to others and violating norms of social distance.

Warner & DeFleur make a statement as to the purpose and goals of research on prejudice. This present study is an attempt to further the goals they set down:

"There is a danger that fundamental research on minority relations will turn away from the sources, nature and consequences of prejudice to focus on the more dramatic riots, social movements, and other collective behavior issues of the moment. Although these dramatic events are significant, the basic task of theory building concerning the manifestation of prejudice remains far from completion. Providing explanations of why one human being holds antipathies toward another in such a way that he commits acts of discrimination in a society deeply devoted to democratic principles is still the heart of the research task." (p.168)

The tolerant personality

Allport (1954) points out that research on "good neighbors" is less plentiful than research on bad neighbors. Bigotry rather than tolerance attracts the attention of the social scientist. He concludes that it is not surprising "... that we know less about tolerance than prejudice." (p.399).

"Most of our knowledge comes from the control groups... it is customary to pair a group of tolerant with a group of intolerant individuals, and then to note the background factors that differentiate the two." (Allport, 1954, p.399)

What is learned from these kinds of studies is a long

list of characteristics which occur with greater frequency in groups of tolerant people, and a corresponding list of opposite characteristics which occur more frequently in groups of prejudiced people. For example, tolerant people were loved and accepted by their parents and raised in a permissive atmosphere, their frustration tolerance is relatively high, have more empathic ability and are more liberal in their politics, while the prejudiced people were disciplined in harsh and capricious ways, have lower frustration tolerance, have less empathy, etc.

(Allport, 1954). These types of studies do not help in differentiating between different types of tolerant personalities.

As the institutional and governmental pressure increases, we may expect a proportionate increase toward what Allport calls conformity tolerance. That is, people will merely conform to group norms of tolerance. This contrasts with character-conditioned tolerance which is a positive state of personality organization, based on a positive respect for individuals, a true trait of goodwill, and generalized state of affection. Within a few years nearly everyone may have very tolerant racial attitudes. It will not be possible to predict who will act in an unprejudiced way, unless more subtle and complex measures of prejudice are constructed. We will discuss the issue of measurement of prejudice in a later section. Now, let us consider two studies which have gone into a detailed consideration of the

tolerant personality (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson & Sanford, 1950; and Bettelheim & Janowitz, 1964, 1965).

Though the primary purpose of Adorno, Frankel-Brunswick, Levinson & Sanford (1950) was to study and shed light on the personality of the prejudiced individual, they described five personality syndromes which characterized the low prejudiced or "tolerant" subjects.

(1) The "rigid" low scorers are characterized by strong superego tendencies and compulsive features. They are disposed to totalitarian thinking and are liable to change allegiances in a critical situation. Their total thinking is hardly distinguishable from the extremely high prejudiced, and, in fact, resemble them more than any of the other low groups.

(2) The "protesting" low scorer has much in common with the high authoritarian. The decisive distinguishing feature is an opposition to whatever appears to be tyranny. The protesters internalized the father-image to such a degree, and the superego is so strong that it turns against its own model and all external authority. The protester is often psychologically constricted.

(3) The "impulsive" low scorers are characterized by never having integrated strong impulses with the ego and superego. They are relatively free of destructive impulses - to the extent that they have them, they turn them inward. They sympathize with whatever is repressed, and react strongly to new stimuli

or whatever may promise some sort of new gratification. This seems to be a pathological category, as the authors indicated that the range of the syndrome is from libertines and addicts of all kinds, to certain asocial characters, such as prostitutes and non-violent criminals, to certain psychotics.

(4) The "easy going" low scorer is characterized by an id which seems to be sublimated into compassion and a well-developed superego, but the extraverted functions of the ego do not keep pace. They are characterized by neurotic indecision and no action may be expected of them. They have a psychological richness, a capacity for enjoying things, imagination, and sense of humor with self-irony, and are ready to confess to all kinds of weaknesses out of a strong sense of inner strength rather than out of a neurotic compulsion. Their character structure hasn't congealed and no set pattern of defences has crystallized.

(5) The "genuine liberal" low scorer has the "ideal" balance between id, ego, and superego. He is little repressed and even has some trouble keeping himself under control. However, his emotion is not blind and is directed against the other as subject. He is compassionate and identifies with the underdog, but without compulsion and without overcompensation (unlike the "protester"). He is anti-authoritarian, but without the element of hesitation and indecision of the "easy-going". He is very outspoken in reaction and opinion.

It is apparent from Adorno, et al's (1950) descriptions that the tolerant personality is not monolithic. Rather there is a large variability (somewhat resembling and overlapping with the prejudiced personality) in such traits as defensive styles (repression-sensitization), impulsivity, rigidity, and others.

The low repression groups (the "easy going", and "impulsive" low scorers), are characterized by neurotic indecision, and self indulgence, or mental illness. Though they have sympathetic attitudes, their life style is one that is fashioned to avoid involvement. The groups characterized by high repression, seem more likely to act especially if they can strike a blow against authority. However, the "rigid" group may change allegiance under critical conditions. One example given by Adorno, et al (1950) was the conversion of many communists to Naziism during the 1930's in Germany. It is unfortunate that Adorno et al, had no behavioral measure to test the predictive ability of their clinical classifications.

Bettelheim & Janowitz (1964, 1965) studied 150 male World War II veterans. They found no relation between anti-black or anti-semitic feelings and objective measures of income, socio-economic status, education, age, religious affiliation, and nature of army experience. However, when it was determined whether the veterans had moved up or down socio-economically in

comparison with their status before the war, it was found that ethnic hostility was concentrated in those that were downwardly mobile. Those who were tolerant towards the Jews were upwardly mobile and those that had shown no change in status were "middle-of-the-roads" with regard to anti-semitism. Objective deprivations suffered during army life were not related to intolerance, but there was a clear association between feelings of deprivation and outspoken or intense anti-semitism or anti-black feelings.

Personality factors such as the ability to store tensions internally or to discharge them in socially constructive ways (and other mechanisms that control aggressive impulses) were clearly related to tolerance. The inability to integrate frustrating social experiences account for much of the aggression that is vented in ethnic hostility. The individual however is only half the story. Social controls against the venting of aggressive impulses toward minority groups seemed to be of overriding significance in many, if not most, of the cases.

Fifty-two of the sixty-one "tolerant" (toward the Jews) were "intolerant" (toward the blacks). One reason was the relative paucity of external sanctions or controls against prejudice directed toward the blacks. Personality factors are also involved: those whose controls against aggression were internalized were more tolerant regardless of the mores of the community.

The authors divided the tolerant men into two categories:

(1) tolerant men with adequate controls, and (2) tolerant men with inadequate controls. These two groups are described below. Of the six psychological attributes which were explored, three (controls, security, and ego strength) were positively associated with tolerance toward the Jews (three others -- hostility, frustration, and isolation were negatively associated). However, only 14 of the men (out of 61) had fully or partly internalized controls. For the overwhelming majority, external controls (i.e. societal sanctions against the expression of aggression) were the controlling force. For many of them their controls were adequate only in a relative sense -- they were low in hostility and frustration so that even relatively weak controls were adequate.

(1) Tolerant men with adequate controls were characterized by an absence of hostility and frustration. Adequacy of control was relative, depending on the absence of strong feelings driving for discharge. Three definite subgroups emerged:

(a) "In general, they were men $\langle \bar{n}=11 \rangle$ who had experienced adequate love but inadequate control in childhood. They were, therefore, unable to internalize control through identification with their parents... $\langle \text{but} \rangle$ no excess hostility pressed for discharge through intolerance... (1964, p.220).

(b) this second $\langle \bar{n}=14 \rangle$ group was similar to the first, but they "...showed some measure of ego strength, although

their tolerance was closely related to acceptance of external authority -- an acceptance which was combined in their cases with some internalization of controls." (1964, p.220).

(c) the third group $\sqrt{n=6}$ "...managed despite harsh upbringing to develop into citizens who were competent, self-reliant, and independent in their own private spheres... Control they could accept, and to some measure exercise, because they had been brought up under the control of accepting parents and of the church." (1964, p.223). Good interpersonal relationships, actual success in life experiences and the acceptance of their parents compensated for the harshness of parental discipline.

All three of these groups of tolerant men (representing the majority of the tolerant men) had personalities which were structured by their early experiences, so as to permit the individual to accept external controls, and, also, be able to use subsequent experiences, such as the army, for internalizing controls. The personalities that the intolerant men had developed (long before entering the army) prevented them from accepting external controls or using the experience to help them internalize controls.

(2) Tolerant men with inadequate controls: All seven of these men shared a pessimistic attitude or outlook on life.

"... their tolerance was not due to the absence of tension or

hostility. They were men who were rather high in hostility, frustration, and isolation, and low in security and ego strength." (1964, p.227). Their tolerance usually originated in a particular life history or small family constellation, such as, they were scapegoats or outcasts and identified with such, or their hostilities were turned inward in the form of self-criticism or depreciation, and, therefore, there was no need for the persecution of an outgroup.

Denial of complex feelings

Until Collins' (1968) study, it had been customary to describe ethnic attitudes as composed of three aspects - cognitive, affective and conative (Woodmansee & Cook 1965, 1967). Triandis (1967) reports on other works or studies that attempt to analyze these three components into smaller aspects. He states that Katz and Stolland (1959) discuss the cognitive component as made up of beliefs about the attitude object, its characteristics, its relation to other objects, the degree of integration into a hierarchical pattern of cognitions, and so on. In view of Collins' findings these differentiations seem useless.

Collins (1968) compiled and sorted a large group of conventional prejudice items. Statements of belief about blacks were designated cognitive items, conventional statements of feelings about blacks and willingness to participate socially with them (social distance items) were designated affective

items, and statements of policy toward blacks as a group (items with a "should" or "ought" verb form) were designated conative items. There were 20 items in each of these categories.

Also, 40 experimental "Lie" items were constructed: 28 were designed to tap complex feelings in relationships with blacks -- it was assumed that white Americans would experience complex or ambivalent feelings in relationships with blacks, and, denial of such feelings would represent a deliberate attempt to deny prejudice or an act of self-deception; the other 12 items exaggerated positive stereotypes of blacks -- it was assumed that a person deliberately trying to make a good impression, or to deny or compensate for residual negative or complex feelings might endorse a positive stereotype, even if it were implausible, or in a self-deceptive, unrealistic way he may actually consider blacks a group with specially favorable characteristics.

When the scale was factor analyzed, support for the three component idea did not materialize. Rather, 4 content defined factors emerged:

(1) Factor I, Militant Integration, has to do with policy toward integration of the races;

(2) Factor VI, Negro Status, involves beliefs about racial equality;

(3) & (4) Factors IV, and V, Social-Psychological Distance: Community Participation, and, Social-Psychological Distance:

Residence and Personal Social Relations, involve the nature of social relationships into which the respondent is willing to accept blacks.

A "second order" factor analysis was done. The 4 prejudice factors loaded on Factor A which was considered as a general prejudice factor. Collins recommends that in view of these results, Factors I, IV, V and VI should be added or combined to achieve a general prejudice score.

The experimental items (Factors II & III) remained separate and distinct from the conventional or general prejudice factors in both factor analyses. We will not discuss Factor III as it is not relevant to this study. Factor II, the Denial-of-Complex-Feelings contains statements which describe how an individual might feel in interpersonal situations involving blacks. Some sample items are, "I probably would feel somewhat self-conscious dancing with a Negro in a public place." "I can easily imagine myself falling in love with and marrying a Negro." "It makes no difference to me whether I'm Negro or White." (See Appendix II for all items). None of these ask the subject what he would do, rather the subject is asked how he would feel if he performed an "unprejudiced" act. The items assume "positive" feelings towards blacks, and that the situations described have some negative aspects; and, also, that the respondent while behaving in an unprejudiced manner (or imagining himself as

behaving in an unprejudiced manner) may also experience avoidant or negative feelings which might be experienced as self-consciousness, difficulty, or hesitancy. Collins (1968) in considering the above, states that the above feelings, self-consciousness, difficulty, and hesitancy might be a function of many things, all rooted in the person's history of relationships with blacks.

"These 'negative' aspects might be a function of sensitivity to the feelings of the Negro or Negroes in the situation, a realistic awareness of difficulties Negroes experience because they are Negroes, awareness of feelings of strangers or unfamiliarity, ... of possible social disapproval ..., or uneasiness because of ... the possibilities of so-called negative feelings on the part of Negroes toward White persons as a group ... The so-called negative aspects may stem from anxiety, generated in part by guilt, unsureness, or from fear of the consequences of acting in an unfamiliar way." (p.48)

These items were based on the assumption (and the judgement of professional "experts" in the field) that an honest, truly unprejudiced person in the United States will experience mixed feelings in many situations involving interpersonal contact with blacks.

Collins divided the sample of 633 subjects into criterion groups. On an a priori basis, one would expect subjects from a New York City interracial student organizations to be less prejudiced than unselected students from N.Y.C., these two groups would be less prejudiced than unselected

students from the Midwest, and that the more prejudiced would be white students in a segregated fraternity in the South. The findings followed this pattern precisely on the conventional items (Factors I, IV, V and VI). Prejudice, as measured by these factors, systematically and consistently increased -- the group with the highest prejudice score was the segregated fraternity.*1

However, on Factor II, Denial-of-Complex-Feelings, the pattern did not hold. It had been assumed that the white student who behaves, or says he would behave in an unprejudiced way would experience the complex feelings and report them. The higher the score on this factor, the higher the denial-of-complex-feelings. The mean score on this factor, for the total sample of 633 students was 8.51 (out of a maximum score of 25), with a standard deviation of 5.15. The means of the Middle Western samples and for a woman's Eastern College are not significantly different from this. The Southern means are significantly lower, as would be expected -- subjects who report themselves as prejudiced would have no reason nor need to "lie" or deny ambivalence. The mean scores of the unselected N.Y.C. sample are significantly higher (they deny their complex feelings more) than the Middle Western students. As Collins states, "The startling result is the mean score for the students active in the organization working for integration." (p.65). Their mean

score is significantly higher than that of any other group.

(For example, their mean score is 17.55, the unselected N.Y.C. students' mean score is 11.05, and the Midwest sample ranges from 7.32 to 8.52). The standard deviations were similar for all the criterion groups.

The most "unprejudiced" group, as judged by scores on the conventional prejudice items, and their behavior in actively working for integration, scored in the "prejudiced" direction on the denial-of-complex-feelings. The panel of "experts" had felt that healthy and truly unprejudiced people would admit their complex feelings. The question then is, are the unprejudiced students, involved in bringing about integration, dissembling? Collins feels that the answer is "no". It was found that once the score on the four conventional factors was higher than the total group mean ($X=45.00$) it was impossible to predict the score on the denial-of-complex-feelings factor. Some of these "highly unprejudiced" subjects were replying the way that the "experts" predicted (i.e. they did not deny their complex feelings, some fell into the middle range, and others were high deniers of complex feelings).

Collins suggests that the high deniers are not lying, nor have they somehow evolved to a utopian point of tolerance where they are truly free of complex feelings, but that they are engaging in honest self-deception -- "... their answers

have the defensive characteristics of the mechanism of denial. Hence the label for this Factor." (p.137). She uses the word denial in the psychoanalytic sense described by Schafer (1954): "Narrowly defined, 'denial' means the defensive refusal to acknowledge the existence of disturbing realities. The concept is, however, often used in a broader sense to include refusal to acknowledge the existence of inner disturbed reactions to external provocations. It is in the broader sense that the concept 'denial' will be used here." (p.55). The defensive aspect of the denial-of-complex-feelings is an avoidance of the anxiety aroused by such unpleasant feelings, as self-consciousness, conspicuousness, hesitancy, doubt, and worry.

Collins also suggests that there are adaptive aspects and superego components to the denial-of-complex-feelings. In the "heat of the battle", it is adaptive to put aside doubts, hesitancy, and questions; there are also increments to self-esteem, and rewards for acting courageously or doing good. A harsh superego may demand a consistency between a person's thoughts, beliefs, behavior, and feelings.

Collins concludes that the denial-of-complex-feelings may constitute an "affective style" - a characteristic way of coping with or handling unpleasant realities, that would be evident in other areas of social attitudes, where the norms for believing and behavior are clear, but where there is com-

plexity in the affective dimension (e.g. feelings which would include unpleasant ones). This was tested by developing 37 new items which were included in the Opinions on Mental Illness (OMI) scale. Collins reports that the modified OMI and her Attitude toward Negroes scale was administered to 137 undergraduate students.

Denial-of-complex-feelings emerged as a factor in the area of opinions toward the mentally ill. Factor scores from the same subjects on both the modified OMI and the ATN were correlated. The highest correlations (.44 and .52) were between the two denial-of-complex-feelings factors. Therefore, those who scored high (or low) on denial-of-complex-feelings on the OMI tended to score high (or low) on the comparable factor in the ATN. The MMPI had also been administered, and, though none of the 31 scales of the MMPI which were scored, were significantly correlated with the attitude factor scores, the size and direction of the correlations of MMPI scores with the two denial-of-complex-feelings factors were strikingly similar. The correlation of congruence was .90. Basically the same was found with the need rank scores from Stein's Self Description Inventory (the correlation of congruence was .77). Collins' hypothesis that the denial-of-complex-feelings is an "affective style" that goes beyond the attitude area of ethnic prejudice gains a great deal of confirmation from these findings.

Collins' work receives further validation from the work of Woodmansee and Cook (1965, 1967) in which her findings, (with the exception of a few minor and irrelevant points) are replicated almost exactly. The four conventional factors, Factors, I, IV, V and VI, emerge almost intact, as does Factor III, overfavorableness, and, more important, Factor II, the denial-of-complex-feelings toward blacks.

In conclusion, two major questions arise:

- (1) if the denial-of-complex-feelings is an "affective style" which holds across different attitude areas, what is the relationship to another general measure of denial or repression?
- (2) since it is the behaviorally involved group (the members of the N.Y.C. inter-racial group working for integration) that have the highest mean score on the denial-of-complex-feelings factor, what does this mean for the relationship between this factor and behavior consistent with tolerant ethnic attitudes? Will the highest deniers-of-complex-feelings be the most likely to avail themselves of an opportunity to act in an "unprejudiced"

manner?

Before we state these questions in the form of hypothesis, we shall consider one more area -- repression-sensitization.

Repression-sensitization

Fenichel (1945) states that the mechanism of repression, though less archaic is "certainly" a derivative of denial. "It consists of an unconsciously purposeful forgetting or not becoming aware of internal impulses or external events which as a rule, represent possible temptations or punishments for, or mere allusions to, objectionable instinctual demands." (p.148).

In discussing repression, Schafer (1954) states, "... the instinctual demand and its derivatives are 'objectionable' because the prospect of discharging them ... stimulates fear of superego punishment, fear of painful consequences in external reality, such as destruction of relationships or -- because intense, unchecked impulses threaten to overwhelm highly valued ego achievements and functions..." (p.193).

Schafer seems to touch on some of the issues which might be motivating the high deniers-of-complex-feelings: i.e. fear of superego punishment for not living up to perfectionistic demands for consistency between attitudes, behavior and feelings, fear of destruction of relationships if doubts or hesitation is expressed while being involved in the civil rights struggle, and the fear of destroying or undermining highly valued ego achieve-

ments, such as, cooperative ventures of blacks and whites for integration.

The unidimensional categorization, repression-sensitization grew out of the original research on the New Look in perception in the 1940's. The specific research which formed the background for much of the current work is exemplified by Bruner and Postman (1947). They presented neutral and potentially threatening words tachistoscopically to the subjects. Two distinct patterns of response emerged: some subjects revealed a defense process in which recognition time for threatening words was longer; the responses of other subjects suggested a sensitizing process in which recognition time was actually quicker for the most anxiety provoking words.

Byrne (1964b) reported that those that had difficulty in perceiving threatening material accurately showed blocking, repression, and avoidance when responding to conflictual stimuli in other contexts. Those who perceived threatening stimuli as accurately, or more accurately, than neutral stimuli responded in other situations with intellectualization, sensitization, and general approach behavior.

Individuals identified as repressors or sensitizers on the basis of perceptual tasks have also been differentiated on the basis of a wide variety of clinical materials: case history and interview materials (Lazarus, et al, 1951), responses

on sentence completion tests (Carpenter, et al, 1956), and on Thematic Apperception Tests responses (Eriksen, 1951).

Development of R-S scale

The measurement of repression-sensitization was approached through the development of scales based on the MMPI. Byrne's (1961) attempts resulted in the most widely used and validated scale. The result was an "... easily administered, reliable, valid method by which these defenses could be measured." (Byrne 1961, p.338). The resultant scale contained 182 items: 156 scorable and 26 buffer items. High scores indicate sensitizing responses. Both the corrected co-efficient of internal consistency and co-efficient of stability (over 6 weeks) was .88.

In Byrne, Barry and Nelson (1963) the results of an internal consistency item analysis were reported. Two independent samples (n=370 for each group) of students were administered the R-S scale. The 127 items which yielded correlations with the total R-S score, significant at the .001 level, or better, in both samples, were retained as scorable items in the revised R-S scale; the other 55 items were designated as buffer items, for a total of 182 items. The revised scale had a corrected split-half reliability of .94 and test-retest reliability of .82 (3 months). Byrne and Griffitt (1969) report the construction of two short forms of the revised R-S scale, Form A and

Form B, consisting of 91 items apiece, 64 and 63 scorable items, respectively. The two forms were found to correlate highly ($r=.90$), and also had a split-half reliability of .88. When administered two weeks apart to the same subjects the correlation between the two forms was .87. The authors conclude that the "two forms appear to be equivalent measures and to have adequate internal consistency and consistency over time to warrant use." (footnote on p.181). Webber (1968) concludes the same based on his research that yielded a co-efficient of equivalence of .83 between Forms A and B.

In delimiting the repression-sensitization dimension, Byrne (1964) states:

"At the repression end of the continuum of defensive behaviors are those which involve avoidance of anxiety arousing stimuli and its consequents; included here are repression, denial and many types of rationalization. At the sensitizing end of the continuum are behaviors which involve an attempt to reduce anxiety by approaching or controlling the stimulus and its consequents. The latter mechanisms include intellectualization, obsessive compulsive behaviors and ruminative worrying." (p.196)

Many studies conducted to test the assumption that the repression-sensitization scale indicates individual differences in the tendency to repress or deny or avoid threatening affective stimuli have been supported. It correlated highly with a similar scale (Ullmann's Facilitation-Inhibition Scale) derived from the MMPI. In two different investigations the

correlations were $r = -.70$, and $-.94$ (Byrne, 1961). The negative correlation is due to the fact that the R-S scale is scored in the sensitizing direction, and the F-I scale in the inhibiting (repression) direction.

Byrne (1961), also reports that sensitizers significantly rate themselves more negatively, have a greater self-ideal discrepancy, and are less authoritarian. Male sensitizers express significantly more sexual content on the TAT. Tempone (1964a) found that clinical judgements of repressive behavior correlated significantly with a modified version of the R-S scale. Tempone (1964a) reports that repressors had higher recognition thresholds than sensitizers for words related to a failure experience; there was no difference for words related to a success experience. There is a high correlation between the R-S scale and reported anxiety (Sullivan, 1969). The sensitizers report much more anxiety. However, when both a self-report of anxiety and a non-self-report were used, it was found that the sensitizers self-report more anxiety, but the repressors show more anxiety on a non-self-report measure -- a word association test. (Lomont, 1965).

Parental antecedents

Byrne (1964a) reasoned that if a repression-sensitization typology is being tapped by the R-S scale, then there should be differences in the home atmosphere of parents of repressors

and sensitizers. Three different approaches to measurement were used: first, the mothers of repressors and sensitizers were asked to complete a questionnaire on child-rearing attitudes; secondly, another group of subjects were asked for their child-rearing attitudes; and thirdly, another group for their perceptions of their mothers' attitudes. It should be stressed that the results of the first two approaches were spotty and inconclusive. The repressors reported that their home atmosphere was characterized by permissiveness, acceptance, and confidence; the mother was seen as consistent, high in self-esteem and had a positive affective relationship with the father. The sensitizers reported the opposite. Merbaum and Kozaoka (1968) confirm these findings and add that the sensitizers tend to view social and peer relationships with suspiciousness and guardedness. Others are seen as adversaries and profound threats to their self-esteem. The repressors perceive peer relationships as satisfying and describe them in cooperative terms.

Byrne's (1964a) and Merbaum and Kozaoka's (1968) findings on parental antecedents are inconclusive because they are based primarily on the subject's own reports, rather than on a study of their actual parents. The findings may be due simply to the fact that repressors tend to present the most socially desirable view of themselves and their parents.

Social desirability and the R-S scale

The repression-sensitization dimension is related to social desirability and acquiescence response set. Liberty, et al (1964) report that the R-S and Facilitation-Inhibition scale load almost entirely on a social desirability and acquiescence response set factors. However, Feder (1967) found that though there is a high correlation between the R-S scale and these two factors, they can only account for one-half of the variance. She concludes that, "... it does appear that the repression-sensitization scale is not merely an equivalent form of the social desirability or acquiescence response set scale, but rather is measuring a rather complex and currently insufficiently measured dimension." (p.405).

Adjustment and the R-S scale

Much of the research on the R-S scale has concerned itself with its relationship to adjustment. In general, it has been found that repressors are better adjusted. Psychiatric patients contain many more sensitizers than do medical patients (Feder, 1967); sensitizers seem more suspicious and guarded, view others as more critical, angry and demeaning of them (Merbaum & Kazoaka, 1967); outpatients of a mental health clinic had a much greater proportion of sensitizers than a general college population (Tempone & Lamb, 1967); the sensitizers in a mental health clinic outpatient group showed much more psycho-

logical conflict, repressors are consistently, along various dimensions, more self-actualized and better adjusted (Foulds & Wareslime, 1971).

Conclusions of repression-sensitization

The R-S scale has proved useful in exploring the personality dimension of repression-sensitization, however, it would be difficult to draw any hard and fast conclusions about repressors or sensitizers without much further study.

Sensitizers self-report more anxiety, but repressors seem to show more anxiety on a non-self-report measure -- a word association test (Lomont, 1965). Repressors seem able to deal with and approach certain unpleasant stimuli (electric shock) more easily than sensitizers. Some studies have shown that there is no difference in amount of emotion expressed, or perceived, but a difference in quality (Merbaum & Kazoaka, 1967; Barocas, 1970; Webber, 1968). For example, Barocas (1970) reports that repressors seem to have a positive set in interpreting and responding to affective messages, while sensitizers have a negative one. Repressors more accurately identified and expressed vocal expressions of positive emotions; and, sensitizers negative ones.

In group tasks, repressors perceive themselves as less aggressive than sensitizers perceive themselves. However, the repressors were rated higher in aggressive behavior, and, also,

in non-aggressive behavior by judges. The sensitizers experienced themselves as more aggressive and involved than the judges' observations, (Parsons, Fulgenzi & Edelberg, 1969). In this instance, it seems that both the repressors and sensitizers are not aware of certain aspects of their behavior.

Clark and Neuringer (1971) suggest that repressors have a greater capacity to respond to non-threatening stimuli and to avoid obsessive ideation. This permits them to have a greater facility for controlled or goal-directed behavior. Parsons, et al (1969) proposed that repressors focus more on goal-directed behavior, and accomplishing the task at hand. The sensitizer, however, is relatively passive, rejects the environment, and has a higher degree of psychological or internal involvement. The repressor responds to "insult" by increasing his self-evaluation (Webber, 1968).

Perhaps, the repressors' superiority in tasks is due to their ability to focus on the problem and not be subject to interference by extraneous external or internal stimuli. A positive set, and high self-esteem, and confidence, plus the ability to react to "insult" by increased self-evaluation would seem to be an asset in getting things done. The sensitizers' greater emphasis on his subjective or internal experience may not be as conducive to dealing with the external world. He values emotionality, and honesty of feeling much more highly

than do repressors (Lefcourt, 1966).

Statement of hypotheses

Hypothesis I: The repression-sensitization scale will be significantly related to the denial-of-complex-feelings factor. The repressors will be high deniers-of-complex-feelings, and the sensitizers low.

The repression-sensitization scale and the denial-of-complex feelings factor may be seen as attempting to measure the same general defensive style. By examining their relationship we are testing the construct validity of each.

Hypothesis II: The high deniers-of-complex-feelings will act more consistent with their tolerant racial attitudes.

There are some indications that high deniers-of-complex-feelings are more likely to belong to active civil rights groups. A test of hypothesis II should indicate the predictive ability of this factor.

*¹ An analysis of variance found these differences significant of known membership groups at the .01 level. All items had a factor loading of .20 or greater, the great majority ranging from .40 to the middle .60's. Reliability coefficients (of the internal consistency type) were .92, .86, .89, and .67 for Factors I, IV, V, and VI, respectively. Factor validity coefficients were .87, .72, .73, and .65.

CHAPTER II

Method

In brief, the Collins' Attitude Toward Negroes Scale and Byrne's Repression-Sensitization Scale were administered to a pool of 319 undergraduate students enrolled in introductory psychology courses. One hundred and twenty-one white subjects who were "tolerant" and could be assigned to three different levels of denial-of-complex-feelings were selected. The experimenter telephoned them and invited them to attend a small group discussion with black college students. In reality, there were no black students. The experimenter met the white subjects that attended and debriefed them.

Subjects

The subjects were selected from undergraduate students enrolled in introductory psychology courses. They were white, native born of European stock. Foreign born, oriental, Puerto Rican and black students, or students born of oriental or Puerto Rican parents were eliminated. This left 186 white, native born students.

The mean "general prejudice" score for the 186 white students was 44.80. Only those students having a score of 45.00

more were considered as tolerant or unprejudiced. These numbered 121. Their "general prejudice" scores ranged from 45 to 57 (the highest possible score). Their denial-of-complex-feelings scores ranged from 5 to 24 (the maximum possible range is from 0 to 25). As Collins reported in her study, the denial-of-complex-feelings score was not related to and could not be predicted from the "general prejudice" score of this group ($r=.10$, not significant).

Instruments and their administration

The Collins Attitude Toward Negroes Scale and Byrne's Repression-Sensitization Scale, Form A were administered to the original pool of students in their introductory psychology recitation classrooms. The scales were incorporated into a folder containing the following (samples in Appendix I):

(1) Biographical information form which requested age, college class, sex, and major area. The birthplace of the student, number of years living in New York City, and birthplace of both parents were also requested. This enabled the experimenter to eliminate all but white, native born, non Puerto Rican students.

(2) Form requesting identification - the students were requested to give their name, mailing address, and phone number. This information was used to contact the students by phone. Complete confidentiality was promised. The pretext for request-

ing this information was that the "... aim of this study is to refine these questionnaires"; and,

"In questionnaire research, many problems come up at all stages of the process. It is often necessary to go back to some previous stage and re-examine the responses in order to understand the score. It is often necessary to contact people who have completed a questionnaire to understand the meaning of the data or to get additional information. Therefore, please fill out the information requested below so that we may get in touch with you again, if necessary."

(3) and (4) The Attitude Toward Negroes and Repression-Sensitization Scales with their answer sheets. The order of these scales alternated.

(5) Volunteering form - the form requested the students to indicate whether they were "interested in taking part in a follow-up study related to the present 'opinion survey'" and to sign the form to signify his/her "willingness to participate."

The study was presented to the students as an attempt to refine the questionnaires involved. This was conveyed in instructions read before the administration of the above folder. After these instructions, black students were spotted visually. In cases of doubt, they were asked, "Are you an American black?" If they answered yes (or indicated they were black, but from the West Indies, South America, or elsewhere), they were given separate instructions for the Collins' Attitude Toward Negroes Scale: "... fill out this questionnaire the way you think a

white college student would fill it out." (See Appendix I for sample).

Telephone contact with tolerant students

The 121 subjects who were unprejudiced and could be assigned to three different levels of denial-of-complex-feelings were telephoned by the experimenter. The call ascertained the subjects' willingness to attend a small group discussion with black college students.

The experimenter (a counselor within the university) introduced himself and stated:

"As part of my counseling duties I have arranged a series of consciousness-raising groups composed of black _____ College students. These all-black groups would like now to meet once with some white students to discuss race relationships at _____ College. Since I had the telephone numbers of a random sample of psychology students, I am calling you myself -- to preserve the confidentiality I promised -- and to ask you, would you like to participate?"

The subjects responded with either "yes", "no", or a request for more information. The procedure followed for each of these was as follows:

(1) "Yes" -- an appointment for the group meeting was made for certain pre-set times. If these times were not convenient for the subjects, than a tentative appointment was made at whatever time was convenient. In this case, the subject was told, "I will have to get back to you on this because, first,

I have to see if the group can change its meeting time to coincide with your schedule. If this is possible, I'll call you back."

(2) "No" -- an attempt was made to persuade the subject by use of four prods which were delivered in the following sequence:

- (a) "I'm surprised at your refusal since your questionnaire responses indicate that you are a person with low prejudice."
- (b) "You will be helping black students understand themselves. Please help them."
- (c) "What turns you off?"
- (d) "Please reconsider and help me."

There was no attempt to persuade through argument or discussion. The prods were delivered simply, in a matter of fact way. The subjects' responses were recorded. If the response remained negative, the experimenter expressed sympathy and understanding for the subject's reasons for not being able to attend, and the contact was terminated.

(c) "Maybe" or request for more information -- general answers were composed for possible questions about the history and formation of the black groups, their purposes, goals, composition, functioning and nature of interactions. (See Appendix III for a detailed script of the 'phone contact).

Recording and analysis of telephone conversation

The subjects' responses on the 'phone were recorded verbatim. The purpose was to explore the possibility that some aspect of the behavior on the 'phone, other than the subjects' final "yes" or "no" would be predictive of his actual attendance at the group meeting.

Three aspects were selected for exploration:

(1) Immediate response of the subject. For each subject, it was noted whether they immediately replied to the invitation with a "yes", "no", or a question.

(2) Expression of reservations. Some subjects expressed reservations spontaneously. They expressed doubts about their own ability to contribute to a group meeting, the attitudes of blacks, or the validity and usefulness of group discussion.

(3) Resistance to prods. The number of prods necessary to elicit agreement to attend was noted.

Group Meeting

When the subjects arrived at the alleged meeting they were met by the experimenter, their names were recorded and the purposes of the study were fully explained. They were asked to avoid discussing the nature of the meeting with anyone. If asked, they were requested to state that, "... it was interesting." They all agreed readily to this.

During the debriefing, the subjects were informed that

the experimenter was concerned about the lack of interaction at the college between members of different ethnic groups. The experimenter promised to explore and develop the possibilities for helping to establish a real black-white discussion group. Several months later, the subjects were offered an opportunity to join an existing group program at the college.

Behavioral measures

Three measures of behavior were obtained: written, verbal, and action.

(a) Volunteer form -- this was in the folder and administered with the scales. See description above (See Appendix I).

(b) Verbal commitment during 'phone contact.

(c) Attendance at meeting.

Therefore, the testing of Hypothesis II (that there would be a relation between the denial-of-complex-feelings score and behavior consistent with tolerance or lack of prejudice) was not limited to one kind of behavior, but ranged from written commitment to a "possible" follow-up, verbal commitment to attend a meeting, to actual appearance at the meeting.

CHAPTER III

Results

The means and standard deviations of the scores on the repression-sensitization and denial-of-complex-feelings scales are shown in Table I. The tolerant group numbers 118 in this instance (out of 121) because repression-sensitization scores were not available in three cases.

Insert Table I about here

Hypothesis I

The correlation between repression-sensitization and denial-of-complex-feelings, using the Pearson product-moment method (Peatman, 1963) was not significant ($r=.00$, $p .50$).

Hypothesis II

The denial-of-complex-feelings does not seem to be a significant factor in the translation of attitudes into behavior.

A chi-square analysis was done for each of the three behavioral measures.

(1) Signing a statement expressing willingness to participate in a "possible" follow-up to the opinion survey.

Table 1

Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of
Tolerant Subjects on Repression-Sensitization
and Denial-of-Complex-Feelings (N=118).

Scales	Means	Standard Deviations
R-S	22.4	10.2
D-C-F	13.8	4.7

Insert Table 2 about here

It is apparent from Table 2 that 62 students indicated that they would be interested in a follow-up study. Nineteen were low, 27 middle, and 16 high deniers-of-complex-feelings. Fifty-one students were not interested. Fourteen of these were low, 16 middle, and 21 high deniers-of-complex-feelings.

The subjects were divided into three groups by determining the 33.3, and 66.6 percentiles (11.8, and 16.4, respectively) and using these as cut-off points. The low denial group had denial-of-complex-feelings scores from 5 to 11; the middle group, from 12 to 16; and, the high denial group, from 17 to 25. This division was followed in all the following analyses. Eight of the 121 tolerant subjects were eliminated from this and subsequent parts of the study because, for various reasons, they could not be contacted by 'phone.

The chi-square analysis indicated that there was no relationship between denial-of-complex-feelings scores and signing behavior ($\chi^2 = 3.19, 2 \text{ d.f.}, n.s.$).

(2) Agreement or non-agreement on 'phone to attend a small group session with black students. Table 3 shows that 85 students agreed to attend, and 28 refused. Both groups

Table 2

Signing Statement as a Function of Level of
Denial-of-Complex-Feelings: Chi-Square Analysis

Signing behavior	Number of subjects at each level of denial- of-complex-feelings			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Signed	19	27	16	62
Did not sign	14	16	21	51
Total	33	43	37	113

$\chi^2=3.19$, 2 d.f., n.s.

are almost evenly distributed among the three levels of denial-of-complex-feelings.

Insert Table 3 about here

A chi-square analysis yielded non-significant results ($\chi^2=.88$, 2 d.f., n.s.).

(3) Attendance at the scheduled meeting. Two chi-square analyses were done. The first (Table 4) only looks at those subjects that agreed to attend the meeting on the 'phone. This group is split into those that agreed to attend but did not show up, and those that did show up. (Eighty-five originally agreed to attend, but 17 were eliminated because the experimenter cancelled their appointments for reasons of time or great inconvenience for the subjects. The 17 were evenly distributed through the total range of denial-of-complex-feelings score).

Insert Table 4 about here

Sixty-eight had definite appointments, but only 26 showed up. Denial-of-complex-feelings was not related to showing up after agreeing to attend ($\chi^2= 1.64$, 2 d.f., n.s.).

The second chi-square analysis compared those that showed up for the alleged group meeting with those that refused on the 'phone and those that agreed on the 'phone, but did not show up (Table 5).

Table 3

Agreement to Attend on Phone as
Function of DCF Scores: Chi-Square Analysis

Phone behavior	Number of subjects at each level of denial- of-complex-feelings			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Agreed	23	34	28	85
Refused	10	9	9	28
Total	33	43	37	113

$\chi^2 = .88$, 2 d.f., n.s.

Table 4

Attendance After Agreeing
to Attend as a Function
of DCF Scores:
Chi-Square Analysis

Attendance	Number of subjects at each level of denial- of-complex-feelings			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Attended	5	12	9	26
Did not Attend	14	16	12	42
Total	19	28	21	68

$\chi^2=1.64, 2 \text{ d.f.}, \text{ n.s.}$

All in all, 96 were invited to attend the group meeting. Only 26 acted in a manner consistent with their "tolerant" attitudes. This behavior was independent of denial-of-complex-feelings scores ($\chi^2 = 2.15$, 2 d.f., n.s.).

Repression-sensitization and general prejudice

Since the repression-sensitization and prejudice scores were available for all the subjects, it was possible to investigate whether these dimensions were:

- (1) related to each other;
- (2) predictive of the tolerant subjects' behavior.

A correlation analysis (Pearson product-moment) was done of the repression-sensitization and prejudice scores for the entire population (including the tolerant and intolerant students, $n=182$). There was no significant relationship ($r=.10$, 180 d.f., n.s.).

Chi-square analyses of the repression-sensitization and general prejudice scores were done to ascertain whether these scores were predictive of the tolerant subjects' behavior. It was thought that, perhaps, the subjects who tended toward repression might be more likely to behave more consistently with their tolerant attitudes.

The statistical analysis was done in the same manner as for the denial-of-complex-feelings. The findings were not significant.

Table 5

Attendance vs. non-
Attendance as a Function
of DCF Scores: Chi-Square
Analysis

Attendance	Number of subjects at each level of denial- of-complex-feelings			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Attended	5	12	9	26
Did not attend	24	25	21	70
Total	29	37	30	96

$\chi^2=2.15, 2 \text{ d.f.}, n.s.$

Insert Table 6 about here

The tolerant subjects' general prejudice scores ranged from 45 to 57. It was felt that, perhaps, those that scored highest (the most tolerant) would behave more consistently.

The results were again not significant, except for the prediction of the response on the 'phone (See Table 6). The greater the prejudice, the more likely that the subject would decline to attend the group meeting ($\chi^2=7.60$, 2 d.f., $p .01$).

Analysis of response on 'phone

Immediate response. A chi-square analysis was done to determine whether there was any relationship between attending at the alleged group meeting and the immediate 'phone response of those subjects that agreed to attend (See Table 7).

Insert Table 7 about here

The experimenter had recorded whether the subjects' immediate response to his invitation was a "yes", "no", or a question. This information was available for 76 subjects. The subjects that immediately answered with a "yes" were much more likely to attend than those that answered immediately with a

Table 6

Agreement to Attend on 'Phone as
 Function of General Prejudice Scores:
 Chi-Square Analysis

Phone behavior	Number of subjects at each level of tolerance scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
	Agreed	23	30	
Refused	15	4	9	28
Total	38	34	41	113

$\chi^2 = 7.60, 2 \text{ d.f.}, p .05$

Table 7

Attendance as a Function of the
 Immediate Response of Those Who
 Agreed to Attend: Chi-Square Analysis

Immediate response	Attendance		Total
	Attended	Did Not Attend	
Yes	12	7	19
No or Question	15	42	57
Total	27	49	76

$\chi^2 = 8.44, 1 \text{ d.f.}, p .01$

"no", or a question, and then agreed to attend. The relationship was significant ($\chi^2 = 8.44$, $p = .01$, 1 d.f.).

Reservations. Many subjects during the 'phone conversation spontaneously expressed reservations about the usefulness of the group meeting before or after agreeing to attend. Those that expressed reservations spontaneously were much less likely to attend (See Table 8).

Insert Table 8 about here

Only 3 of 22 subjects that expressed reservations attended, while 24 of 54 who did not express any reservations attended. A chi-square analysis yielded a significant relationship between the expression of reservations and attendance after agreeing to come ($\chi^2 = 6.48$, $p = .05$, 1 d.f.).

*Note that this information was not available on 1 of the 28 subjects that attended.

Table 8

Attendance of Subjects That Agreed
to Attend on the Phone as a Function
of Whether They Expressed Reservations
on Phone: Chi-Square Analysis

Attendance	Reservations on phone		Total
	Yes	No	
Attended	3	24	27
Did not Attend	19	30	49
Total	22	54	76

$\chi^2 = 6.48, 1 \text{ d.f.}, p .05$

CHAPTER IV

Discussion

Repression-sensitization and denial-of-complex-feelings

The lack of relationship between repression-sensitization and the denial-of-complex-feelings underlines the necessity for more extensive study of both scales. Many investigators have challenged the contention that the repression-sensitization scale taps defensive styles.

Some studies suggest that it measures the tendency to give socially desirable responses, or anxiety (Liberty, et al, 1964; Feder 1967); others that it is related to adjustment (Merbaum & Kazaoka, 1967; Tempone & Lamb, 1967). Sensitizers, in some situations, are not aware of their behavior to the same extent as repressors (Parsons, et al, 1969).

If, as we shall discuss later, the subjects were concerned that they should not be "evaluated" negatively in the present study, the scale's susceptibility to reflect the tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner, or level of anxiety may have compromised its ability to tap the defensive styles.

Furthermore, the juxtaposition of a scale which has

many items that refer to mental health (e.g., I have strange and peculiar thoughts), with another one that deals with the very sensitive issue of interpersonal racial relations may have also confounded the subjects' responses on either of the scales.

Personality variables and behavior

We may conclude that personality dimensions (such as, denial-of-complex-feelings, and repression-sensitization) are not important factors in the translation of attitudes into behavior. Interactional or interpersonal concepts, such as, norms, roles, group membership, reference groups, and subcultures have proven predictive of behavior in previous studies.

One study has found that the personality variable (repression-sensitization) was the least potent factor in influencing conforming behavior; and, in fact, its influence was noticeable only when the other factors, such as amount of oppositional pressure from other subjects, were conducive to its appearance (Khol & Nickols, 1971).

There may have been many factors operating in the present study that were powerful enough to override the possible effects of the personality dimensions measured. There were also many differences between the present study and previous studies (that studied interactional concepts) which may have made it difficult for the effects of the personality dimensions

to manifest themselves.

We will consider the following factors and issues to try to understand the results of the present study:

(1) Differences between the present study and previous ones. Subsumed under this will be differences in subjects, social climate, independent and dependent variable measures.

(2) Demand characteristics of the present study.

(3) Inconsistency-consistency of behavior.

Differences from previous studies

(1) Differences between subjects. Previous studies focused on subjects that were prejudiced, or on the differences between prejudiced and unprejudiced. None addressed themselves to the question why some tolerant people will behave consistent with their expressed attitudes and some will not. The use of a more homogeneous population could make it more difficult to elucidate differences within.

(2) Social climate. The social climate in regards to racial relations is changing very rapidly. The college of the present study was in the second year of an "open admissions" program that radically altered the racial balance.

Many colleges in the same city were going through the same change. There were many instances of friction and disputes between students and faculty of different races. Many incidents went unreported. However, on May 5, 1971 (The New York Post,

pp.3 & 4) two well known and large colleges, previously known for the liberalism of their students, were reported in the grips of bitter territorial disputes between black and white students. One of these colleges had a "brawl" which led to a situation where "... it was unusual for black faculty and students to even talk to whites."

It is possible that this atmosphere of tension and conflict may have confounded the present study by creating fears and feelings whose quality or intensity were not tapped by the personality measures. It is conceivable that such an atmosphere may have affected attendance at the alleged small group meeting with blacks.

(3) Independent variable measures. No previous studies investigated the relationship between personality factors and behavior. Personality variables, such as repression-sensitization and denial-of-complex-feelings may only be of importance in determining or predicting behavior, in interaction with other factors. A consideration of this point leads to the problem of inconsistency-consistency between attitudes and behavior. This will be discussed in a later section.

(4) Dependent variable measures. Fendrich (1967) had very similar dependent variable measures. However, he did not use the data of actual attendance at the groups. He used the expression of intention to attend the groups as the behavioral

measure. This behavioral intention is quite removed from actual behavior, as evidenced by the results of the present study where only 28 of 85 acted in a manner consistent with their avowed intentions.

It is possible that while the personality factors are not as important as interpersonal or interactional concepts when dealing with verbal, or signing behavior, or behavioral intentions, such is not the case when dealing with behavior that entails taking action that involves the white subject personally with a black person.

Completing attitude scales in a non-prejudiced direction and expressing altruistic behavioral intentions will not bring about any changes in racial relationships unless people are willing to also take concrete behavioral actions toward the ideal. Interpersonal constructs still have to be measured against this standard -- are they predictive of action in the "real" world?

Demand characteristics

Orne (1962) stated that, "... the totality of cues which convey an experimental hypotheses to the subject become significant determinants of subjects behavior." (p.779). As much as possible, according to his understanding of the study, the subject will play the good subject.

Weber & Cook (1972) conclude that the assumption that

subjects can guess the purpose of hypothesis of many experiments is unjustified. Only rarely is there a situation where the socially desirable response or intent of the experiment is clear. Four subject roles have emerged in the literature. Weber & Cook stated that there is widespread evidence only for the apprehensive subject. It seems that evaluation apprehension seems to be the major subject role and overshadows the others. Even prior experience of deceptions is not strongly related to bias in any systematic or clear way.

Conceivably, the subjects in the present study may have feared negative evaluation by the experimenter, their white peers in the class, their black peers in the class, and the black students supposed to be present in the small groups. How evaluation apprehension affected behavior, or interacted with racial attitudes, and other sets of attitudes toward peers, and psychologists is still to be determined.

The lack of consistency in so many studies suggests that we cannot expect a simple relationship between verbal or written behavior on an attitude scale and action.

Many exhaustive reviews of the literature have concluded that little consistency has been found between attitudes and behavior (Chein, et al, 1949; Fishbein, 1967; Hyman, 1969; & Wicker, 1969).

Generally, many investigators have assumed that there

should be a simple and direct relationship between what is discovered in the testing situation and behavior. Jahoda (in Chein, et al, 1949) suggests that the research task should be to determine the "cross pressures" from many sources which lead to consistent or inconsistent behavior. She asks, "What are the conditions, the social and psychological processes that determine whether or not inconsistencies in intergroup relations occur." (p.10).

Hyman (in Chein, et al, 1949) points out that the test situation is very different from the real situation. In real situations, people often have to express themselves in the face of an argument or open hostility. In the present study, we observed that tolerant subjects behaved consistently, to a different extent, according to the behavior they were requested to show. When asked to express willingness to participate in a "possible" follow-up study, 55% (62 of 113) of the tolerant subjects were "willing"; over the 'phone, 75% (85 of 113) agreed to attend; only 23% (26 of 113) actually attended.

These results clearly suggest that the nature of behavior, as well as the nature or manner of soliciting such behavior may be important factors. Fishbein (1967) states that attitudes toward the behavior, the individual's beliefs about and evaluations of the consequences of performing a particular behavior are important determiners.

What the individual personally feels he should do and what society or others feel or want him to do may also be important determiners (Fishbein, 1967). Attitudes toward the object and toward the situation may be of equal importance (Rokeach & Kliejunos, 1972). In view of the charged racial atmosphere on campus, such feelings and fears of consequences may have affected behavior, especially, showing up for the meeting, radically.

The tolerant personality

The tolerant personality may not be profitably studied if an assumption of homogeneity is made. The tolerant subjects seemingly had only one thing in common, they all had scored above the mean in a scale that measured racial attitudes. They were not characterized by any degree of a repressing or sensitizing defensive style, any level of denial-of-complex-feelings, nor any tendency to act in a particular way to affirm their racial attitudes.

There were not only actors (who showed consistent behavior in all three behavioral measures), but, non-actors who behaved inconsistently in all behavior, and, also, some fell in between these two extremes.

This broad range of characteristics is reminiscent of Adorno, et al's (1950) description of the five personality syndromes of their tolerant subjects. These groups also varied

widely in repression-sensitization defensive styles and tendency to action.

Significant results

General prejudice. The tolerant subjects' scores on the general prejudice factor were significantly related to their 'phone agreement to attend the alleged meeting ($\chi^2=7.60$, $p .05$, 2 d.f.). This might be an indication that Collins' (1968) general prejudice factor is predictive of the expression of behavioral intention. Green (1972) using an almost identical scale derived from Collins' scale, found that the general prejudice score was predictive of behavioral intentions.

If the present study had included prejudiced subjects the relationship might have been more dramatic, and, perhaps, significant for the other behaviors as well. The general prejudice factor (a second-order factor) as well as its component factors (first-order factors) deserve more attention based on these findings.

Analysis of 'phone behavior. The very high significant relationship between immediate response on the 'phone and actual attendance brings into focus the potential importance of behavioral factors in predicting subsequent behavior. Whether or not the subjects agreed eventually was not predictive, but if the first word, or words were "yes", or "sure", etc., they were much more likely to attend than if they asked a question

(even seemingly innocuous ones, such as, "When is it?") and then agreed, or said "no", but were subsequently persuaded.

Even in a relatively structured conversation, subjects make extraneous or spontaneous remarks that can meaningfully modify the evaluation of their performance on the attitude scale.

Perhaps, investigators have been looking in the wrong places for indicators of attitude. The usual attitude test situation has been challenged as not representative of real, everyday-type behavior. (Chein, et al, 1949). If we focus on behaviors that are common to all types of situations, we might get more accurate estimations of attitude.

Some behaviors of importance may be immediacy of response, spontaneous or extraneous verbalizations, vocal qualities, speed or behavioral manifestations of anxiety.

Conclusions

Racial attitudes are not directly translated into behavior consistent with such attitudes. In the everyday, real world, a person is influenced by many factors. In the laboratory, a subject may see quite clearly that if he is racially tolerant, then he should, and, in fact, will behave in certain ways.

In the real world, many sets of attitudes will be aroused. These will include attitudes about the particular

situation, the nature and range of the behavior called for, the possibility of being evaluated by others, consequences, and also, particular members of the "other" race. It is conceivable that attitudes toward blacks in general, will be quite different from the attitudes toward a particular group of blacks in a particular situation.

The above, and many other "cross pressures" do not act on a homogeneous group of tolerant individuals. The effect of any set of "cross pressures" may depend on the personality characteristics of the individual.

The lack of relationship between denial-of-complex-feelings and behavior suggests that high denial is a result of involvement with blacks, and does not indicate a predisposition to become involved. This refers to Collins' (unpub.) finding that subjects involved in civil rights organizations had high denial-of-complex-feelings.

The fact that denial-of-complex-feelings and repression-sensitization were not related calls for more study. There is the possibility that each measures a different aspect of repressing-sensitizing defensive style. Perhaps, people can be repressors in one area of functioning, and sensitizers in others. This seems to be suggested by Barocas' (1970) findings where repressors perceived positive emotions more accurately, and sensitizers negative ones.

These two scales may be able to complement each other. Four groups may be compared: (1) subjects who score as high repressors and high deniers-of-complex-feelings; (2) high repressors and low deniers; (3) high sensitizers and high deniers; and (4) high sensitizers and low deniers.

More attention should be given to behavioral indicators of attitude. As scientific workers in areas of great social importance, we should strive to not overlook the real world of interaction. In the natural world, people rarely express themselves in a "yes" or "no", "true" or "false" manner; and, when they do their communications are full of gestures, vocal qualities, verbal cues, and other observable behaviors which qualify meaning, and intensity, though content may remain the same.

APPENDIX I

Instructions read to class

Biographical request form

Identification request form

Collins' Attitude Toward Negroes Scale

Byrne's Repression-Sensitization Scale, Form A

Volunteer form

Instructions for black students

INTRODUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONS TO CLASS

My name is John Munoz. I am counselor in the City University -- and I am also completing my dissertation research for the Ph.D. in psychology. I am interested in social and ethnic attitudes which vary among people. To understand this problem, psychologists over the last half-century have studied it from many sides.

One of the useful methods has been the use of questionnaires. Questionnaires, however, must be tried out under actual field conditions. The aim of this study is to refine these questionnaires. Your contribution is an important one. Please answer all questions as truthfully as you can. Please answer all the questions -- although some might not seem perfectly clear -- make your own judgements and answer them. Some questions might seem outdated or obsolete because these scales have been in use for some years. Please answer the questions to the best of your ability and understanding.

Please read all instructions carefully, including the cover sheets. Remember that only I will see your answer sheets and these will be analyzed statistically for a large population -- not individually. Your answers will be completely confidential and will not be seen by your instructor nor any other person.

I hope to have the group findings before the end of term and communicate them to you. You may begin. Please remember to read all instructions carefully and answer all the questions.

In questionnaire research, many problems come up at all stages of the process. It is often necessary to go back to some previous stage and re-examine the responses in order to understand the score. It is often necessary to contact people who have completed a questionnaire to understand the meaning of the data or to get additional information. Therefore, please fill out the information requested below so that we may get in touch with you again, if necessary. Please be assured that the strictest confidentiality will be observed. Your names and other information will only be used for the purposes stated, and once that part of the project is completed this sheet will be detached and discarded. All analyses and presentations of data will be grouped; no one individual's data will ever be presented by itself even if anonymous.

Name: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Phone: _____

We are working on the construction of a questionnaire of opinions of White Americans toward the American Negro. We are asking the opinions of students in different parts of the United States. Do not put your name on this booklet.
Put your name on the answer sheet.

Here are your instructions for answering the questionnaire:
This booklet contains numbered statements. Read each statement and decide whether it is true as applied to you or false as applied to you, whether you consider the statement true - or mostly true or false or mostly false. If you think the statement is true or mostly true put a check on the answer sheet in the column headed T. If you think the statement is false or mostly false put a check in the column headed F. Please give your own opinion. Do not leave any blanks, please answer every statement.

Be sure that the number of the statement agrees with the number on your answer sheet.

Now turn the page and go ahead.

Note:

Many of the following items may seem outdated, because they were first developed several years ago. Please answer them as well as you can.

Developed by Mary Evans Collins, Ph.D.

New York University.

DO NOT MAKE ANY MARKS ON THIS BOOKLET

1. White children stand to gain much in cultural broadening from school integration.
2. In a local community or campus charity drive I would rather not be represented by a Negro chairman even if he or she were qualified for the job.
3. If the people in a community do not feel they are ready for integration, it should be delayed.
4. It is possible to have segregation and equal rights at the same time.
5. If he were qualified, I would be willing to vote for a Negro as a councilman on my city council.
6. Since segregation has been declared illegal, we should integrate schools.
7. Democratic ideals cannot be taught effectively in segregated schools.
8. Even if he were qualified I would not be willing to vote for a Negro as President of the United States.
9. It is not right to ask Americans to accept integration if they honestly don't believe in it.
10. There are as many good reasons for keeping schools segregated as there are to integrate them.
11. I am willing to have Negroes live in the same part of town as I do.
12. I see no reason why a Negro should not be allowed to marry a white person if both parties desire it.
13. Integration is more trouble than it is worth.
14. If he were qualified I would be willing to vote for a Negro for Congress from my district.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

15. I believe that the Negro is entitled to the same social privileges as the white man.
16. Integration will result in greater understanding between Negroes and whites.
17. I would rather not spend much time in social conversations with Negroes.
18. The people of each state should be allowed to decide for or against integration in state matters.
19. Most Negroes are probably not more musical than most white people.
20. I would rather not belong to a fraternity or sorority or social club which has Negro members.
21. The fight for integration is a fight for democracy.
22. Employers should be required to hire workers without regard to race.
23. Going to a public camp site with a Negro family for a vacation would make me no more self-conscious than going with a white family.
24. The inability of the Negroes to develop outstanding leaders dooms them to a low place in society.
25. I am willing to have Negroes as close personal friends.
26. I would not feel uneasy about sending my children to an inter-racial school even if the Negro children in the school were mostly from a slum neighborhood.
27. Since we live in a democracy, if we don't want integration it should not be forced upon us.
28. If I were eating lunch in a restaurant alone with a Negro, I would be less self-conscious if the Negro were of the same sex as I rather than the opposite sex.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

29. Because they have felt intolerance against themselves, Negroes tend to be less prejudiced toward other minority groups than are most people.
30. First we degrade human beings by the curse of slavery for 250 years, and then because they are not advanced we argue that they have not the capacity to rise.
31. If Negroes were given half a chance, they would certainly show that on the average they are in many ways superior to whites.
32. I could trust a Negro person as easily as I could trust a white person if I knew him well enough.
33. I would rather not have Negroes live in the same apartment building I live in.
34. Because of the limitations in their backgrounds most Southern Negroes don't have the kinds of cultural interests and manners a well-brought up white person has.
35. The Negro should be given the same educational advantages as the white man.
36. Some Negroes are so touchy about the way they are treated by whites that it is difficult to get along with them.
37. Negroes have their rights, but it is best to keep them in their own districts and schools and to prevent too much contact with whites.
38. Most Negroes do not want integration.
39. Some Negroes are as prejudiced against Negroes as some white people are.
40. The Negro and the white man are inherently equal.
41. I wouldn't think twice about what other people thought of me if I had a chance to recommend a qualified Negro teacher for a vacancy in an all white school.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

42. I am willing to live next door to a Negro family.
43. I would not feel conspicuous if I took a Negro guest for a swim at an all white club.
44. I would rather not have Negroes live in my neighborhood.
45. I would have no worries about going to a party with an attractive Negro date.
47. Integration is lowering the moral standards of our country.
48. I would worry about how it would affect my relationship with others if I were assigned a Negro as a roommate.
49. Negroes should not be favored because they are Negroes, but should be given justice because they are men.
50. Before I sponsored a Negro for membership in all white club I would think a lot about how this would make the other members feel toward me.
51. We should not integrate schools until the Negro raises his standards of living.
52. If there were complete equality of opportunity tomorrow, it would take no more than a year or so before Negroes would be showing themselves as completely equal to whites in job skills and most other areas.
53. The Negro should be accorded equal rights through integration.
54. I have felt uneasy or guilty at times when I have been critical of the behavior of a Negro person or of Negroes as a group.
55. If I needed to criticize a Negro who was working for me it would probably occur to me that he might think that my criticism meant that I was prejudiced.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

56. I would rather not try on clothes at a store where Negroes also shop and try on clothes.
57. I would be willing to have a Negro as a dinner guest in my home.
58. If the Negroes were of the same social class level as I am, I'd just as soon move into a colored neighborhood as a white one.
59. Our refusal to accept the Negro is not based on any fact in nature but rather on prejudice, and should be overcome.
60. I probably would feel somewhat self-conscious dancing with a Negro in public place.
61. Integration should not be attempted because of the turmoil it causes.
62. If I needed to correct a Negro whom I was training I would be no more careful than if he were white.
63. I think it is right that the colored race should occupy a somewhat lower position socially than the white race.
64. I would not experience any difficulty or embarrassment in talking about the Negro crime rate with Negroes.
65. The problems caused by racial intermarriage are so great that it is better to avoid almost all close contacts between Negroes and whites.
66. Regulations which restrict Negroes from voting just because they are Negroes should be abolished by federal law.
67. It makes no difference to me whether I'm Negro or white.
68. Sometimes it is difficult for me to know how to act in a really unprejudiced way.
69. I would rather not have Negroes swim in the same pool as I do.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

70. I would feel somewhat uneasy talking about intermarriage with Negroes whom I do not know well.
71. I am willing to use lending library books Negroes also borrow.
72. An unprejudiced person will not openly criticise the behavior of a Negro.
73. I think the Negroes should make up a rather clearly defined working class in America.
74. It's hard to know how friendly to be to a Negro maid or porter.
75. Integration of the schools will be beneficial to both white and Negro children alike.
76. I can't think of any circumstances in which I would feel self-conscious talking to a Negro.
77. I think I'm lucky that I am not a Negro.
78. There's something strange and different about most Negroes which makes it hard to understand them.
79. When I meet a new person I may not notice if he is a Negro or white.
80. Some Negroes are brighter and have more character than some white people.
81. It should be required by law that hospitals are available to all persons, regardless of race.
82. If the only Negroes one knows are maids or cleaning women it's hard to remember that many Negroes are well educated.
83. I can easily imagine myself falling in love with and marrying a Negro.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

84. Since there is so much need for moral and economic improvement among Negroes, Negro leaders should work mainly in these areas instead of trying to encourage closer relationships with whites.

85. Cultural and mental differences have placed a wide gap between the white man and the Negro which will not be closed for many years.

86. When I see a Negro and white couple together I'm inclined to be more curious about their relationship than if they were both Negro or both white.

87. I am willing to have Negroes go to the same barber shop or beauty shop as I do.

88. If a medical specialist to whom I was referred turned out to be a Negro I would not find this surprising.

89. The Negro must possess deeper moral strength than the white man, since he has come as far as he has in the face of far greater obstacles.

90. The difference between the black and white races is not one of mere degree, but of kind.

91. I don't like some of the Negroes I know or have heard about.

92. It would be a mistake ever to have Negroes for foremen and leaders over whites.

93. Many Negro college students, like many white students, aren't really interested in education but only in how college can improve their chances to get ahead.

94. Most Negroes in the United States whether they realize it or not have mixed feelings toward any white person.

95. Some Negro people are cleaner and are harder workers than some white people.

96. I am uncomfortable if I have to deal with Negroes except for business.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

97. I feel in sympathy with Negroes who are fighting for desegregation.

98. Negroes as a group probably have a better sense of humor than most white people.

99. In this day of rush and hurry, the Negro has met the problems of society in a much calmer manner than the white man.

100. Segregation in public places such as trains, buses, theatres, restaurants, hotels, etc. should be made unlawful.

HEALTH AND OPINION SURVEY

Form A

This inventory consists of numbered statements. Read each statement and decide whether it is true as applied to you or false as applied to you. Section of answer sheet correctly marked

You are to mark your answers on the answer sheet you have. Look at the example of the answer sheet shown at the right. If a statement is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE, as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed T. (See A at the right). If a statement is FALSE or NOT USUALLY TRUE, as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed F. (See B at the right). If a statement does not apply to you or if it is something that you don't know about, mark no mark on the answer sheet.

Remember to give your OWN opinion of yourself. Do not leave any blank spaces if you can avoid it.

In marking your answers on the answer sheet, be sure that the number of the statement agrees with the number on the answer sheet. Make your marks heavy and black. Erase completely any answer you wish to change. Do not make any marks on this booklet.

Remember, try to make some answer to every statement.

NOW OPEN THE BOOKLET AND GO AHEAD.

1. I have a good appetite.
2. I like to read newspaper articles on crime.
3. My hands and feet are usually warm enough.
4. There seems to be a lump in my throat much of the time.
5. I enjoy detective or mystery stories.
6. I am troubled by attacks of nausea and vomiting.
7. At times I feel like smashing things.
8. My sleep is fitful and disturbed.
9. Much of the time my head seem to hurt all over.
10. My judgment is better than it ever was.
11. I am in just as good physical health as most of my friends.
12. I am almost never bothered by pains over the heart or in my chest.
13. Everything is turning out just like the prophets of the Bible said.
14. I sometimes keep on at a thing until others lose their patience with me.
15. I wish I could be as happy as other seem to be.
16. I get angry sometimes.
17. Most of the time I feel blue
18. It takes a lot of argument to convince most people of the truth.
19. Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
20. I think most people would lie to get ahead.
21. I do many things which I regret afterwards (regret things more or more often than others seem to).
22. My hardest battles are with myself.
23. I believe in the second coming of Christ.
24. I have little or no trouble with my muscles twitching or jumping.
25. Much of the time I feel as if I have done something wrong or evil.
26. I am happy most of the time.
27. Often I feel as if there were a tight band about my head.
28. My table manners are not quite as good at home as when I am out in company.

29. Most people will use somewhat unfair means to gain profit or an advantage rather than to lose it.
30. Often I can't understand why I have been so cross and grouchy.
31. I have never vomited blood or coughed up blood.
32. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.
33. I commonly wonder what hidden reason another person may have for doing something nice for me.
34. Criticism or scolding hurts me terrible.
35. My conduct is largely controlled by the customs of those about me.
36. At times I feel like picking a fist fight with someone.
37. I would rather win than lose in a game.
38. Most nights I go to sleep without thoughts or ideas bothering me.
39. I have never had a fit or a convulsion.
40. I have never felt better in my life than I do now.
41. I resent having anyone take me in so cleverly that I have had to admit that it was one on me.
42. I do not tire quickly.
43. What others think of me does not bother me.
44. It makes me uncomfortable to put on a stunt at a party even when others are doing the same sort of thing.
45. I frequently have to fight against showing that I am bashful.
46. I seldom or never have dizzy spells.
47. I am afraid of losing my mind.
48. I am against giving money to beggars.
49. I frequently notice my hand shakes when I try to do something.
50. I can read a long while without tiring my eyes.
51. I have very few headaches.
52. I do not like everyone I know.
53. I enjoy many different kinds of play and recreation.
54. I gossip a little at times.
55. I brood a great deal.

56. I have periods of such great restlessness that I cannot sit long in a chair.
57. I have few or no pains.
58. Sometimes without any reason or even when things are going wrong I feel excitedly happy, "on top of the world."
59. Sometimes at elections I vote for men about whom I know very little.
60. It is safer to trust nobody.
61. I do not blame a person for taking advantage of someone who lays himself open to it.
62. My eyesight is as good as it has been for years.
63. I have often felt that strangers were looking at me critically.
64. I have periods in which I feel unusually cheerful without any special reason.
65. Life is a strain for me much of the time.
66. Even when I am with people I feel lonely much of the time.
67. I think nearly anyone would tell a lie to keep out of trouble.
68. I am easily embarrassed.
69. I worry over money and business.
70. I easily become impatient with people.
71. Sometimes I become so excited that I find it hard to get to sleep.
72. I forget right away what people say to me.
73. I often feel as if things were not real.
74. I have a habit of counting things that are not important such as bulbs on electric signs, and so forth.
75. I have strange and peculiar thoughts.
76. I get anxious and upset when I have to make a short trip away from home.
77. I have been afraid of things or people that I knew could not hurt me.
78. I have more trouble concentrating than others seem to have.
79. I have several times given up doing a thing because I thought too little of my ability.
80. Bad words, often terrible words, come into my mind and I cannot get rid of them.
81. Almost every day something happens to frighten me.

82. At periods my mind seems to work more slowly than usual.
83. I very seldom have spells of the blues.
84. I wish I could get over worrying about things I said that may have injured other people's feelings.
85. People often disappoint me.
86. I often think, "I wish I were a child again."
87. At times I think I am no good at all.
88. I worry quite a bit over possible misfortunes.
89. I am apt to pass up something I want to do because others feel that I am not going about it in the right way.
90. I find it hard to set aside a task that I have undertaken, even for a short time.
91. I feel tired a good deal of the time.

I _____ (am/am not) interested
in taking part in a follow-up study related to the present
"opinion survey." My signature below signifies my willing-
ness to participate.

(signed) _____

This questionnaire is being developed as part of a study of attitudes of white Americans toward the American black. As part of the study we are asking American blacks to fill out the questionnaire following these instructions:

Please fill out this questionnaire the way you think a typical white City College student would fill it out.

APPENDIX II

Denial-of-complex-feelings items from Collins' Attitude Scale. (The "key" is in the direction of admitting or low-denial-of-complex-feelings; it has to be reversed, so that a high score is high-denial-of-complex-feelings. The "loading" column indicates the loading of each item, reported in Collins' (1968) original study).

FACTOR II - Denial-of-Complex-Feelings

Key	Load- ing	Item
T	-.63	60. I probably would feel somewhat self-conscious dancing with a Negro in a public place.
F	.58	45. I would have no worries about going to a party with an attractive Negro date.
F	.57	83. I can easily imagine myself falling in love with and marrying a Negro.
F	.54	67. It makes no difference to me whether I'm Negro white.
T	-.53	86. When I see a Negro and white couple together I'm inclined to be more curious about their relationship than if they were both Negro or both white.
T	-.47	50. Before I sponsored a Negro for membership in all whit club I would think a lot about how this would make the other members feel toward me.
F	.47	76. I can't think of any circumstances in which I would feel self-conscious talking to a Negro.
T	-.46	46. I might feel self-conscious about having a Negro couple as overnight guests in my home.
T	-.45	70. I would feel somewhat uneasy talking about inter-marriage with Negroes whom I do not know well.
T	-.45	77. I think I'm lucky that I am not a Negro.
T	-.44	28. If I were eating lunch in a restaurant along with a Negro, I would be less self-conscious if the Negro were of the same sex as I rather than the opposite sex.
F	.43	43. I would not feel conspicuous if I took a Negro guest for a swim in an all white club.
F	.42	58. If the Negroes were of the same social class level as I am, I'd just as soon move into a colored neighborhood as a white one.

FACTOR II - Denial-of-Complex-Feelings

Key	Load- ing	Item
T	-.41	68. Sometimes it is difficult for me to know how to act in a really unprejudiced way.
F	.40	41. I wouldn't think twice about what other people thought of me if I had a chance to recommend a qualified Negro teacher for a vacancy in an all white school.
F	.34	79. When I meet a new person I may not notice if he is a Negro or white.
F	.33	64. I would not experience any difficulty or embarrassment in talking about the Negro crime rate with Negroes.
F	.33	26. I would not feel uneasy about sending my children to an inter-racial school even if the Negro children in the school were mostly from a slum neighborhood.
T	-.32	55. If I needed to criticise a Negro who was working for me it would probably occur to me that he might think that my criticism meant that I was prejudiced.
T	-.32	74. It's hard to know how friendly to be to a Negro maid or porter.
F	.31	12. I see no reason why a Negro should not be allowed to marry a white person if both parties desire it.
F	.30	23. Going to a public camp site with a Negro family for a vacation would make me no more self-conscious than going with a white family.
F	.28	88. If a medical specialist to whom I was referred turned out to be a Negro I would not find this surprising.
T	-.25	85. Cultural and mental differences have placed a wide gap between the white man and the Negro which will not be closed for many years.
T	-.23	34. Because of the limitations in their backgrounds most Southern Negroes don't have the kinds of cultural interests and manners a well-brought up white person has.

APPENDIX III

Procedure to be followed in 'phone contact.

PHONE CONTACT

Mr. or Mrs. or Miss _____? Hello, I'm John Munoz, a counselor at City University. You will remember that I passed out questionnaires in your psychology class as part of my research.

As part of my counseling duties, I have arranged a series of consciousness-raising groups of black City College students. These all-black groups would like now to meet once with some white students to discuss race relationships at City College. Since I had the telephone numbers of a random sample of psychology students, I am calling you myself -- to preserve the confidentiality I promised -- to ask you

Would you like to participate?

PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED FOR POSITIVE RESPONSES

UNQUALIFIED YES: "There are a lot of times available -- Mon. thru Fri. from 4:00 to 6:00 P.M." (If these are not acceptable, then offer:) "Thurs. during club hours, from 12:00 to 2:00 P.M. or Sat. 9 - 1 P.M. (If this also is not acceptable, then schedule at whatever time is convenient for Subject.) "I will have to get back to you on this because first I have to see if I can have the group change its meeting time to coincide with your schedule. If this is possible, I'll call you back."

QUALIFIED YES: Answers such as, "Yes, but I need to know more about it..." (Follow the procedure for the "Maybe's").

Answers such as "Yes", but I can't afford the time right now. Call me in a few weeks." or a "Yes" but for some reason the Subject will not commit himself to an appointment, will be treated as a "No". Go to the procedure to be followed for a negative response.

PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED FOR NEGATIVE RESPONSES

UNQUALIFIED NO: In case of a flat refusal, use prods in following sequence:

1. I'm surprised at your refusal since your questionnaire responses indicate that you are a person with low prejudice.
2. You will be helping black students understand themselves. Please help them.
3. What "turns you off?"
4. Please reconsider and help me.

QUALIFIED NO: Answers such as, "No, there is an emergency at home. My mother is in the hospital, etc.", or some other concrete and understandable excuse in which the person indicates that because of unusual present circumstances he cannot consider attending will be categorized as a "qualified no". Answers such as "No, I cannot spare the time right now." or, "Yes, but not right now" or a "Yes" followed by an inability to make an appointment, will be treated as "unqualified no's", and the procedure of "prods" will be used. Answers such as, "No, I don't know enough about it", or any answer indicating lack of information will then be treated as a "Maybe".

PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED FOR A "MAYBE" OR REQUEST FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION

There are bound to be questions asking for descriptions of the makeup of the groups, how they function, what the interactions will be like if the subject is present, the purposes and goals, the history, etc. According to the questions the following information will be imparted:

History and formation of the groups: A desire to get together and talk about mutual problems sprung up among many black students. Some of the administration heard about this and because of my experience I was asked to help set up discussion or consciousness-raising groups. My involvement is basically in helping them to get organized, get rooms and some advice here and there, though basically the groups run themselves and decide what to talk about. They decided recently that they would like to include some white students in each group for one session to talk about black-white relationships. To preserve the confidentiality that I promised I volunteered to call you myself.

Purposes and goals: Well, each group differs from the other, but the general purpose is to become more aware of the problems that they have in common and to share experiences. Since the question of black-white relationships comes up often they decided that it would be helpful to include some white students in one session.

Functioning and nature of interactions of the groups: Can't really predict this. They're just like any other groups -- sometimes vibrant and challenging, other times quiet and contemplative, most of the time interesting.

Make-up of the group: Cross-section of the typical CCNY black students. There are about 5 to 8 black students in each group. Some are mostly males, others females, and others split down the middle. Can't really predict it because it's often up to who shows up that particular meeting. (How many whites will be in each group?). I can't tell you exactly, except that there will be some. (Will I be alone?). That's highly unlikely. (Will you be there?). I'm often around. You should remember that you may leave the group at any time. (I'll go if you can guarantee a certain composition of the group). I can't really do that, but let me say that the groups are well mixed, and its highly unlikely that you will be in an unmixed or unbalanced group.

IF SUBJECT FINALLY SAYS "YES": Follow procedure for positive responses.

IF SUBJECT SAYS "NO": Follow procedure for negative responses.

IF SUBJECT SAYS HE HAS TO THINK ABOUT IT: Follow procedure for negative responses.

Bibliography

- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel - Brunswick, Else, Levinson, D.J. & Sanford, R.N. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1950.
- Allport, G.W. The nature of prejudice. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1954.
- Barocas, H. The effects of defensive styles (repression-sensitization) on the perception and communication of vocal affect. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, City University of New York, 1970.
- Bettelheim, B. and Janowitz, M. Social change and prejudice. New York: The Free Press, 1964.
- Bettleheim, B. and Janowitz, M. Ethnic tolerance: a function of social and personal control. In H. Proshansky & B. Seidenberg (Eds.) Basic readings in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.
- Blumer, H. Research on racial relations: United States of America. *International Social Science Bulletin*, 1958, 10, 403-447.
- Brookover, W.B., and Holland, J.B. An inquiry into the meaning of minority group attitude expressions. *American Sociological Review*, 1952, 17, 196-202.
- Bruner, J.S. and Postman, L. Emotional selectivity in perception and reaction. *Journal of Personality*, 1947, 16, 69-77.
- Byrne, D. The repression-sensitization scale: Rationale, reliability, and validity. *Journal of Personality*, 1961, 29, 334-349.
- Byrne, D. Childrearing antecedents of repression-sensitization. *Child Development*, 1964, 35, 1033-1039, (a).
- Byrne, D. Repression-sensitization as a dimension of personality. In B.A. Maher (Ed.) Progress in experimental personality research. New York: Academic Press, 1964, 169-220, (b).

- Byrne, D., Barry, J. and Nelson, D. Relation of the revised repression-sensitization scale to measure of self-description. *Psychological Reports*, 1963, 13, 323-334.
- Byrne, D. and Griffitt, W. Similarity and awareness of personality characteristics and determinants of attraction. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality*, 1969, 3, 179-186.
- Carpenter, B., Wiener, M., and Carpenter, Janet T. Predictability of perceptual defense behavior. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology*, 1956, 52, 380-383.
- Chein, I., Deutsch, M., Hyman, H., and Jahoda, Marie. Consistency and inconsistency in intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1949, 5, No. 3, 63p.p.
- Clark, L.F., and Neuringer, C. Repressor-sensitizer personality styles and associated levels of verbal ability, social intelligence, sex knowledge and quantitative ability. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 1971, 36, 183-188.
- Collins, Mary E. Dissimulation factors in attitude measurement. Unpublished manuscript, Research Center for Mental Health, New York University, 1968. (Mimeo).
- DeFleur, M.L. and Westie, F.R. Verbal attitudes and overt acts: an experiment on the salience of attitudes. *American Sociological Review*, 1958, 23, 667-673.
- DeFriese, G.H. and Ford, W.S., Jr. Open occupancy: what whites say, what they do. *Transactions*, 1968, 5, 53-56.
- Eriksen, C.W. Some implications for TAT interpretation arising from need and perception experiments. *Journal of Personality*, 1951, 19, 282-288.
- Feder, Carol Z. Relationship of repression-sensitization to adjustment status, social desirability, and acquiescence response set. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1967, 31, 401-406.
- Fendrich, J.M. Perceived reference group support: racial attitudes and overt behavior. *American Sociological Review*, 1967, 32, 960-970.
- Fenichel, O. The psychoanalytic theory of neurosis. New York: Norton Press, 1945.

- Fishbein, M. Attitude and the prediction of behavior. In M. Fishbein (Ed.), Readings in attitude theory and measurement. New York: Wiley, 1967.
- Foulds, M.L. and Wareslime, R.G. Relationship between repression-sensitization and a measure of self-actualization. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 1971, 36, 257-259.
- Green, J.A. Attitudinal and situational determinants of intended behavior toward blacks. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 1972, 22, 13-17.
- Harding, J., Kutner, B., Proshansky, H., and Chein, I. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology, Volume 2, Cambridge, Mass: Addison - Wesley, 1954.
- Hyman, H.H. Social psychology and race relations. In I. Katz and Patricia Gurin (Eds.), Race and the social sciences. New York: Basic Books, 1969.
- Khol, T.A., and Nickols, Shirley A. Conformity and repression-sensitization. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1971, 84, 251-256.
- Kutner, B., Wilkins, Carol and Yarrow, Penny R. Verbal attitudes and overt behavior involving racial prejudice. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology*, 1952, 47, 649-652.
- LaPiere, R.T. Attitudes versus actions. *Social Forces*, 1934, 13, 230-237.
- Lazarus, R.S., Eriksen, C.W., and Fonda, C.P. Personality dynamics and auditory perceptual recognition. *Journal of Personality*, 1951, 19, 471-482.
- Lefcourt, H.M. Repression-sensitization: a measure of the evaluation of emotional expression. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1966, 30, 444-449.
- Liberty, P.G., Lunneborg, C.E., and Atkinson, G.C. Perceptual defense, dissimulation, and response styles. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1964, 28, 529-537.
- Lindzey, G. Differences between the high and low in prejudice and their implications for a theory of prejudices. *Journal of Personality*, 1950, 19, 16-40.

- Linn, L.S. Verbal attitudes and overt behavior: a study of racial discrimination. *Social Forces*, 1965, 43, 353-364.
- Lohman, J.D. and Reitzes, D.C. Deliberately organized groups and racial behavior. *American Sociological Review*, 1954, 19, 342-344.
- Lomont, J.F. The repression-sensitization dimension in relation to anxiety responses. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1965, 29, 84-86.
- Merbaum, M. and Kozaoka, K. Reports of emotional experiences by sensitizers and repressors during an interview transaction. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 1967, 72, 101-105.
- Orne, M.T. On the social psychology of the psychological experiment: with particular reference to demand characteristics and their implications. *American Psychologist*, 1962, 17, 776-783.
- Parsons, O.A., Fulgenzi, L.B., and Edelberg, R. Aggressiveness and Psychophysiological responsivity in groups of repressors and sensitizers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1969, 12, 235-244.
- Pearlin, L.I. Shifting group attachments and attitudes toward Negroes. *Social Forces*, 1954, 33, 47-50.
- Peatman, J.G. Introduction to applied statistics. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
- Rokeach, M., and Kliejunas, P. Behavior as a function of attitude-toward-object and attitude-toward-situation. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 1972, 22, 194-201.
- Schafer, R. Psychoanalytic interpretation in Rorschach testing. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1954.
- Sullivan, P.F., and Roberts, L.K. Relationship of manifest anxiety to repression-sensitization on the MMPI. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 1969, 33, 763-764.
- Tempone, V.J. Extension of the repression-sensitization hypothesis to success and failure experience. *Psychological Reports*, 1964, (a), 15, 39-45.
- Tempone, V.J., and Lamb, W. Repression-sensitization and its relation to measures of adjustment and conflict. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1967, 31, 131-136.

- Triandis, H.C. Toward an analysis of the components of interpersonal attitudes. In Carolyn W. Sherif & Muzafer Sherif (Eds.), Attitude, ego-involvement, and change. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967, 227-270.
- Warner, L.G., and DeFleur, M.L. Attitude as an interactional concept: social constraint and social distance as intervening variables between attitudes and action. *American Sociological Review*, 1969, 34, 153-169.
- Webber, A.W. Repression-sensitization, prejudice and culture as predictors of projection, denial, and intropunitiveness-extropunitiveness. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Texas at Austin, 1968.
- Weber, S.J., and Cook, T.D. Subject effects in laboratory research: an examination of subject roles, demand characteristics, and valid inference. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1972, 77, 273-295.
- Wicker, A.W. Attitude versus actions: the relationship of verbal and overt behavioral responses to attitude objects. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1969, 25, No. 4, 41-78.
- Woodmansee, J.J., and Cook, W.W. Dimension of prejudice in verbal measures of attitude toward Negroes. Progress Report, Attitude Research Project, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, 1965. (Mimeo).
- Woodmansee, J.J., and Cook, S.W. Dimensions of verbal attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1967, 7, 240-250.