

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This material 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.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

**Xerox University Microfilms**

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

74-13,445

KORNFELD, Alfred D., 1942-  
THE FAVORABILITY OF PERSON PERCEPTION AS A  
FUNCTION OF PERCEIVER AND TARGET PERSON  
PERSONALITY STYLE.

The City University of New York, Ph.D., 1974  
Psychology, clinical

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© COPYRIGHT BY

ALFRED D. KORNFELD

1974

THE FAVORABILITY OF PERSON PERCEPTION  
AS A FUNCTION OF PERCEIVER AND TARGET  
PERSON PERSONALITY STYLE

by

ALFRED D. KORNFELD

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.

1974

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 16, 1974  
date

Alden E. Wessman  
Chairman of Examining Committee

1/23/74  
date

Flora L. Denmark  
Executive Officer

Professor Alden E. Wessman

Professor David F. Ricks

Professor Harold Wilensky

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to the members of my dissertation committee. Dr. Alden E. Wessman served as chairman. His generosity and optimism counteracted my more negative affects. Dr. David F. Ricks offered kindness and subtle wisdom. The support and encouragement of Dr. Harold Wilensky, given over a period of years, played a significant role in enabling this project to reach fruition.

Dr. Leo Schneiderman has long been a source of intellectual stimulation. He graciously consented to serve as a pre-informed judge. In addition, I would like to thank Ann Marie Orza and Sheila Wachtel, who also acted as pre-informed judges. My colleague, Ed Nebelkopf, offered valuable suggestions during the initial stages of this study.

A special debt of gratitude is owed Malcolm Forbes, who served as the interviewer and provided general assistance.

I would also like to gratefully acknowledge the contributions made by the staff and students of E.C.S.C. and G.H.C.C.

It is impossible to enumerate the contributions made by my wife, Teena. I will only mention her love and dedication.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	6
The Person Perception Literature . . . . .	6
Development of the concept of person perception . . . . .	6
Development of the concept of implicit personality theory . . . . .	8
Individual differences and implicit personality theory . . . . .	12
Sex differences in person perception . . . . .	13
Individual differences and person perception . . . . .	15
Summary. . . . .	16
The Repression-Sensitization Literature. . . . .	17
Theoretical background of the concepts of defense and repression . . . . .	17
Early empirical studies of repression- sensitization. . . . .	18
The development of the R-S scale . . . . .	20
Repression-sensitization and social desirability . . . . .	22
The r-s dimension and impression formation processes. . . . .	24
The r-s dimension and social interaction . . . . .	25
Conclusions and Evaluation of the R-S Scale. . . . .	26
The Experimental Hypotheses. . . . .	28
III. METHOD . . . . .	30
General Description and Rationale for the Selection of the Measuring Instruments . . . . .	30
Repression-sensitization scale . . . . .	30
The person perception rating instrument. . . . .	31
The defensive style rating form. . . . .	34
The Experimental Design. . . . .	34

Phase one - designation of the three perceiver-rater groups on the basis of R-S scores . . . . .	34
Phase two - testing and selection of extreme repressors and extreme sensitizer target persons as stimulus objects . . . . .	35
Phase three - data collection: rating of target persons by the <u>Ss</u> . . . . .	37
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	39
Preliminary Analysis of Repression- Sensitization Scores . . . . .	39
The Testing for Equivalence of Perceiver- Rater Types . . . . .	41
Analysis of the Pre-Informed Judges' Ratings . . . . .	44
Analysis of the Main Hypotheses . . . . .	46
Correlational Analysis of Individual Scales . . . . .	60
Perceiver-Raters Free Description of Target Stimuli. . . . .	61
V. DISCUSSION . . . . .	64
Greater Favorability Ratings Assigned to Repressor Targets . . . . .	64
Cheerfulness-Depression as a Salient Dimension of R-S Scores and Favorability Ratings . . . . .	67
Additional Components of R-S Scores: Anxiety . . . . .	69
R-S Scores, Social Desirability, and Self- Presentation. . . . .	70
R-S Scores and Psychopathology. . . . .	72
Relationship of the Present Findings to Other Person Perception Studies . . . . .	73
The Present Findings and the Construct Validity of the Repression-Sensitization Scale . . . . .	75
Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Research. . . . .	77
VI. SUMMARY . . . . .	79
APPENDICES . . . . .	83
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	131

## LIST OF TABLES

1. Mean Favorableness and Meaningfulness Values of Adjectives Comprising the Person Perception Rating Instrument . . . . .	33
2. Experimental Groups . . . . .	38
3. Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges of R-S Scores for the E.C.S.C. and G.H.C.C. Samples and Byrne's Norms . . . . .	39
4. Distribution of R-S Scores for the G.H.C.C. and E.C.S.C. Samples . . . . .	41
5. Means, $t$ Values, Variances, and $F$ Values for E.C.S.C. R-S Scores . . . . .	43
6. Analysis of Variance of Pre-Informed Judges' Ratings . . . . .	44
7. R-S Scores and Pre-Informed Judges' Ratings for Selected Target Person Stimuli. . . . .	46
8. Analysis of Variance of Total Person Perception Favorability Scores . . . . .	49
9. Analysis of Variance of the Total Person Perception Favorability Scores for Extreme Groups. . . . .	54
10. Analysis of Variance of the Adjective Traits - Warm-Cold, Kind-Unkind, Cheerful-Depressed, Courteous-Rude, and Ambitious-Lazy. . . . .	55
11. Analysis of Variance for the Adjective Traits - Trustworthy-Untrustworthy, Intelligent-Unintelligent, Thoughtful-Thoughtless, Broadminded-Narrowminded, and Sincere-Insincere . . . . .	56
12. Summary of Target Factors Across All Raters . . . . .	57
13. Mean Favorability Rating for Individual Target Stimuli. . . . .	59
14. Correlational Analysis of Individual Scales . . . . .	60

15.	Content Analysis of Raters' Free Descriptions of Target Persons . . . . .	63
16.	Analysis of Variance for Cheerful-Depressed . . . . .	85
17.	Analysis of Variance for Courteous-Rude . . . . .	86
18.	Analysis of Variance for Warm-Cold. . . . .	87
19.	Analysis of Variance for Ambitious-Lazy . . . . .	88
20.	Analysis of Variance for Kind-Unkind. . . . .	89
21.	Analysis of Variance for Trustworthy-Untrustworthy. . . . .	90
22.	Analysis of Variance for Broadminded-Narrowminded . . . . .	91
23.	Analysis of Variance for Thoughtful-Thoughtless . . . . .	92
24.	Analysis of Variance for Sincere-Insincere. . . . .	93
25.	Analysis of Variance for Intelligent-Unintelligent. . . . .	94
26.	Repressor Raters-Repressor Targets. . . . .	119
27.	Neutral Raters-Repressor Targets. . . . .	120
28.	Sensitizer Raters-Repressor Targets . . . . .	121
29.	Repressor Raters-Sensitizer Targets . . . . .	122
30.	Neutral Raters-Sensitizer Targets . . . . .	123
31.	Sensitizer Raters-Sensitizer Targets. . . . .	124
32.	Discarded Perceiver-Rater Subjects. . . . .	125
33.	Repression-Sensitization and Depression- Brooding Scores for the G.H.C.C. Sample . . . . .	127
34.	Pre-Informed Judges' Ratings. . . . .	130

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The significance of person perception for interpersonal behavior has acquired axiomatic status (Smith, 1966; Warr and Knapper, 1968). That clinicians have long been cognizant of the need to comprehend this phenomenon is attested to by their reliance upon such concepts as transference, counter-transference, and parataxic distortion (Singer, 1965). Yet, relatively few experimental studies have clearly demonstrated a relationship between personality variables and the processes of impression formation. Thus far, consistent individual differences in person perception have been mainly found to be associated with cognitive attributes such as cognitive complexity (Tagiuri, 1969). There is a paucity of evidence showing that an individual's position along a given personality dimension correlates with the accurate perception of others (Shrauger and Altrocchi, 1964). In view of the acknowledged salience of person perception processes, there would appear to be a need for studies that formulate and test specific hypotheses relating individual differences in personality traits to person perception variables. The present study constitutes one effort to fulfill this need. More specifically, this study is directed towards an examination of the relationship between impression formation and the dimension of personality style known as repression-sensitization.

Byrne's (1961, 1963) Repression-Sensitization (R-S) Scale has

gained general acceptance as the standard operational definition of the repression-sensitization dimension. Individuals located at the upper and lower ends of this dimension have been labelled Sensitizers and Repressors respectively. Repressors are defined as individuals who avoid anxiety-evoking stimuli through the utilization of repression and denial. Sensitizers are defined as individuals who approach anxiety-evoking stimuli and use such defenses as intellectualization and obsessive rumination (Byrne, 1964). While the actual construct validity of the R-S Scale is somewhat unclear, its heuristic value has been demonstrated in numerous studies in the areas of anxiety, defense, and self-perception (Epstein and Shontz, 1972). Recent evidence suggests that it may also have relevance for the processes of person perception and impression management. Parsons and Fulgenzi (1968) report that Repressor judges tend to give more favorable ratings to Sensitizer targets on measures of hostility and aggression than do Sensitizer judges when they rate Repressor targets. Sensitizers also appear to possess a negative "philosophy of life," tending to see the generalized other in less favorable terms than do Repressors (Duke and Wrightsman, 1968).

The R-S Scale may be interpreted as an index of attitude toward inner and outer stimuli (Epstein and Shontz, 1972). There is evidence to suggest that verbal and non-verbal measures of anxiety are more discrepant for Repressors than for Sensitizers (Weinstein, Averill, Opton, and Lazarus, 1968).

Byrne, Golightly, and Sheffield (1965) found that Repressors scored at or above the mean scale value of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) standardization group, while Sensitizers scored below the mean on most scales. This finding may reflect a denial of any real

problems on the part of Repressors rather than any superior adjustment. Turk (1963) has proposed that the repression-sensitization dimension be redefined as a measure of "presentational conformity," or the extent to which an individual presents himself in a culturally approved fashion while avoiding the expression of negative affect. Repressors would therefore be expected to show more conformity to social norms and what Goffman (1959) has termed "the presentation of self in everyday life."

Carrera and Cohen (1968) have operationally defined the R-S Scale as a measure of the tendency to express socially desirable feelings and attitudes. They present evidence to indicate that the verbal behavior of Sensitizers contains a greater amount of negative affect than does the verbal behavior of Repressors. Lefcourt (1966) states that Sensitizers describe Repressors as liars, happy go lucky, conservative, and not too bright. Repressors describe Sensitizers as ill, abnormal, and away from reality. Sensitizers viewed the R-S Scale as a measure of personality characteristics, equating emotional expression with honesty with oneself. Thus there is evidence consistent with the hypothesis that both the impression one forms of others, and the impressions that one "gives off" (Goffman, 1959) relate to the r-s personality style.

One problem which is frequently encountered in the attempt to relate personality variables and person perception is the failure to clearly specify the nature of the personality factors and the nature of their interaction with target stimulus characteristics (Shrauger and Altrocchi, 1964). In addition, the problem of measuring person perception accuracy remains a vexing issue which has caused some investigators to propose that the processes underlying person perception are themselves

worthy of study (Tagiuri, 1958). This study will attempt to grapple with the aforementioned problems by specifying the nature of both the perceiver's and target's personality style. The issue of veridicality is deliberately eschewed, and is replaced by an examination of some aspects of the perceiver's implicit personality theory (Warr and Knapper, 1968). More specifically, the favorability and differentiation of the subjects' impressions will be related to the r-s status of the perceiver and target person.

The favorability of impression is generally regarded as a primary element in interpersonal behavior (Carson, 1969), person perception (Warr and Knapper, 1968), and Semantic Differential ratings (Snider and Osgood, 1969). Shrauger and Altrocchi (1964) have argued that the degree of favorability expressed in the description of another person "...should be high on a priority list of specific dimensions worth investigating (pp. 294-295)."

Altrocchi (1961) reported a tendency for Sensitizers to make greater differentiations between others than did Repressors. Sensitizers appear to resemble obsessive-compulsive individuals, while Repressors most closely resemble Hysterics. The cognitive characteristics of the latter have been described as global, diffuse, and unarticulated (Gardner, Holzman, Klein, Linton, and Spence, 1959; Shapiro, 1965). Repressors also appear to resemble cognitively simple individuals in their concern for the norm value of behavior. In contrast, Sensitizers resemble cognitively complex individuals in their tendency to perceive others in terms of depth and maladjustment (Bieri, Atkins, Briar, Leaman, Miller, and Tripodi, 1966).

The major hypotheses of this study are as follows:

1. Repressors will tend to demonstrate a higher level of favorability rating (Smith, 1966) than will Neutrals, and Sensitizers. Accordingly,

Repressor perceivers will rate all types of target persons more favorably than will Neutral and Sensitizer perceivers.

2. The person perceptions of Neutrals and Sensitizers will be more differentiated than those of Repressors. In contrast to Repressor perceivers, Neutral and Sensitizer perceivers will vary their assignment of favorability as a function of the type of person and trait being rated.

Specifically, it is predicted than Sensitizer and Neutral perceivers will rate Repressor targets less favorably than will Repressor raters on those traits deemed to be less manageable in nature.

3. The r-s continuum will exhibit a relationship to self-presentational behavior. Thus, Repressor targets will be more favorably rated by all perceiver types than will Sensitizer targets.

The testing of the above hypotheses will involve the creation of perceiver-rater and target person groups. Perceiver raters will be classified as either Repressors, Neutrals, or Sensitizers on the basis of scores obtained on the R-S sample distribution. Similarly, scores on the obtained R-S sample distribution will be used to classify target persons as either Repressors or Sensitizers. Video-tape recordings of interviews conducted with the target persons will be rated by pre-informed judges for the presence of repressing versus sensitizing characteristics. Finally, the target persons most accurately identified by the pre-informed judges will be rated for favorability by the perceiver-rater groups.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### THE PERSON PERCEPTION LITERATURE

##### Development of the Concept of Person Perception

The historical antecedent of experimental investigation in the area of person perception may be found in Darwin's classic studies on emotional expression (Thompson, 1968). Darwin's concern with the factors underlying the accurate perception of emotions influenced early experimental workers. Accordingly, much of the pre-1950 literature centered upon the measurement of accuracy in inferring emotions and personality traits in others. Woodworth and Schlossberg's identification of three dimensions in the judgment of facial expressions exemplifies this type of research (Hastorf, Schneider, and Polefka, 1970). However, under the impetus of Cronbach's (1958) critique of person perception accuracy scores, there ensued a re-evaluation of research strategy. Recognizing the inherent difficulties in ascertaining the veridicality of person perceptions, some investigators proposed that the underlying processes involved in judging others were themselves worthy of study (Tagiuri, 1958). It also seems probable that the elucidation of person perception processes is a necessary prerequisite for accuracy-type studies.

Conceptually, the process of person perception may be defined as an inferential process which goes beyond raw data information to create personality or dispositional constructs (Brown, 1965). This process has been

variously labelled impression formation, social cognition, social perception, interpersonal perception, le connaissance d'autri, and person perception (Tagiuri, 1969). Current usage appears to favor the latter term (Allport, 1961). Despite variation in the terminology employed, most investigators seem to agree upon a fundamental set of properties which are associated with the perception of social rather than physical objects. These include such common factors as the attribution of causality, intention, and dispositions (Heider, 1958), and organization in terms of structure, meaning, and stability (Hastorf et al., 1970). In addition, it is thought that the nature of the social stimulus may be a factor in determining the type of process involved.

Bronfenbrenner, Harding, and Gallwey (1958) distinguished two types of abilities in person perception. The first type is defined in terms of sensitivity to the generalized other, and refers to the awareness of social norms. In this instance the subject is required to identify common rather than individual characteristics. The second type of ability is defined as the capacity to judge the particular other and relates to the perception of differences between others. The failure to differentiate these two apparently distinct abilities has sometimes resulted in both theoretical and methodological confusion.

The work of S. Asch (1946) generated much of the current interest in the experimental investigation of person perception. Strongly influenced by Gestalt Theory, Asch rejected simple additive models of person perception. Instead, he hypothesized that impression formation was a process resulting from the organization of stimulus traits into immediate wholes. The heuristic value of Asch's work is undeniable, although his actual experimentation has been criticized both on the grounds of its putative

artificiality and its inadequate theoretical model (Matkom, 1963). Nevertheless, it has been demonstrated that such central traits as "warm-cold" are functionally related to differential expectations regarding others and to subsequent behavior (Kelley, 1950).

#### Development of the Concept of Implicit Personality Theory

Asch's investigations raised the question of how inferences about another were actually engendered. The hypothesis that inferences resulted from global impressions formed on the basis of stimulus characteristics left the operations involved in making such inferences undefined. In an effort to clarify the nature of these processes Bruner and Tagiuri (1954) proposed an alternative model having as its central construct "naive" or "implicit personality theory" (IPT). This common sense type theory referred to the manner in which inferential relationships between personality traits were generated within individuals. Subsequent research based on implicit personality theory indicated that a knowledge of inferences drawn from single personality traits could be used to predict inferences drawn from double traits, while the latter predicted inferences drawn from triple trait combinations (Bruner, Shapiro, and Tagiuri, 1958). As Bruner et al. noted: "The matrix of lay personality theory is related to definite operations within a specified universe of content that defines the meaning of traits in combination (p. 228)." This type of definition suggests that the processes involved in judging another may be closer to cognition or apperception rather than to pure perception. It must also be noted that the above definition reflects an objective analysis of implicit personality theory. Viewed in a phenomenological framework, there is a very low probability of an individual being able to state formally his particular pattern or combination of categories or beliefs (Rosenberg and Jones, 1972).

Since there is no single definition of ipt that has attained universal acceptance, the following list of definitions is presented, to be followed by an analysis of some common characteristics:

1. "The assumed correlations between traits which we carry around in our heads... it is simply a correlation matrix among traits" (Hastorf et al., 1970).
2. "The categories used in the everyday characterization of personality" (Brown, 1965).
3. The space defined by the central tendency, variability and the shape of the descriptive distribution that is characteristic of a judge. (Cronbach, 1958).
4. "That process in person perception whereby the possession of a desirable attribute is assumed to imply the possession of other desirable attributes" (Warr and Simms, 1965).
5. a) "The categories that an individual employs to describe the range of abilities, attitudes, interests, physical features, traits, and values that he perceives in himself and others."  
b) "The beliefs that the person holds concerning which of these beliefs go together and which do not" (Rosenberg and Jones, 1972).
6. The "...relative frequencies of joint occurrences of various personality attributes and behavioral dispositions in other persons" (Passini and Norman, 1966).
7. "A set of learned associations about traits, attributes, and behaviors which go together" (Hakel, 1969).
8. A type of lay personality theory which shares many of the features of scientific personality theory, such as concern with the correlation of traits, the selection of salient dimensions of categorization, and the weighing of personality items (Argyle, 1969).
9. An individual pattern of trait intercorrelations (Koltuv, 1962).
10. A general evaluative set in impression formation, i.e., Thorndike's Halo Effect (Hastorf et al., 1970).
11. Newcomb's logical error or the relationship between traits that arise from logical presuppositions as opposed to actual behavioral relationships (Tagiuri, 1969).

It would appear that the most salient feature of these ipt definitions is the emphasis on the intercorrelation of personality trait concepts within a given individual. While there is a focus on individual

organization, it is recognized that commonly held assumptions concerning ipt across individuals may generate widely shared stereotypes about personality. A strong cognitive element is also present, with the individual depicted as weighing and/or selecting the relevant dimensions for personal analysis. The latter aspect of ipt is most extensively developed in G. Kelly's (1955) theory of personal constructs, where the individual's cognitive map is organized along the lines of bi-polar constructs. The Kelly-derived construct of cognitive complexity has implications for research in the area of impression formation (Shrauger and Altrocchi, 1964).

The halo effect and logical error represent early attempts at portraying ipt, although they emphasized error in rating others. There is a striking similarity between the shift from halo type error conceptions to ipt interpretations, and recent re-interpretations of response styles such as social desirability and acquiescence. In both instances, what was formerly regarded as a nuisance and a source of error, is now viewed as a meaningful variable that may correlate with personality factors. Finally, with the exception of Cronbach's and Koltuv's psychometric analyses, most of the definitions have a global and non-specific quality.

Implicit personality theory has frequently referred to those aspects of impression formation that transcend a specific situation and which therefore are characteristic of the individual. It is in regard to this aspect of ipt that the issue of veridicality in person perception is most pertinent. Hastorf et al. (1970) have defined this problem in terms of the realist versus idealist positions. For the realist the process of interpersonal judgment is reflective of actual trait intercorrelations present in the social stimulus. Gordon Allport (1961) illustrated this position

when he proposed a general ability to judge others that was trans-situational in character. He suggested that such attributes as intelligence, experience, cognitive complexity, and self-insight were characteristic of the "good judge." For the idealist, person perception is more likely to reflect the characteristics of the perceiver rather than those of the object being perceived.

The research of Norman and Passini (1963, 1966) represents a variant of the idealist position. Initially, Norman (1966) had proposed to develop a basic descriptive or taxonomic language. Utilizing previous research conducted by R.B. Cattell, Norman factor analyzed ratings on the Peer Nomination Rating Scale (PNR), which is an adaptation of Cattell's Standard Reduced Personality Sphere (Cattell, 1965). Norman required his Ss to nominate their peers on the "A" and "B" poles of the PNR's 20 bi-polar scales. In congruence with previous research five relatively orthogonal factors emerged: I. Extraversion, II. Agreeableness, III. Conscientiousness, IV. Emotional Stability, and V. Culture. However, Norman found that even groups having relatively short interpersonal contact yielded the same factor structure. There was confirmation of this somewhat unexpected finding when Norman and Passini (1966) found no differences between the ratings of strangers as opposed to the ratings of more familiar individuals. In the former situation, all that an individual rater has available are the minimal cues provided and beliefs concerning the manner in which traits are organized in others. Hake1 (1969) reported that a factor analysis of trait implications based on the PNR scale yields the same factor structure as the above in the absence of any personal stimulus.

Dornbusch, Hastorf, Richardson, Muzzy, and Vreeland (1965) analyzed free descriptions of others made by camp children. Three types of analyses

were performed: 1. one child describing two other children, 2. two children describing one child, and 3. two children describing two other children.

In general the results of this study demonstrated that the highest degree of overlap is found in the case of the common perceiver. In consonance with the previous discussion, these authors hold that "...the most powerful influence description is the manner in which the individual perceiver structures his world (Dornbusch et al., 1965, p.440)."

#### Individual Differences and Implicit Personality Theory

The overall factors influencing the perception of others consist of the attributes of the stimulus person, the nature of the interactional task, and the characteristics of the perceiver (Tagiuri, 1958). In addition, interactions between these three factors must be taken into account.

Wertheimer (1960) found that ipt played a greater role in the ratings of others than in self-ratings. Kraus (1972) compared self-ratings, peer-ratings and judge ratings using content masked audio tapes. He reported lower correlations for self/judge ratings compared to peer/judge ratings. There are two possible explanations for this finding. On the one hand, an individual may be unaware of the types of dispositions he gives off to others. Or, alternately, he may distort self-report in a defensive fashion.

Koltuv (1963) extended this particular line of research to include an idiographic analysis of ipt's. She reported that individual trait inter-correlations were significant even after the halo effect was partialled out. Although Koltuv did not specifically examine the personality correlates of individual ipt's, she did acknowledge the possibility of systematic individual differences. For example, both sexes might infer a positive relationship between masculinity and physical attractiveness when perceiving males, but the same attributes might be negatively correlated for female stimuli.

Hamilton and Gifford (1970) tested the hypothesis that ipt is related to differences in cue utilization. Ss rated 52 preconstructed profiles of a male in his 20's, with the profiles being generated by four categories of biographical-social information and five categories of personality traits. A factor analysis revealed six judge types who emphasized such cues as biographical data, race, and cultural refinement. Wiggins and Hoffman (1969) had Ss rate 199 profiles of college students for intelligence using information ranging from level of education to the presence of anxiety. A factor analysis of their data indicated three types of judges related to the Ss own level of intelligence, ethnocentrism, and religious belief system.

An intensively idiographic analysis of ipt is contained in a provocative study by Rosenberg and Jones (1972). Essentially what these authors did was to apply recent developments in psychometric techniques to the problems of literary analysis. Deriving a list of traits from a content analysis of T. Dreiser's works, they proceeded to factor analyze their Ss ratings of these traits. This analysis yielded the following factors: I. Sex, II. Conformity, III. Evaluation, and IV. Potency. The evaluative dimension was found to be less salient than would be expected on the basis of research utilizing the Semantic Differential (Snider and Osgood, 1969), or the basic findings of person perception research (Tagiuri, 1969). However, this relatively unexpected finding may reflect Dreiser's deliberate avoidance of extreme evaluation.

#### Sex Differences in Person Perception

The emergence of a sex factor in the previous study lends credence to the common belief that sex is both a dimension of stimulus content and a source of subject variation in impression formation. Yet the effect of sex differences upon person perception remains unresolved. On the basis

of his survey of the literature, Tagiuri (1969) suggested that women are more likely to rely upon intuition and trait-inference than men. In contrast, men tend to utilize surface, physical dimensions. However, the sex variable may interact in a complex fashion with perceiver, stimulus, and task variables. For example, the ratings of like sex subjects may differ from those assigned to opposite sex subjects (Wertheimer, 1960). There may also be major sex differences for the correlates of ego control patterns and the meaning of hostility, dominance, and other traits (Shrauger and Altrocchi, 1964).

Shapiro and Tagiuri (1959) found that women are more likely to give a greater number of extreme inferences in a social perception task that utilizes a trait implicative procedure. The authors state that "...perhaps this is one of the things we mean when we say that women are extremely intuitive...they are readier to maintain more extreme hypotheses than are men (Shapiro and Tagiuri, p.135)." At the same time, these authors acknowledge that individual differences out-weighed sex differences in their study. Other studies present what is perhaps a more favorable depiction of the female. Nidorff and Crockett (1964) reported that women seek out more information than do men because the former have more available categories and are therefore able to discern fine distinctions between others. Exline (1963) observes that women are more likely to engage in mutual visual interaction in a person perception task. He relates this finding to Witkin's work on psychological differentiation, and he suggests that women are more visually field-dependent.

Sullivan (quoted in Sarbin, 1954) found that female Ss tended to use more inferential categories when asked to rate others in a paper and pencil task. Sarbin (1954) hypothesized that women would also use more inferential categories when asked to rate live Ss. He found that women generally prefer

inferential categories of the type: warm, aggressive, hostile, and logical. On the other hand, men favored descriptive categories of the type: tall, student, and girl.

While it is difficult to formulate any definite generalizations about the relation of sex and person perception, there does seem to be some agreement that women tend to be somewhat superior in accuracy and are more likely to use inferential categories in judging others.

#### Individual Differences and Person Perception

While the studies discussed in section C utilized an inductive approach, those to be discussed in this section are deductive in that they relate specific dispositional variables to impression formation. With the exception of sex differences, the individual character of the perceiver remains an area of unresolved problems with regard to person perception. Personality theory and empirical research have generally failed to isolate the personality variables that might significantly relate to person perception (Shrauger and Altrocchi, 1964). Cognitive variables have generally provided the most consistent findings in this area. Crockett (1965) found that cognitive complexity is related to the manner in which Ss utilized information in forming impressions of others. Ss high in cognitive complexity are more likely to form a final impression that utilizes both positive and negative information. Ss low in cognitive complexity seem to exhibit more concern for the norm value of behavior and to attend to surface cues such as interpersonal power and obvious intellectual skills. Cognitively complex individuals are more likely to seek out inner states and to see others in terms of depth and maladjustment (Bieri et al., 1966). In a related finding, Matkom (1963) reported that the differences in perception between the real and apparent

levels of personality were reliably greater for maladjusted Ss than they were for adjusted Ss. Authoritarianism and behavioral hostility have also been found to relate to the processes of person perception (Warr and Knapper, 1968). Warr and Simms (1965) found that Ss high on the California F Scale are more likely to make extreme judgments concerning the implication of traits when the central trait of intelligence is present.

Since person perception usually occurs in social interaction, individuals may endeavor to monitor their own behavior in order to influence the impressions which others have of them. Erving Goffman has noted that "...when an individual enters the presence of others, they commonly seek to acquire information about him or to bring into play information already possessed (Goffman, 1959, p.1)." In utilizing a dramaturgical model, Goffman invites attention to the acting, role-playing, and quasi-deliberate aspects of social interactions. Such impression management would seem to be effected through a process that is symmetrical to the impression formation process. That is, impressions are produced through the selective disclosure or suppression of behavior as a function of the role being presented (Braginsky, Braginsky, and Ring, 1969). While Goffman (1959, 1969) concentrates upon the expressive components of impression management, any type of behavior might serve this function. This has long been taken into account in personality inventories such as the MMPI, where the problem of "faking good" versus "faking-bad" is identified through the K and F scales respectively.

#### Summary

The preceding review of the person perception literature yields a number of tentative generalizations which will be incorporated into both the hypotheses to be presented at the end of this chapter and the subsequent experimental design. These generalizations are as follows:

1. Person perception processes may be studied apart from the question of accuracy.
2. Both the favorability and the differentiation of impressions appear to be significant components of person perception.
3. Impressions may be organized around such central traits as warmth and intelligence.
4. The sex of both the perceiver and the person being judged can exert an influence upon person perception processes. There is some evidence that women tend to use trait-inferential categories, while men are more responsive to surface cues.
5. When some form of social interaction is indicated, impression management processes should be taken into account.
6. Individual differences may influence person perception.

### The Repression-Sensitization Literature

#### Theoretical Background of the Concepts of Defense and Repression

The theoretical rationale for the repression-sensitization (r-s) dimension is premised upon the psychoanalytic concept of defense. The defense mechanism of repression has comprised a central element in the elucidation of theory and research in the areas of drive-control, symptom formation, and psychotherapy. In its early usage, the meaning of the term repression was coextensive with that of defense (S. Freud, 1936). Although the term defense was later expanded to encompass such additional mechanism as isolation, undoing, and projection, repression has retained its status as a major component in the conceptual armamentarium of psychoanalytical theorists and practitioners. Invariably, repression has been described as an avoidance response to potentially threatening stimuli. Utilizing a spatial analogy, S. Freud (1966) likened repression to a watchman who guards

the threshold between the states of consciousness and unconsciousness.

While the construct of sensitization has been less clearly articulated than that of repression, it has usually been associated with obsessive-compulsive type defenses such as intellectualization and ruminative worrying (Byrne, 1964).

The empirical origins of the r-s dimension are rooted in the so-called "new look" in perception. The emergence of the r-s style from perceptual research reflects a concern with the coping and defensive aspects of perception. In this connection, the prototypical statement was made by Bruner and Postman (1947), who described perception as a form of adaptive behavior dependent upon the needs and values of the organism.

Subsequent experimentation generated by the Bruner-Postman approach revealed individual differences in response to threatening stimuli. The fact that some Ss took more time than others to recognize threatening stimuli led investigators to suggest that they were exhibiting a perceptual style which was akin to repression. Unexpectedly, other Ss yielded shorter reaction times to threatening stimuli. Such Ss were apparently utilizing a perceptual process essentially indistinguishable from perceptual vigilance. The tendency of Ss to adopt either the style of perceptual defense or that of perceptual vigilance remained constant despite variations in subject population, perceptual tasks, and specific measures of defensive style (Byrne, 1964).

#### Early Empirical Studies of Repression-Sensitization

J. Gordon (1957) introduced the terms "Repressor" and "Sensitizer" into the psychological literature. Gordon defined Repressors as constricted individuals who operate with defenses which drive them away from others and

who consequently possess a lowered awareness of potential sources of interpersonal threat. He defined Sensitizers as individuals who rely on perceptual vigilance in response to threatening stimuli. Gordon hypothesized that Sensitizers would be more accurate in their perceptions of others because of their greater awareness of threat. Repressors and Sensitizers were defined by multiple criteria, including the L and K scales of the MMPI, and the Taylor MAS. Gordon reported that Repressors were more accurate in predicting similarities between themselves and others, while Sensitizers were more accurate in predicting differences between themselves and others.

Coincident with the publication of Gordon's work, Cronbach's analysis of person perception scores was beginning to exert an influence in the area of person perception research. Pursuing Cronbach's suggested component analysis of person perception ratings, Altrocchi (1961) found that differences in assumed similarity scores of Repressors and Sensitizers were a function of stable differences in self-concept rather than of actual differences in person perception. Sensitizers manifested a more negative self-concept and were a more heterogeneous group than were Repressors. Altrocchi's findings severely diminished the credibility of Gordon's study. Nevertheless, Gordon's pioneering effort raised the possibility that the r-s dimension might be related to impression formation.

Early selection criteria for Repressors and Sensitizers usually included the Hysteria (Hy) and Psychasthenia (Pt) scales of the MMPI (Altrocchi, 1961). Items on the Hy scale involve specific somatic complaints and a denial of emotional or interpersonal difficulty. High Hy scores are associated with such typical hysterical behaviors as immaturity, superficiality, naiveté, self-centeredness, and lack of insight. The Pt scale is composed of items relating to anxiety symptoms, irrational fears, and ruminative self-

doubt. Marked elevations on Pt are associated with obsessionalism (Dahlstrom, Welsh, and Dahlstrom, 1972).

#### The Development of the R-S Scale

Byrne's (1961; 1963) development of the Repression-Sensitization (R-S) Scale resulted in a refined measure of the r-s dimension. Byrne (1961) utilized a procedure where items from six MMPI scales (D, Pt, Welsh Anxiety, L, K, and Hy denial) were scored once with inconsistent items omitted. In a later study, 127 items of the original 182 R-S Scale items were cross-validated (Byrne, 1963). The split-half reliability coefficient of this cross-validated scale was determined to be .94 (corrected), while the test-retest coefficient (3 months) was reported at .82. The low, or Repressor end of the R-S Scale is largely composed of Hy items, while the Sensitizer end largely consists of Pt items (Dahlstrom et al., 1972).

Performance on the revised R-S Scale has become the standard operational definition for the determination of Repressor, Neutral, and Sensitizer. At the Repressor end of the continuum are those defenses that deal with anxiety through avoidance behaviors, and which include such defenses as repression and denial. The sensitizing end of the dimension is characterized by behaviors which deal with anxiety through such approach behaviors as intellectualization, obsessiveness, and ruminative worrying (Byrne, 1964).

Research utilizing the R-S scale has to a great extent centered about two hypotheses formulated by Byrne (1964). They are as follows:

1. Repressors are individuals who avoid threatening stimuli, while Sensitizers are individuals who approach threatening stimuli.

2. There is a curvilinear relationship between R-S scores and indices of maladjustment; i.e., maladjustment will be greatest for individuals at the extremes of the scales and least for individuals in the middle range.

These two hypotheses have generated a large number of studies directed toward an examination of the content, criterion, and construct validity of the R-S Scale. With respect to content validity, Tempone (quoted in Byrne, 1964) found that clinicians were able to correctly identify 90% of the items on the revised R-S Scale as Repressor versus Sensitizer items. Most published studies indicate a positive relationship between R-S scores and various measures of psychological disturbance. Tempone (1967) found that clinical SS drawn from a mental health center were more sensitized than a control college sample. Ihilevich and Gleser (1971) found a positive correlation between R-S Scores and a measure of field-articulation. Their interpretation of this finding is that the R-S Scale may actually be measuring anxiety rather than defensive style. Sensitizers are also more likely to exhibit conflict on projective measures compared to Repressors (Barker and King, 1970, Tempone, 1967).

The self-concept of the Sensitizer is generally regarded as being negative (Byrne, 1963). For example, Altrocchi (1961) found that Sensitizers are more likely to admit to hostile and submissive tendencies. An extreme Sensitizer may utilize an interpersonal strategy that emphasizes weakness, dependency, and depression. Such behaviors would correspond to some of the role requirements necessary for playing the "sick role" in Western society (Szasz, 1961). Sensitizers are more likely to seek and to continue psychotherapy than are Repressors (Thelen, 1969). Dublin (1968)

equated sensitization with defensive failure which results in anxiety, indecisiveness, and rumination.

The specification of the R-S Scale's construct validity remains an unsettled issue. Proposed answers to the question of what this scale is actually measuring have included presentational conformity (Turk, 1963), anxiety (Lomont, 1965), attitude toward emotionality (Lefcourt, 1966), social desirability (Feder, 1967), and defensiveness (Golen, 1967). As Lefcourt (1966) has noted, the exclusive utilization of the R-S Scale precludes an analysis in terms of converging operations and an estimation of the likelihood of alternate interpretations of the construct.

In reporting the results of a factor-analytic study, Golin, Herron, Lakota, and Reineck (1967) state that the R-S Scale and the Taylor MAS share essentially the same factor structure and meaning. Scores on both scales were found to be a function of two bi-polar and orthogonal traits, defensiveness and emotionality. Thus a high R-S score may be interpreted as the outcome of low defensiveness, high anxiety, or any intermediate combination.

#### Repression-Sensitization and Social Desirability

One potentially fruitful area of analysis concerns the relationship of the R-S Scale to measures of social desirability. Joy (quoted in Byrne, 1964) reported a correlation of  $-.91$  between R-S scores and Edwards' Social Desirability scale. Since Edwards' scale is largely composed of items referring to psychopathology, the high negative correlation is a not unexpected finding. Byrne (1964) reported a correlation of  $-.37$  between R-S scores and the Crowne-Marlowe measure of social desirability. Feder (1967) indicated that about one-quarter of the

variance in R-S scores is accounted for by a social desirability factor, and another one-quarter by an acquiescence factor. Feder concluded that about one-half of the variance in R-S scores is accounted for by response style variables and therefore the R-S Scale is not merely an alternate measure of social desirability or acquiescence.

In defending the construct validity of the R-S Scale, Byrne (1964) has argued that the network of studies and relationships that it has generated would not have resulted from response-style variables. Even allowing for response set interpretations of the R-S Scale, one is still left with the possibility that individuals who differ with respect to the former variables may nevertheless also differ in the manner in which they characteristically deal with threat (Glass, 1968).

The social implications of R-S scores provide another avenue of investigation. Turk (1963) has proposed that the r-s dimension relates to a norm governing the expression of sentiment in a social relationship. Repressors are those individuals who describe themselves in culturally approved ways, emphasize clichéd modes of expression, and eschew emotionality, especially hostility. He defines a Sensitizer as an individual who lacks restraint on such expression. Turk proposes that the r-s dimension may be best described as a measure of "presentational conformity." He reports that only in the case of Sensitizer nurse/physician dyads was there a significant correlation between the self-ratings of enjoyment of the relationship by the nurses and the physician's ratings. Apparently the Sensitizer nurse was more consistent in the overt expression of affect, resulting in greater person perception accuracy by others. Weissman and Ritter (1970) found that Sensitizers were more open to experience and lower in ego strength compared to Repressors. These same authors indicated

that Sensitizers described themselves on the Adjective Check List as more critical, impatient, unconventional, action-oriented, socially insensitive, and personally troubled than did Repressors.

#### The R-S Dimension and Impression Formation Processes

If the processes of impression management and impression formation are symmetrical, there should be differences in the types of impressions formed by Repressor and Sensitizer judges. Parsons and Fulgenzi (1968) had judges rate heterogeneous groups of Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers during a half-hour interaction period. Repressors were rated as being more hostile than Sensitizers. Sensitizer judges also rated the Repressors as being more hostile than Sensitizer targets. Repressor judges, in contrast, consistently described Sensitizers as low in hostility. Altrocchi, Shrauger, and McCleod (1964) compared the perceptions of Repressors, Sensitizers, and Expressors. The latter category is comprised of individuals who respond directly to threat, are uninhibited, and express impulses with little anxiety or guilt. Pairs of strangers rated one another during a half-hour interaction period. For male Ss, Expressors rated themselves as more hostile than did Repressors or Sensitizers. For females, Sensitizers and Expressors attributed more hostility to themselves than did Repressors. Overall, Sensitizers attributed more hostility to others than did either Repressors or Expressors.

The preceding studies suggest that the Sensitizer may be operating with a negative response bias that influences both the perception of self and others. Duke and Wrightsman (1968) report that Sensitizers perceive the generalized other in more negative terms than do Repressors.

Kaplan (1967<sub>b</sub>) has proposed a response-bias interpretation to

account for the relationship between R-S scores and person perception. The response-bias interpretation eliminates the need for traditional perceptual variables. Instead, it attempts to account for group differences in terms of response hierarchies which determine perception in an ambiguous situation. Kaplan had Repressor, Neutral, and Sensitizer Ss rate a tape-recording of an individual on the ACL. Only neutral Ss benefited from a more information condition. Repressors were more accurate than Sensitizers in this study because the criterion for stimulus selection was made on the basis of average standing on a variety of measures. The results of Kaplan's study indicate that the negative response-bias of Sensitizers interfered with veridical perception.

Smith (1969) found no differences between Repressor, Neutral, and Sensitizer judges in their ability to rate targets for Repressor versus Sensitizer characteristics. The failure to demonstrate differences between the various judges led Smith to conclude that the R-S dimension is unrelated to person perception. However, the relatively structured nature of her stimuli (written biographical descriptions) and the nature of her dependent variable (rating for r-s characteristics) may have precluded the operation of personality style.

#### The R-S Dimension and Social Interaction

There is evidence to suggest that Repressors and Sensitizers have different styles of social interaction. Axtell and Cole (1971) found that Repressors are less verbally responsive to feedback when required to present themselves in a positive or negative fashion. These authors speculate that Repressors have learned a general avoidance response to both the positive and negative aspects of self-reference in order to avoid

aversive responses from others. Repressor and Sensitizer interviewers elicit different amounts of verbal behavior from Neutral interviewees. Apparently, the greater verbalizing of Sensitizers results in an attenuation of interviewee output (Kaplan, 1967<sub>a</sub>).

Carrera and Cohen (1968) investigated the interpersonal interactions of small homogeneous groups of Sensitizers and Repressors. Operationally defining the r-s dimension as the tendency to express socially deviant and undesirable feelings and attitudes, they hypothesized that Sensitizer groups would contain a greater amount of emotionally negative verbalizations. There was some evidence to indicate that Sensitizer groups responded with greater hostile affect when subjected to an experimental failure condition.

#### Conclusions and Evaluation of the R-S Scale

An overall evaluation of the r-s literature does not yield any unequivocal conclusions. It may be safely stated that Byrne's curvilinear hypothesis has not been confirmed. It has been suggested that the R-S Scale is best interpreted as a measure of attitude toward outer and inner stimuli (Epstein and Shontz, 1972). Following this line of argument, Repressors emerge as individuals who avoid or distort experience when potential threat is present, while Sensitizers seek out a greater variety of inner and outer stimuli.

It has been noted that the conscious expression of emotional expression on the part of Repressors is more likely to be discrepant when compared to physiological measures (Lazarus, Alfert, and Lomont, 1965) or ratings made by judges (Parsons and Felgenzi, 1968). On the whole, such findings are consonant with Turk's (1963) interpretation of the r-s dimension as a measure of presentational conformity. Given a potentially

stressful situation, Repressors would be predicted to avoid direct awareness of such affects as anxiety and anger because of their conformity to certain norms and/or their interpretation of the situation. The net result might be displacement of conscious concerns to the body (physiological arousal) or unconsciously motivated behavior.

Psychoanalytic theory does not allow for a precise delineation of the consequences of relying exclusively on either repressing or sensitizing defenses (Baker and King, 1970). Excessive reliance on repression should result in unconscious conflicts, immaturity, and symptom formation, while producing an absence of conscious tension akin to the la belle indifférence of the hysteric. Sensitization, on the other hand, implies some sort of self-insight or conscious awareness of inner conflict. However, it may also be argued that a certain degree of repression is necessary to maintain personality integration and that sensitization implies a breakdown in defenses.

As this review has indicated, both Repressors and Sensitizers have been depicted as deviating from Neutrals or from some normal standard. While the balance of evidence is in favor of Repressors, there is enough evidence to suggest that the R-S Scale is something other than a linear measure of emotional expression. It may be proposed that the R-S Scale does have functional relationships to the phenomena of self-presentation (Turk, 1963, Parsons and Fulgenzi, 1968) and the perception of others (Altrocchi et al., 1964; Kaplan, 1967<sub>b</sub>; Duke and Wrightsman, 1970). In summary, the following tentative generalizations may be made:

1. Repressors tend to see themselves and others in more favorable terms compared to Sensitizers and Neutrals.
2. The person perceptions of Repressors are characterized by a positive

halo effect compared to Sensitizers.

3. Repressors are more likely to maintain a positive self-presentation and avoid the expression of negative affect than are either Neutrals or Sensitizers.

### The Experimental Hypotheses

#### Main Effects Across all Traits

Personality style of the perceiver-raters: Repressor perceiver-raters will rate target persons more favorably than will either Neutral or Sensitizer perceivers. The rank order of favorability ratings will be as follows: Repressor > Neutral > Sensitizer.

Personality style of the target person: Repressor targets will be more favorably rated by all perceiver-rater groups.

#### Interaction Effect Across All Traits

Repressor perceiver-raters will rate Repressor target stimuli more favorably than will either Sensitizer or Neutral perceiver-raters.

#### Main Effects for Specific Traits

Personality style of the perceiver-raters: For any given trait, the favorability ratings of the Repressor perceiver-raters will be higher than those of Neutral and Sensitizer perceiver-raters.

Personality style of the target person: Repressor targets will be more favorably rated by all perceiver-raters on the adjective traits: warm-cold, kind-unkind, cheerful-depressed, courteous-rude, and ambitious-lazy.

#### Interaction Effect for Specific Traits

Repressor perceiver-raters will rate Repressor targets more favorably than will either Neutral or Sensitizer perceiver-raters on the

adjective traits: sincere-insincere, trustworthy-untrustworthy,  
thoughtful-thoughtless, broadminded-narrowminded, and intelligent-  
unintelligent.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD

The hypotheses presented in the previous chapter suggest that the person perceptions of Repressors will be more favorable and less differentiated than those of Neutrals and Sensitizers. In addition, it was proposed that the self-presentational behavior of Repressors would elicit more favorable evaluations than would the behavior of Sensitizers. As noted in Chapter I, the testing of the hypotheses involved the creation of perceiver-rater and target stimuli groups, the assessment of the R-S status of the targets, and favorability ratings of the targets made by the perceiver-raters. The current chapter will delineate both the nature of the testing instruments and the experimental design.

#### General Description and Rationale for the Selection of the Measuring Instruments

The following measuring instruments were employed:

1. The Repression-Sensitization (R-S) Scale
2. The Person Perception Rating Instrument
3. The Defensive-Style Rating Form

The descriptions of these three instruments follow.

#### Repression-Sensitization Scale

The revised Repression-Sensitization Scale (Byrne, Barry, and Nelson, 1963) served as the measure of personality style for the rater and

target groups (Appendix B). The revised R-S Scale consists of 182 MMPI items, of which 127 are keyed and 55 are buffer items. The reliability and validity of the R-S Scale are discussed in Chapter II. In order to facilitate computer scoring, the R-S Scale was divided into two sections consisting of 150 and 32 items respectively.

#### The Person Perception Rating Instrument (PPRI)

The PPRI (Appendix D) was developed to measure both the overall favorability and differentiation of impressions, and the favorability of individual trait ratings. Although there is currently no standard person perception rating instrument, the semantic differential or bipolar construct format is frequently employed (Passini and Norman, 1966; Warr and Knapper, 1968).

The PPRI consists of ten bi-polar adjective trait dimensions. Each individual scale is in a semantic differential format and consists of seven steps. The appearance of the scale follows the arrangement of Rosenberg and Olshan (1972). Warr and Knapper (1968) state that the effects of serial position for semantic differential scales is usually insignificant. Nevertheless, they recommend varying the order in which the scales are presented. Following their recommendations, four different versions of the rating instrument having varied orders and polarities were utilized.

Each adjective trait was selected from Anderson's (1968) list of 555 personality trait words ranked for likeableness. Anderson reports reliability coefficients, based on inter-population comparisons, ranging from .96 to .99. The likeability and meaningfulness ratings reported by Anderson were derived from person perception studies, although the stimulus

dealt with the generalized other rather than specific individuals. The means of the favorableness ratings were based on a seven point scale, with values from zero to six. The means for the meaningfulness of traits (i.e., clarity) were based on a five point scale, with values ranging from zero to four (see Table 1).

Anderson's data provide evidence bearing on the meaningfulness of the traits utilized in this study. In addition, such trait pairs as intelligent-unintelligent, and warm-cold have been a central concern in person perception studies (Asch, 1946; Kelley, 1950; Warr and Simms, 1965; Wiggins et al., 1969).

The following criteria were employed in selecting adjective traits for the Person Perception Rating Instrument:

1. All traits were selected from Anderson's sub-listing of 200 high meaning traits.
2. Traits were selected in such a manner as to avoid trait pairs close in meaning.
3. The traits were selected so that the means of the meaningfulness scores for the two poles of each adjective trait dimension were approximately equal. The overall means of meaningfulness ratings for the unfavorable traits versus the favorable traits were approximately equal, being 3.71 and 3.69 respectively.
4. For each trait pair, the favorable end of the scale had a mean likeableness rating higher than 4.75.
5. For each trait pair, the unfavorable end of the scale had a mean likeableness rating less than 1.75.

TABLE 1

MEAN FAVORABLENESS AND MEANINGFULNESS VALUES OF ADJECTIVES  
COMPRISING THE PERSON PERCEPTION RATING INSTRUMENT

Favorable Trait	$\bar{X}_L^*$	$\bar{X}_M^{**}$	Unfavorable Trait	$\bar{X}_L$	$\bar{X}_M$
Sincere	5.73	3.70	Insincere	.66	3.64
Trustworthy	5.39	3.70	Untrustworthy	.65	3.76
Intelligent	5.37	3.68	Unintelligent	1.68	3.64
Thoughtful	5.29	3.76	Thoughtless	.77	3.66
Warm	5.22	3.56	Cold	1.13	3.60
Kind	5.20	3.68	Unkind	.66	3.78
Broadminded	5.03	3.64	Narrowminded	.80	3.74
Cheerful	5.04	3.72	Depressed	1.66	3.70
Courteous	4.94	3.66	Rude	.76	3.76
Ambitious	4.84	3.78	Lazy	1.26	3.80
Mean Value	5.21	3.69	Mean Value	1.00	3.71

\*  $\bar{X}_L$  = mean likeableness rating

\*\*  $\bar{X}_M$  = mean meaningfulness rating

note: all values are based on Anderson's (1968) norms.

### The Defensive Style Rating Form

R-S scores provided the basis for the selection of target stimuli. In order to insure that the selected target stimuli represented the extremes of the R-S continuum, the Defensive Style Rating Form (Appendix E) was developed. The Defensive Style Rating Form is a six point scale designed to reveal the presence of repressing versus sensitizing characteristics. The ratings of defensive style made by judges are based upon the descriptions of Repressors and Sensitizers provided on the form.

### The Experimental Design

#### Phase One - Designation of the Three Perceiver-Rater Groups on the Basis of R-S Scores

The first experimental phase consisted of the administration of the revised R-S Scale to 197 female undergraduates enrolled in psychology courses at Eastern Connecticut State College (E.C.S.C.). Both males and females participated in all phases of the study except the interview. However, only the data from white females was analyzed. The scale was administered during the regular class period. The Ss were told that the questionnaire was part of a research project, that their participation was voluntary, and that any results would be held in the strictest confidence. The reason for the division of the scale into two sections was explained, and Ss were instructed to treat the questionnaire as a single unit. Three female Ss (one white, two black) refused to take the scale and therefore did not participate in the rest of the study.

The Ss were divided into the following three perceiver-rater groups on the basis of R-S scores:

Repressor Perceiver-rater: bottom third of the E.C.S.C. sample;

Neutral Perceiver-rater: middle third; and Sensitizer Perceiver-rater: the upper third.

Phase Two - Testing and Selection of Extreme Repressors  
and Sensitizer Target Persons as Stimulus Objects

The target person pool was created by administering the revised R-S Scale to 96 female undergraduates enrolled in psychology and business courses at Greater Hartford Community College (G.H.C.C.) Since the experimental design included favorability ratings, it seemed appropriate to control for potential confounding effects resulting from familiarity. G.H.C.C. is some thirty miles distant from E.C.S.C., and it was felt that the likelihood of familiarity between the perceiver-rater and target stimuli groups was therefore minimal.

The administration instructions and procedures at G.H.C.C. were similar to those at E.C.S.C. None of the G.H.C.C. Ss refused administration of the scale.

The potential target stimuli were to be selected on the following basis: Repressor Target: Ss who scored at or below the tenth percentile for the G.H.C.C. sample and Sensitizer Target: Ss at or above the ninetyeth percentile. (The corresponding R-S raw scores will be discussed on page 40).

The 18 potential target persons were called out of their regular classes and met by E, who informed them that a psychological study was being conducted and that part of the experiment involved the video-recording of brief interviews. It was also explained that these recordings would be used in another part of the study, although the nature of the experimental design was not explained. However, Ss were assured that their identities would be kept confidential, and that no student or staff member of G.H.C.C.

would ever view the video-tapes.

Ss were led by E to the conference room in which the interviewing and taping would take place. They were then introduced to the interviewer, a 25 year old white male with some counseling and interviewing experience. The interviewer was unaware of the experimental hypotheses or the personality style of the Ss being interviewed. In order to create a natural atmosphere, the interviewer did not rigidly adhere to the interview schedule, but rather asked the questions in the stated order at appropriate points during the interview. The interview questions included attitudes toward school, self, and others (see Appendix F). All of the interviews were brief and lasted approximately three to five minutes. Permission was obtained from each S to video-tape the interview session, and to allow the use of the recording for further research.

Ss were seated at right angles to the interviewer and ten feet from the recording equipment, which was in full view at all times. Black and White video-tape recordings of the interviews were made using a Sony Portable Videocorder, model number DV-2400. The interviewer did not appear on the video portion of the recording, but was present on the audio portion. The utilization of a video-tape format was predicated upon the assumption that this medium provides a more meaningful, but still controlled stimulus compared to paper and pencil descriptions of others (Argyle, 1969). At the same time, it was felt that the interview condition was sufficiently anxiety-evoking to elicit different defensive styles.

Originally, 18 Ss were selected on the basis of R-S score criteria. However, two of the Ss were Black and their interviews were not recorded.

The selection of the 10 actual target persons was made on the basis of ratings by pre-informed judges. The judges were instructed to rate the

r-s status of the target person Ss on the basis of the Defensive Style Rating Form (appendix E). However, the pre-informed judges were not aware of the design or hypotheses of the study.

The three pre-informed judges were a male Ph.D. Clinical Psychologist, a female psychologist with post-masters training and clinical experience, and a female college graduate R.N. with psychiatric experience. The video-tape recordings of the target person stimuli were played back using a Sony model CV-2200 playback deck and a 21 inch monitor. All of the judges viewed the same order of target stimuli (see appendix I). The five Repressor and five Sensitizer targets most accurately identified by the pre-informed judges were selected as the actual target person stimuli to be presented in the third phase of the experiment.

#### Phase Three - Data Collection: Ratings of Target Persons by Ss

The final phase of the experiment involved the rating of the 10 selected target person stimuli by the previously tested E.C.S.C. perceiver-raters. One hundred fifty-six of the original 197 Ss participated in this part of the study. Groups of 20-30 perceiver-raters viewed the video-tapes of the target stimuli in a small auditorium. The playback format was identical to that utilized in the pre-informed judge phase. Although a perceiver-rater group consisted of Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers, only Repressor or Sensitizer stimuli were viewed and rated.

The four different Person Perception Rating Instrument (PPRI) forms (appendix D) were randomly distributed to the Ss. Each S received a booklet consisting of five identical rating sheets. The instructions attached to the PPRI (see page 108) were then read to each group. It was emphasized that care should be taken in observing the direction of the scales. Ss were encouraged to rate the stimulus target person on each scale, even where

they felt that they had insufficient information on which to base their ratings. The order of presentation of the target person stimuli was varied between groups. The presentation of each individual stimulus person recording was followed by a brief rating period during which the video-tape playback machine was inoperative. Ratings for favorability were then made using the Person Perception Rating Instrument.

After all of the recordings were viewed and rated, the perceiver Ss were requested to write a brief analysis focused on the question: "What about these people caused or influenced the ratings you gave them?" Finally, Ss were asked if they had any familiarity with the target persons. No perceiver S responded in the affirmative.

The experiment employed a two by three factorial design, and the experimental groups are described in Table 2.

TABLE 2  
EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

Treatment	Perceiver Personality Style	Target Personality Style
A1 B1	Repressor	Repressor
A1 B2	Repressor	Sensitizer
A2 B1	Neutral	Repressor
A2 B2	Neutral	Sensitizer
A3 B1	Sensitizer	Repressor
A3 B2	Sensitizer	Sensitizer

Note: Each experimental group consisted of 25 Ss resulting in a total N of 150 Ss.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### Preliminary Analysis of Repression-Sensitization Scores

Table 3 indicates that the G.H.C.C. sample had a higher mean and larger standard deviation than both the E.C.S.C. sample and Byrne's (1963) reported norms for female college students. A  $t$  test conducted between the means of the G.H.C.C. and E.C.S.C. samples was significant at the .01 level ( $t = 3.00$ ,  $df = 291$ , two tail test). However, a test for homogeneity of variance of R-S scores between the two samples was not significant ( $F = 1.21$ ,  $df = 95$ , 196.)

TABLE 3

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES FOR R-S SCORES FOR THE E.C.S.C. AND G.H.C.C. SAMPLES AND FOR BYRNE'S NORMS

Sample	N	Mean	S.D.	Range
E.C.S.C.	197	42.10	18.30	5 - 107
G.H.C.C.	96	50.34	22.11	7 - 100
Byrne (1963)	571	42.68	18.66	0 - 104

The differences between the mean R-S scores of the E.C.S.C. and G.H.C.C. samples may be artifactual in nature and reflect possible sampling

biases produced by the relatively small size of the G.H.C.C. sample. It is conceivable that there was a genuine tendency towards sensitization associated with the G.H.C.C. sample. It should be noted that the E.C.S.C. sample largely consists of a rural student body, while the G.H.C.C. sample is almost entirely urban in composition. While the sophistication associated with urbanism might be expected to yield a higher rate of symptom report, the research literature is far from clear on this issue (Dohrenwend and Dohrenwend, 1969).

The distribution of R-S scores for the two groups is presented in table 4. For the E.C.S.C. sample, a percentile score of 33 was equivalent to a raw score of 32.30, while a percentile score of 67 was equivalent to a raw score of 49.3. Thus the division into the three groups of Repressor, Neutral, and Sensitizer perceiver-raters was on the respective raw scores of 0 - 32, 33 - 49, and 50 - 107.

For the G.H.C.C. sample, used as targets, a percentile score of 90 was associated with a raw score of 82.20, while a percentile score of 10 was associated with a raw score of 20.80. But, as will be noted later, there was some slight modification of the cut-off points for the actual targets selected.

A survey of the research literature reveals that a fairly wide range of values is associated with the operational definitions of Repressor and Sensitizer. Representative cutoff points for Repressors range from 17 (Smith, 1969) to 37 (Marbaum and Bedia, 1967), while those for Sensitizers range from 37 (Carrera and Cohen, 1968) to 83 (Smith, 1969).

The difference between the mean R-S scores of the two samples does not appear to be critical for the purposes of this study as (1) the values obtained for both samples correspond to generally reported scores, (2) the

actual final definition of Repressor and Sensitizer for the G.H.C.C. sample referred only to the extreme values of the distribution, and (3) a full range of R-S scores was employed only in the instance of the E.C.S.C. sample which provided the perceiver-raters for the study.

TABLE 4  
DISTRIBUTION OF R-S SCORES FOR THE  
G.H.C.C. AND E.C.S.C. SAMPLES

Scores	G.H.C.C. Sample	E.C.S.C. Sample
100 - 109	2	2
90 - 99	1	1
80 - 89	9	2
70 - 79	7	11
60 - 69	13	16
50 - 59	19	33
40 - 49	13	42
30 - 39	12	34
20 - 29	12	37
10 - 19	6	17
0 - 9	2	2
Total	96	197
	$P_{10} = 20.80$	$P_{33} = 32.30$
	$P_{90} = 82.80$	$P_{67} = 49.30$

The Testing For Equivalence of Perceiver-Rater Types

It will be recalled that the assignment of perceiver Ss to the

two experimental conditions was not conducted on a purely random basis. Groups consisting of 20 to 30 Repressors, Sensitizers, and Neutrals were alternately presented with Repressor and Sensitizer target person stimuli. It therefore seemed appropriate to test for the equivalence of variability and central tendency of R-S scores within each of the perceiver-rater types. The F test for homogeneity of variance (Edwards, 1972), and the t test for means were selected.

As no prior hypotheses concerning the direction of the differences between sample variances were made, the probability values of the F table were doubled. An F value of 2.27 (df = 24, 24, two tail test) was required to reject the null hypothesis of homogeneity of variance at the .05 level. A t value of 2.01 (df = 48) was required to reject the null hypothesis of equal means at the .05 level. An examination of table 5 indicates no significant F or t values. It may therefore be assumed that the variances and means of R-S scores are equivalent within each of the various perceiver-rater types.

TABLE 5  
 MEANS,  $\bar{t}$  VALUES, VARIANCES, AND  $\bar{F}$  VALUES  
 FOR E.C.S.C. R-S SCORES

Group	Mean	$\bar{t}$	Variance	$\bar{F}$
Repressor Raters- Repressor Targets	23.60		35.76	
Repressor Raters- Sensitizer Targets	21.32	1.23	49.98	1.40
Neutral Raters- Repressor Targets	40.16		15.76	
Neutral Raters- Sensitizer Targets	41.44	1.06	20.98	1.33
Sensitizer Raters- Repressor Targets	61.56		170.04	
Sensitizer Raters- Sensitizer Targets	63.96	.69	130.87	1.30

Analysis of the Pre-Informed Judges' Ratings

The five final Repressor and five final Sensitizer targets were selected from video-taped interviews conducted with an original sample of seven extreme Repressors and nine extreme Sensitizers on the basis of the pre-informed judges' ratings. The total distribution of the pre-informed judges' ratings appears in appendix I.

An estimate of the reliability of the pre-informed judges was obtained from an intraclass correlation derived from a two-way analysis of variance without replications (Guilford and Furchter, 1973, pp. 261-263). An inspection of table 6 indicates that while the judges did not significantly differ from one another, the target persons were significantly different at the .01 level. Based on the intraclass correlation ( $r_{cc}$ ), the typical rater's reliability is of the order of .73. If the three ratings for each ratee were averaged, the intraclass correlation ( $r_{kk}$ ) of this set of averages with a similar set of averages would be about .89 (Guilford and Furchter, p.264).

TABLE 6  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRE-INFORMED JUDGES' RATINGS

Source	Sums of Squares	df	MS	F
Targets	126.00	15	8.40	8.94 *
Judges	3.88	2	1.94	2.06
Remainder	28.12	30	.94	

\*p < .01

The overall mean Defensive-Style rating for the seven extreme Repressors was 2.53, while the mean rating for the nine extreme Sensitizers was 3.90. The differences in ratings between the Repressor and Sensitizer interviewees was significant at the .05 level ( $t = 1.88$ ,  $df = 14$ , one tail test). The Pearson Product Moment correlation between R-S scores and pre-informed judges' ratings was .45 and was also significant at the .05 level ( $df = 14$ , one tail test). The moderate correlation between R-S scores and judges' ratings for defensive style approximates the correlational value reported by Tempone (Byrne, 1964). It may be deduced that the pre-informed judges' ratings accounted for only about 20% of the target person R-S score variance. Such additional factors as the specific characteristics of the judges, target persons, and rating instrument may have influenced the ratings for defensive style. Furthermore, this finding may also reflect upon the more general problem of establishing relationships between test performance and overt behavior.

The five selected Repressor targets had a mean Defensive style rating of 2.7 or less, while the five selected Sensitizer targets had a rating of 3.7 or greater (see table 7). Originally, it had been proposed to select Repressor and Sensitizer target stimuli from the G.H.C.C. sample utilizing the tenth and ninetieth percentiles respectively. This would have resulted in the selection of subjects whose Repression-Sensitization scores were 20.80 or less in the case of Repressors, and equal to or greater than 82.20 in the case of Sensitizers. Due to a loss of potential Ss, the actual Repressor targets had raw scores on the R-S scale equal to or less than 28, while for Sensitizers the R-S values were equal to or greater than 69. However, the mean R-S score of 20.4 for Repressor targets and 82.2 for Sensitizer targets indicates that the selected targets overall

means did meet the original criteria. Inspection of table 7 reveals that the mean judges' rating for the selected Repressor and Sensitizer targets were 1.8 and 5.1 respectively.

TABLE 7  
R-S SCORES AND PRE-INFORMED JUDGES' RATINGS  
FOR SELECTED TARGET PERSON STIMULI (REPRESSORS)

Subject	R-S Score	Mean Judges' Rating
1	21	1.3
2	28	1.7
3	28	1.7
4	14	1.7
5	11	2.7
Mean	20.4	1.8
(Sensitizers)		
6	87	3.7
7	69	4.0
8	75	5.7
9	80	6.0
10	100	6.0
Mean	82.2	5.1

#### Analysis of the Main Hypotheses

The perceiver-rater favorability ratings were analyzed using a two by three factorial analysis of variance, type I fixed-effects model

(Edwards, 1972). The values obtained on the seven point rating scale were adjusted so that low values represent the favorable end of the trait dimension, while high values represent the unfavorable end. The scores produced by each perceiver-rater were summed across the five target persons, with the resulting scores treated as a single value for purposes of analysis.

Omega Squared ( $\omega^2$ ) provided an estimate of the strength of association between the significant independent variables of personality style, and the dependent variable of person perception favorability rating. The estimate of the strength of association was derived from the following formula:

$$\omega^2 = \frac{SS \text{ Targets} - MS \text{ error}}{MS \text{ error} + SS \text{ total}} \quad (\text{Hays, 1963, pp. 406-407}).$$

The ratings of six perceiver-raters were eliminated using a table of random numbers in order to obtain an equal number of observations for each of the experimental treatments.

The first three hypotheses to be tested refer to total favorability ratings summed across all of the adjective trait dimensions.

Hypothesis One - Perceiver-Rater Personality Style:

Repressor perceiver-raters will judge target persons more favorably compared to Neutral and Sensitizer perceiver-raters. The rank order of favorability ratings will be as follows: Repressor > Neutral > Sensitizer.

An examination of table 8 indicates that there were no significant differences between the perceiver-raters in their judgment of overall favorability. The mean ratings for the Repressor, Neutral, and Sensitizer perceiver-raters were 3.46, 3.35, and 3.47 respectively.

Hypothesis Two - Personality Style of the Target Persons:

Repressor target stimuli will be rated more favorably compared to Sensitizer targets across all rater types.

The personality style of the target persons proved to be a highly significant variable. The overall mean rating for Repressor targets was 2.99, while for Sensitizer targets the mean rating was 3.87. This difference was significant at the .001 level ( $F = 100.41$ ,  $df = 1, 144$ ). The index omega squared was .40, indicating that about 40% of the variance in overall person perception favorability ratings is being accounted for by the personality style of the target person.

Hypothesis Three - Interaction Effect:

Repressor perceivers will rate Repressor target persons more favorably than will either Neutral or Sensitizer perceivers.

This hypothesis was not confirmed as the Rater x Target interaction was not significant ( $F = .70$ ,  $df = 2, 144$ ). The Repressor mean favorability rating for the Repressor targets was 3.03, compared to ratings of 2.84 and 3.09 for the Neutral and Sensitizer raters. An inspection of table 8 also indicates that there were no significant differences in the ratings assigned to Sensitizer targets by the three perceiver-rater groups.

TABLE 8  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TOTAL PERSON  
PERCEPTION FAVORABILITY SCORES

Source	Sums of Squares	df	MS	F	p
Targets (A)	73,349.95	1	73,349.95	100.41	<.001
Raters (B)	1,134.60	2	567.30	.78	n.s.
A x B	1,025.00	2	512.50	.70	n.s.
Within (error)	105,192.95	144	730.50		

Cell Means

Raters	Targets		Mean
	Repressor	Sensitizer	
Repressor	3.03	3.89	3.46
Neutral	2.84	3.86	3.35
Sensitizer	3.09	3.86	3.47
Mean	2.99	3.87	

$\omega^2 = .40$

The results of the preceding section may be criticized on the grounds that defining Sensitizers and Repressors by the lower and upper thirds of the R-S raw score distribution did not result in the formation of groups that were distinctly different in defensive style. An additional analysis was therefore carried out using the ten lowest R-S scores (Repressor perceivers), the ten highest R-S scores (Sensitizer perceivers), and ten randomly chosen middle R-S scores (Neutral perceivers) for each of the target person

conditions. For the Repressor targets, the range of scores for Repressor, Neutral, and Sensitizer perceivers were respectively, 12 to 22, 36 to 46, and 59 to 107. For the Sensitizer targets, the range of comparable scores was 5 to 20, 33 to 47, and 63 to 92.

An examination of table 9 indicates that again only the Target person variable was significant. The mean person perception favorability rating for Repressor targets was 3.05, while for Sensitizer targets the mean rating was 3.95. The value of omega squared ( $\omega^2$ ) was again .40.

Thus far, the only significant finding to emerge from the analysis of the results pertains to the target effect. While it may be concluded that the stimulus properties of the target persons were a salient factor, the non-significance of the rater and rater x target interaction indicates that the operation of the hypothesized person perception processes was nil. The following pair of hypotheses explored the relationship between the experimental factors and specific adjective trait dimension combinations.

Hypothesis Four - Repressor target stimuli will be more favorably rated by all perceiver-rater types on the adjective trait dimensions of warm-cold, kind-unkind, cheerful-depressed, courteous-rude, and ambitious-lazy.

This hypothesis was confirmed, as the target factor for this set of adjectives was highly significant ( $F = 233.02$ ,  $df = 1, 144$ ,  $p. = <.001$ ). Again, neither the rater or rater x target interaction proved to be significant. An examination of table 10 indicates that the mean favorability ratings for Repressor and Sensitizer targets were respectively 2.91 and 4.08. The omega squared value of .60 indicates that, for this particular set of adjective traits, a sizeable portion of the total variance in rater scores is being accounted for by the personality style of the target person. The saliency of the target variable is again evident in the results pertaining to

Hypothesis four. The set of adjective traits associated with this hypothesis appear to have in common the property of manageability . That is, they are surface traits that may be readily manipulated for purposes of impression management. The next experimental hypothesis pertains to adjective traits that were evaluated as being less manageable in nature.

Hypothesis Five - Repressor raters will rate Repressor targets more favorably than will either Neutral or Sensitizer raters on the adjective trait dimensions of sincere-insincere, trustworthy-untrustworthy, intelligent-unintelligent, thoughtful-thoughtless, and broadminded-narrowminded.

An inspection of the cell means of table 11 indicates that this hypothesis was not supported. For all rater groups, the Repressor targets ( $\bar{X} = 3.12$ ) were more favorably rated than were the Sensitizer targets ( $\bar{X} = 3.68$ ). The target factor again proved to be the only significant variable ( $F = 32.76$ ,  $df = 1, 144$ ,  $p. = < .001$ ). The value of omega squared was .18. Thus, while the differences between Repressor and Sensitizer targets were significant, the target person variable accounted for only about 18% of the total variance in person perception favorability scores. Compared to the previous set of adjectives, Repressors are rated less favorably and Sensitizers more favorably. While hypothesis five was not directly confirmed, the smaller mean difference and experimental effect associated with this set of adjective traits provides some justification for drawing the inference that they were less manageable in nature.

The final experimental hypothesis to be examined refers to the favorability ratings made on each specific adjective trait dimension.

Hypothesis Six - Personality Style of the Perceiver:

For any given adjective trait, the favorability ratings of the Repressor perceivers will be greater than those of the Sensitizer or Repressor Perceivers.

Table 12 presents the summary of the analysis of variance for each of the adjective trait dimensions. (The complete analysis of variance for each adjective trait dimension is found in appendix A, tables 16 to 25)

Neither the rater personality style or the target x rater interaction proved to be significant for any of the adjective-trait dimensions. However, as indicated by table 12 the target personality factor was significant for every adjective-trait dimension. The maximum theoretical difference between Repressor and Sensitizer targets was six, since the favorability ratings were made using a seven point scale (1-7). The greatest difference between the Repressor and Sensitizer targets was found for the cheerful-depressed dimension (dif. = 2.02), followed by the warm-cold (dif. = 1.10), courteous-rude (dif. = 1.09), ambitious-lazy (dif. = .94), kind-unkind (dif. = .83), trustworthy-untrustworthy (dif. = .76), broadminded-narrowminded (dif. = .64), thoughtful-thoughtless (dif. = .56), sincere-insincere (dif. = .46), and intelligent-unintelligent dimensions (dif. = .32).

If one considers the neutral point of the scale as having a value of four, Sensitizer targets are rated toward the unfavorable end of the dimension on the following four traits: cheerful-depressed, warm-cold, ambitious-lazy, and broadminded-narrowminded. Sensitizer targets are most favorably rated on the trait dimension of sincere-insincere ( $\bar{X} = 3.13$ ) and least favorably rated on the dimension cheerful-depressed ( $\bar{X} = 4.86$ ). Repressor targets, in contrast, were rated toward the favorable end of the dimension for each of the adjective traits. They received their most favorable ratings on the dimension courteous-rude ( $\bar{X} = 2.39$ ), and their least favorable ratings on the broadminded-narrowminded dimension ( $\bar{X} = 3.64$ ).

Across all target and perceiver types, the broadminded-narrowminded dimension was found to have the least favorable rating ( $\bar{X} = 3.96$ ), while the

sincere-insincere dimension received the most favorable rating ( $\bar{X} = 2.90$ ). Anderson's (1968) norms indicate that the trait sincere had the highest likeability rating of 555 traits sampled, while insincere ranked 543. Given this large discrepancy in likeability between sincere and insincere, and the proclivity of Ss to rate strangers favorably, it is perhaps not too surprising to find that this dimension had a high overall favorability rating. The relatively low ratings on the broadminded-narrowminded dimension may have reflected the extreme stimulus properties of the target persons. For example, both types of target persons may have been perceived as rigid or dogmatic.

Table 12 also presents the values of omega squared for the adjective traits. The greatest experimental effect was associated with the cheerful-depressed dimension ( $\omega^2 = .04$ ).

TABLE 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE TOTAL PERSON PERCEPTION  
FAVORABILITY SCORES FOR EXTREME GROUPS

Source	Sums of Squares	df	MS	F	p
Targets (A)	30,330.01	1	30,330.01	41.36	<.001
Raters (B)	1,252.03	2	626.02	.85	n.s.
A x B	1,625.64	2	826.32	1.13	n.s.
Within (error)	39,595.50	54	733.25		

Cell Means

<u>Raters</u>	<u>Targets</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>Repressor</u>	<u>Sensitizer</u>	
Repressor	3.30	3.94	3.62
Neutral	2.91	4.06	3.48
Sensitizer	2.95	3.86	3.40
Mean	3.05	3.95	
	<u>omega squared</u> ( $\omega^2$ ) = .40		

TABLE 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE ADJECTIVE TRAITS - WARM-COLD  
KIND-UNKIND, CHEERFUL-DEPRESSED, COURTEOUS-RUDE, AND  
AMBITIOUS-LAZY

Source	Sums of Squares	df	MS	F	p
Targets (A)	31,915.82	1	31,915.82	233.02	<.001
Raters (B)	314.92	2	157.46	1.10	n.s.
A x B	416.62	2	208.31	1.46	n.s.
Within (error)	20,608.20	144	143.11		

## Cell Means

<u>Raters</u>	<u>Targets</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>Repressor</u>	<u>Sensitizer</u>	
Repressor	3.00	4.12	3.56
Neutral	2.74	4.09	3.42
Sensitizer	2.99	4.02	3.51
Mean	2.91	4.08	
	<u>omega squared</u> ( $\omega^2$ ) = .60		

TABLE 11

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE ADJECTIVE TRAITS - TRUSTWORTHY-  
UNTRUSTWORTHY, INTELLIGENT-UNINTELLIGENT, THOUGHTFUL-  
THOUGHTLESS, BROADMINDED-NARROWMINDED, AND SINCERE-INSINCERE

Source	Sums of Squares	df	MS	F	p
Targets (A)	7,196.80	1	7,196.80	32.76	<.001
Raters (B)	312.28	2	156.14	.71	n.s.
A x B	59.46	2	29.73	.13	n.s.
Within (error)	31,632.40	144	219.67		

Cell Means

<u>Raters</u>	<u>Targets</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>Repressor</u>	<u>Sensitizer</u>	
Repressor	3.18	3.68	3.43
Neutral	3.01	3.63	3.32
Sensitizer	3.18	3.45	3.45
Mean	3.12	3.68	

omega squared ( $\omega^2$ ) = .18

TABLE 12  
SUMMARY OF TARGET FACTORS ACROSS ALL RATERS

Adjective Trait	Repressors	Sensitizers	F	$\omega^2$
Cheerful-Depressed	2.84	4.86	304.73**	.67
Courteous-Rude	2.39	3.48	87.08**	.37
Warm-Cold	3.05	4.15	85.79**	.37
Ambitious-Lazy	3.31	4.25	69.88*	.31
Kind-Unkind	2.79	3.62	55.71**	.26
Trustworthy-Untrustworthy	2.88	3.64	41.15**	.21
Broadminded-Narrowminded	3.64	4.28	25.84**	.13
Thoughtful-Thoughtless	3.18	3.74	23.15**	.13
Sincere-Insincere	2.67	3.13	11.75**	.06
Intelligent-Unintelligent	3.28	3.60	7.33*	.04

\*  $p < .01$

\*\*  $p < .001$

The previous analyses of the target factor were based on favorability ratings which were pooled across the individual perceiver-raters. It may be argued that a more appropriate measure of the target effect would be obtained if the favorability ratings of the five individual Repressor and Sensitizer target stimuli were employed. Therefore, an additional analysis was performed on the individual target stimuli.

Table 12 indicates the mean favorability ratings assigned to the individual target stimuli. The difference between the average individual favorability ratings of the Repressor and Sensitizer target groups was found to be significant at the .01 level ( $t = 4.4$ , two tail.  $df = 8$ ). However, the second Repressor target had a slightly less favorable rating than did the second Sensitizer target. This anomaly may have resulted from the relatively low R-S score (69) of this Sensitizer target. It is also interesting to note that, on the basis of interview behavior, the second Repressor target was felt to be appreciably more constricted than the other Repressor targets. The extent to which the excessively constricted appearance of this Repressor target contrasted with the appearance of the other Repressor targets may have acted to decrease the favorability of the ratings assigned to her. An analagous effect may have been operative in the case of the second Sensitizer target.

TABLE 13  
 MEAN FAVORABILITY RATINGS FOR INDIVIDUAL  
 TARGET STIMULI

Group	1	2	Subjects 3	4	5
Repressor	2.66 (21)*	3.59 (28)	3.15 (11)	2.69 (28)	2.86 (14)
Sensitizer	3.93 (87)	3.54 (69)	4.04 (100)	3.96 (80)	3.89 (75)

\* R-S scores of subjects are in parentheses

Correlational Analysis of Individual Scales

The Pearson Product Moment correlations of each individual adjective trait scale with the total favorability score is presented in table 14. The moderate ( $r = .67$ ) to high ( $r = .91$ ) correlations suggest that a "halo" type effect influenced the favorability ratings.

TABLE 14  
CORRELATIONS OF INDIVIDUAL TRAIT DIMENSIONS  
WITH TOTAL FAVORABILITY SCORE

Trait Dimension	$r_{xy}^*$
Broadminded-Narrowminded.....	.91
Warm-Cold.....	.91
Thoughtful-Thoughtless.....	.86
Courteous-Rude.....	.84
Kind-Unkind.....	.84
Cheerful-Depressed.....	.83
Intelligent-Unintelligent.....	.82
Ambitious-Lazy.....	.79
Trustworthy-Untrustworthy.....	.70
Sincere-Insincere.....	.67

\*Note: All correlations are significant at the .001 level.

Perceiver-Raters Free Descriptions of Target Stimuli

Table 15 contains a content category analysis of the free descriptions of the Target Ss provided by the Perceiver-rater Ss. The table reflects the utilization of multiple categories by a given Perceiver-rater S. As the actual number of obtained descriptions varied between Perceiver-rater/target stimuli combinations, direct comparisons across Repressor-Sensitizer combinations were not made.

An examination of table 15 indicates that a preponderance of the free descriptions are to be found in the categories involving physical descriptions, vocal qualities, and reactions to the study, questions, and interviewer. The Perceiver-rater Ss apparently emphasized cues relating to the immediate stimulus situation rather than more inferential categories. There were, however, some revealing descriptions provided by some of the Ss. They are as follows:

Selected Comments on Repressor Targets

Sensitizer Perceiver-raters - "...sometimes I felt they weren't being truthful." "I personally reacted better to the people who enjoyed their life and wanted to live more fully." "Some of those interviewed didn't seem to be someone I would have liked." "They all seemed to have similar personalities, nothing outstanding."

Neutral Perceiver-rater - "I thought the people were all too much in love with their schools."

Repressor Perceiver-rater - "Basically they were satisfied with themselves."

Selected Comments on Sensitizer Targets

Sensitizer Perceiver-raters - "...most of the people interviewed disliked or feared a specific type person but when asked what they would change their

personality to, it would be exactly that type of person." "I've found that most of them were quite depressed about life and school." "I think that all these people were uncomfortable because they were being recorded."

Neutral Perceiver-rater - "Some of them seemed as though they couldn't care less about the whole interview." "I noticed that a few people appeared to be depressed and not cheerful simply by noting their facial expressions and hand gestures." "Most of them seemed on the depressed side and looking for something more in life."

Repressor Perceiver-rater - "Actually, I feel that all these people could use some counseling." "Most of them appeared to be unhappy and dissatisfied with life."

The negative evaluation assigned to Sensitizer targets by perceiver-rater Ss is again evident in the preceding free descriptions. The Sensitizer perceivers' comments concerning Repressor targets convey a rejecting, critical attitude. These selected comments, however, were atypical in that a preponderance of the free descriptions were non-evaluative in tone.

TABLE 15  
 CONTENT ANALYSIS OF RATERS' FREE  
 DESCRIPTIONS OF TARGET PERSONS

Category	Repressor Targets			Sensitizer Targets			Total
	A	B	C	A	B	C	
Physical Appearance	0	2	0	2	1	2	7
Dress	2	1	3	0	0	1	7
Gestures	7	4	6	8	5	3	33
Facial Expression	5	4	1	6	3	3	22
Tone of Voice	7	3	7	4	7	5	33
Language Quality	9	3	11	9	10	5	47
Speed of Response	5	1	2	1	0	5	14
Personality Qualities	7	8	4	4	4	4	31
Emotional Adjustment	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
Ambitions	0	1	2	5	3	2	13
Attitude toward study, interviewer	8	12	9	3	5	3	40
Self-concept	2	1	3	3	1	5	15
Attitude toward school, others	1	4	4	4	5	2	20
Comparison to personal values	0	0	1	2	2	2	7

Key

A = Repressor Rater

B = Neutral Rater

C = Sensitizer Rater

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION

#### Greater Favorability Ratings Assigned to Repressor Targets

This study has attempted to establish a relationship between the favorability of evaluation and personality style. More specifically, hypotheses relating the personality style of the perceiver and target person to the judged level of favorability have been formulated and tested. There was a consistent demonstration of the experimental effect associated with target personality style. It was found that all perceiver groups, despite divergencies in their own personality style, rated the Sensitizer targets less favorably than the Repressor targets. This must be considered the major finding to emerge from this study, since the hypotheses relating perceptual variables to the personality style of the perceiver were not sustained.

The import of this finding as to the salience of target personality styles would appear to be modified in light of the fairly small differences between Repressor and Sensitizer target favorability ratings. The overall difference in favorability rating between the two target types was .88 out of a possible 6 point difference. Thus Repressor targets received an overall favorability rating of 2.99, and Sensitizer targets received an overall favorability rating of 3.87. However, the differences between Repressor and Sensitizer targets may have been minimized by the operation of the discrediting effect which was recently elaborated by Izzet and Leginski (1972). These authors found that a less favorable impression of a stimulus person is

obtained when the source of favorable impressions is the stimulus person rather than another person. In contrast, a less negative impression is obtained when the source of negative information is the stimulus person rather than another. It appears reasonable to infer that the Repressor targets were describing themselves in essentially favorable terms, while the self-descriptions of the Sensitizer targets were unfavorable. The discrediting effect would then tend to minimize both the favorable ratings of Repressor targets and the unfavorable ratings of Sensitizer targets. Although all of the differences in ratings for Repressor versus Sensitizer targets on any given adjective trait dimension were highly significant, the magnitudes of the absolute differences were also generally small. The cheerful-depressed dimension yielded the largest difference in ratings, with a 2.02 out of a possible 6 separating Sensitizer and Repressor targets. The finding that a majority of the ratings of the targets are toward the favorable end of the adjective trait dimension probably reflects the general tendency for subjects in person perception experiments to rate strangers favorably (Shrauger and Altrocchi, 1964).

That the perceiver-raters adjudged the Sensitizer targets to be less intelligent than the Repressor targets is a cause for surprise in view of the frequent disposition in the psychological literature to equate Repressors with hysterics and Sensitizers with obsessive-compulsives. Schafer (1948) associated repressive characteristics with a lowered verbal I.Q. and obsessive-compulsive characteristics with an elevated verbal I.Q. However, Clark and Neuringer (1971) found that repression rather than sensitization was associated with a high verbal aptitude. These authors speculate that the greater ability of Repressors to respond differentially to non-threatening situations and their freedom from obsessive rumination results in a higher

verbal aptitude. While there was a significant difference between Repressor and Sensitizer targets on the intelligent-unintelligent dimension, the size of the difference was small (.38) and accounted for only 4% of the total variance in intelligent-unintelligent ratings. It is also possible that a general negative halo effect operated to support the perception that the Sensitizers were less intelligent than the Repressors.

The theoretical model employed in r-s research is premised upon the assumption that individuals who utilize repressive defenses will be prejudiced, dogmatic, and opinionated. However, there is research to cast doubt upon the validity of this assumption. Thus, positive relationships between the R-S Scale and Rokeach's dogmatism and left-opinionation and the MMPI prejudice scale have been reported (Byrne, 1964). Similarly, Ss in this study rated the Sensitizer targets as less broadminded than the Repressor targets.

The finding that higher favorability ratings were assigned to Repressor targets is consonant with results obtained in two separate studies which were designed to measure the self-reports of Repressors and Sensitizers. On the basis of the CPI, Repressors have been depicted as ambitious, intellectually able, honest, sincere, thoughtful, and outgoing. In contrast, Sensitizers have been depicted as quiet, unambitious, conventional-constricted, defensive, cool, self-centered, and distant from others (Joy, quoted in Byrne, 1964). Hoffman (1970) reports that Repressors describe themselves on the Adjective Check List (ACL) as significantly more practical, less moody, more self-controlled and responsible, and more sincere and dependable. Repressors also checked significantly fewer unfavorable adjectives. Thus self-reports generated by the CPI and the ACL, which are both paper and pencil inventories, were generally confirmed by the perceiver Ss ratings of the target person stimuli interview behavior.

Cheerfulness-Depression as a Salient Dimension of R-S  
Scores and Favorability Ratings

The findings of this study also indicate that the favorability of evaluation transcended any given adjective trait dimension. Thus the possession of Sensitizer characteristics was invariably associated with less favorable ratings. This held a fortiori for the cheerful-depressed dimension, where the personality style of the target accounted for 67% of the variance in favorability ratings. In contrast, the warm-cold dimension accounted for only 37% of the variance in favorability ratings.

Previous person perception research has generally regarded the "warm-cold" dimension as a central element in impression formation (Asch, 1946; Kelley, 1950). This assertion, however, has not gone unchallenged. Levy (1960) failed to find evidence that would support the centrality of the "warm-cold" dimension. More recently, Warr and Knapper (1968) have proposed that the apparent centrality of any given trait is a function of the relationship between cue and response traits. In addition, the putative centrality of the "warm-cold" dimension has most often been found in cases in which paper and pencil-type studies were employed. In such studies the psychopathology of the target person constituted neither an implicit or explicit concern of the rater. It is conceivable that the differences obtained between the target persons were a function of either interviewer characteristics or the specific rating dimensions presented to the perceiver-raters. Yet, the emergence of the cheerful-depressed dimension as a salient category of description implies that a psychopathological dimension did influence the perceiver-raters' judgments. Many of the spontaneous remarks made by the perceiver-raters in the Sensitizer target condition did refer to the patient or psychotherapy status of the target persons. Ss, as participants in a

psychological experiment, may have assumed that they were actually expected to rate the target persons for the presence or absence of psychopathology.

An examination of the R-S Scale's composition provides further support for the significance of the cheerful-depressed dimension. It will be recalled that the revised R-S Scale consists of items drawn from the Pt, D, Welsh Anxiety, L, K, and Hy Denial scales of the MMPI (Byrne, 1963). Some thirty items of the revised R-S Scale are actually D scale items. This represents some 50% of the total MMPI D scale items. At the same time, all ten items of the Depression-Brooding Scale (see appendix C) appear on the revised R-S Scale (Dahlstrom et al., 1972, p. 407). An examination of the Depression-Brooding Scale's composition reveals item content associated with subjective brooding, unhappiness, personal indifference, low self-esteem, and excessive sensitivity. The Pearson product moment correlation of the Depression-Brooding and revised R-S Scales was found to be .81 for the G.H.C.C. sample ( $p = <.01$ ). Thus it may be concluded that Depression-Brooding scores accounted for about 66% of the total variance in R-S scores for the target sample pool. The average Depression-Brooding score for the Repressor targets was 1.6, which was significantly different from the value of 7.6 for the Sensitizer targets ( $t = 10.71$ ,  $p = <.01$ ). Clinical observations lend further support to the association between depressive characteristics and the r-s dimension. Altrocchi et al., (1960) depict extreme Sensitizers as depressed, anxious and obsessive individuals who emphasize their own weakness and helplessness. Conversely, extreme Repressors are individuals who emphasize their own interpersonal competence while denying any dysphoric affects.

Bonime (1966) has interpreted depression as a form of covert hostility associated with the highly manipulative individual. His analysis portrays the depressed individual as one who attempts to coerce others into giving

emotionally comforting responses. The depressed individual is described as anxious, manipulative, resistant, and begrudging. One frequent concomitant of this particular style of interpersonal strategy is rejection by others. It is possible that the less favorable ratings given the Sensitizer targets by all perceiver groups reflected a similar type of rejection. Along the same lines, Joy (quoted in Byrne, 1964) found that Sensitizers are less frequently chosen as a partner in a human relations problem situation. There is nothing in Bonime's analysis to suggest that depressed individuals exhibit empathy for other depressed persons. Rather, he characterizes the depressed person as lacking in sympathetic responses. This element of psychodynamic description is consistent with the finding that the Sensitizer perceivers also judged the Sensitizer targets less favorably than they did the Repressor targets.

#### Additional Components of R-S Scores: Anxiety

While it seems reasonable to conclude that the affect of depression was of major significance in defining the stimulus attributes of the Sensitizer targets, other factors were operative. Among the most important of these were anxiety and obsessive-compulsive features.

Simultaneous elevation on the D and Pt scales of the MMPI have been frequently noted (Mendels, 1970). Carson (1969) observed that the clinically common profile of 2-7 is associated with self-devaluation, intropunitiveness, tension, and nervousness. In this connection it should be noted that 42 items on the revised R-S Scale are Pt items. Golin et al. (1967) report a correlation of .87 between the R-S Scale and the Taylor MAS. Ihilevich and Gleser (1971) found that the R-S Scale correlated .96 with Welsh's first MMPI factor (anxiety). Mendels (1970) states that many depressed individuals exhibit such anxiety features as tension, uncertainty, non-specific fears,

tremors, and sweating. Thus those who rated the Sensitizer stimuli may have been responding to a set of personality characteristics which included manifest anxiety as well as depression.

#### R-S Scores, Social Desirability and Self-Presentation

Turk (1963), in referring to the r-s literature, observed that:

"We may assume that what a person said about himself in these studies was not simply a function of his personal state (what he saw, what he was saying, what his personal feelings were), but also was a function of the appropriateness of saying certain things which dictate how much and what he should say about himself - the self which he should project (p.165)."

The reconceptualization of the R-S Scale in terms of what Turk has called "presentational conformity" invites attention to relationships between the R-S Scale and the construct of social desirability.

Byrne (1964) has indicated that there is a substantial relationship between Edwards' Social Desirability Scale (SDS) and the R-S Scale, with correlations in the .90 range frequently reported. At first glance, it would appear that the differences between Repressors and Sensitizers which had been previously attributed to their respective reliance on avoidance versus approach defenses, might be more reasonably considered a consequence of their respective positions along the social desirability continuum.

In a similar vein, Block (1965) has observed that a social desirability interpretation of MMPI items would appear to severely undermine the credibility of characterological interpretations. But, Block considers it significant that the Edwards' SD Scale was derived from a pool of MMPI items largely consisting of the Taylor MAS, and the F, K, and L scales of the MMPI. The content of this item pool includes such undesirable characteristics as personal vulnerability, bodily tension and unhappiness. Block feels justified in concluding that a high social desirability score might

be associated with a psychologically comfortable individual and a low score associated with a psychologically uncomfortable individual. Thus he states that "...a high score on the Pt scale will entail a low score on the SD scale because the signs of neuroticism are themselves socially undesirable (Block, p. 70)." Endler (quoted in Byrne, 1964) reported a correlation of .92 between the Pt and R-S Scales. Given the fact that both the R-S and SD Scales contain a substantial number of Pt items, it is not too surprising to find a high relationship between the R-S and SD Scales.

The social desirability literature indicates that an individual may recognize the deviant implications of personality statements while simultaneously behaving in a deviant fashion (Edwards, 1967). Thus while both the Sensitizer perceiver-raters and the Sensitizer targets were defined by the fact that they described themselves in socially undesirable terms on the R-S Scale, the Sensitizer perceiver-raters appeared to be as cognizant of the deviant quality of Sensitizer target behavior as were the Repressor and Neutral perceiver-raters.

The precise nature of the relationship between the constructs of social desirability and repression-sensitization remains unsettled. It does seem probable that Sensitizers are less concerned with the presentational conformity factor. Consequently, they are more likely to exhibit dysphoric and hostile affects. Thus Carrera and Cohen (1968) found that extreme Sensitizers respond to threat of failure with the verbalization of hostile affect.

It would appear reasonable to conclude that the stimulus properties associated with the Sensitizer targets conveyed a relatively greater amount of negative information than did those associated with the Repressor targets. Kanouse and Hanson (1972) state that there is a considerable body of research to lend sustenance to the contention that negative properties or evaluations

carry greater weight than do positive evaluations. Given the general positive bias of person perception raters (Shrauger and Altrocchi, 1964), the Sensitizer stimuli may have produced a judgmental anchoring or contrast effect. Despite the fact that only Repressor or Sensitizer targets were physically present in a given experimental condition, the perceiver-raters' implicit norms may have operated as a standard of comparison.

### R-S Scores and Psychopathology

The findings of the present study support that interpretation which accords some import to the psychopathological dimension as a determinant of variance in R-S scores. More specifically, both the negative halo effect associated with the Sensitizer targets and the spontaneous remarks of the perceiver-raters appear to provide evidence for the presence of a linear relationship between R-S scores and psychopathology.

After reviewing the R-S literature, Byrne (1964) concluded that:

"The proposition that the two extremes of the repression-sensitization dimension represent different but equally maladjusted ways of responding to anxiety and conflict is not consistent with the majority of evidence now available (p. 197)."

Repressors have been depicted as individuals who not only appear to be well on psychological inventories, but who are rarely found in clinical populations (Tempone, 1967), exhibit less conflict on projective measures (Barker and King, 1970), and are less likely to seek out psychotherapy (Thelen, 1969). Byrne (1964, 1965, 1968) himself has reported positive correlations between the R-S Scale and such indicators of maladjustment as negative self-description, incongruent perceptions, and hospitalization. These observations are consonant with the major findings of this study in so far as peer ratings may be assumed to accurately reflect adjustment status. The reported findings would also appear to justify the following generalization:

all forms of psychopathology tend to generate feelings, attitudes, and behaviors which result in rejection or disapproval by others.

Relationship of Present Findings to Other  
Person-Perception Studies

Smith's (1969) findings in the area of clinical judgment parallel the results of this study. She tested the hypothesis that the ratings which judges gave to written descriptions of Repressor and Sensitizer targets would be influenced by the judges' own personality style. Contrary to her hypothesis, she found that the accuracy of the judges' ratings of repression-sensitization for the targets were unrelated to the judges' standing on the r-s dimension. The locus of concern in Smith's study was person perception accuracy as it was exhibited in a paper and pencil task. In contrast, the present study dealt with the rated favorability of video-taped target persons, and accuracy was not a consideration. Yet the findings of this study and Smith's findings converge upon one paramount point: in both instances the r-s dimension was found to exercise an impact upon target stimuli effects and in neither instance did the R-S scores of the judges correlate with their rating behavior. The psychological literature affords some support for the view that performance on the R-S Scale is unrelated to variation in impression formation. Thus Altrocchi (1961) found no evidence to indicate that Repressors and Sensitizers differ significantly in their perceptions of others. He reported that any apparent differences in person perception were actually a function of stable differences in self-concept. In a related study, Byrne, Griffitt, and Stefaniak (1967) failed to demonstrate that the R-S Scale was related to interpersonal attraction.

The failure of this study to confirm any of the hypotheses relating personality style to the favorability and differentiation of impression

formation is perhaps partially explicable in terms of the experimental design. Although the interview situation was probably sufficiently threatening for the target persons, and therefore resulted in the operation of different patterns of defense, the perceiver-raters were not in a comparably stressful situation. Shrauger and Altrocchi (1964) have argued that the differences in the perception of others predicted by clinical theories may operate only in those situations which are threatening enough to arouse ego defenses.

The fact that the experimental design required the selection of target stimuli from the extremes of the R-S dimension may have resulted in a relatively simple psychophysical task for the raters. The decision to utilize target stimuli found at the extremes was made in order to insure that the targets presented to the raters were clearly representative of Repressor and Sensitizer characteristics. This decision was prompted by the fact that studies have found that stimuli at the extremes of a clinical scale are judged more reliably and accurately than those in the middle range (Miller and Bieri, 1963; Hunt, Schwartz, and Walker, 1965). An unforeseen concomitant of the reliance upon targets drawn from the extremes of the R-S continuum may have been the failure of the raters to demonstrate subtle person perception effects.

The impression formation hypotheses of this study were grounded in the notion that self perception and other perception are closely related. However, the findings indicated that the favorability of self-presentation as measured by the R-S Scale did not relate to the perception of others. The failure to demonstrate a relationship between the two types of perception may have been a consequence of the methodology employed. The utilization of extreme target stimuli may have resulted in the creation of two quite divergent target groups, each possessing a highly intercorrelated set of traits. Thus high scores on the R-S Scale may have reflected an implicit personality

theory of the self ordered around the intercorrelation of undesirable traits. Conversely, low scores may have reflected the intercorrelation of desirable traits. Under these conditions, Repressors and Sensitizers may have respectively presented themselves as "good guys" and "bad guys" when they responded to both the R-S Scale and the interview situation. The latter type of self-presentation may have served to reinforce any pre-existing "halo effect" associated with the perceiver-raters.

The magnitude of the difference separating Repressor and Sensitizer targets might have been a function of a bias introduced by the ratings of the pre-informed judges. The decision to use these judges was predicated upon the belief that greater accuracy in the selection of final target stimuli would be obtained if the R-S scores were supplemented by an additional criterion. Obviously, the use of judges' ratings effectively precluded the use of a random sample of Repressor and target stimuli. This may limit the applicability of generalizations drawn from the Final Trait Favorability Ratings.

#### The Present Findings and the Construct Validity of the Repression-Sensitization Scale

Feder (1967) has drawn attention to the complex nature and the insufficiently defined status of the repression-sensitization dimension. Hoffman (1970) noted that recent studies based on the R-S construct have failed to confirm predictions in the areas of adjustment, insight, hostility, inter-personal attraction, and the expression of physical illness. In addition, he failed to find differences between Repressors and Sensitizers in their utilization of avoidance and vigilance in threatening experimental tasks. Since this is precisely the type of experimental design that originally generated the R-S construct, the utility of this construct would thus appear to be called in question. It is from this vantage point that Hoffman calls for a reassessment

as he suggests that "It seems time to re-evaluate the assumptions and definitions underlying the R-S Scale (Hoffman, p. 96)."

Thus the contradictory evidence frequently noted in the R-S literature may be a function of a complex instrument interacting with different samples and experimental tasks. It seems probable that the correlates of the R-S Scale include the factors of depression, anxiety, and response sets, as well as differences in avoidance and approach tendencies.

In spite of the reservations cited above which bear on the utility of the R-S Scale, the results of this study indicate that the r-s dimension may possess relevance for an understanding of the process of impression management (Goffman, 1959). The essentially negative self-presentation of the Sensitizer targets may have served as a means to minimize potential criticisms from others while at the same time eliciting maximum support from them (Altrocchi, 1960). However, in view of the less favorable ratings received by Sensitizer targets, this did not function as a particularly effective strategy. Repressors, in contrast, may have presented an essentially positive concept in order to achieve social approval from others (Crowne and Marlowe, 1964). This does not necessarily imply that either Repressor or Sensitizer targets were engaging in conscious dissimulation. It is highly likely that the nature of the experimental treatment, which involved being video-taped and interviewed, was anxiety-evoking for the target ss. Clearly, the Repressor targets were able to present themselves in such a manner as to elicit a relatively favorable impression, while the converse held true for the Sensitizers. Explanations involving the arousal of approach versus avoidance defenses, social desirability, and psychopathology would all appear to be consistent with target person behavior.

### Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Research

That the Repression-Sensitization Scale is relevant to processes in the area of self-presentational behavior is the major finding to emerge from this study. Experimental evidence has been adduced in support of the proposition that differences in the self-presentations of Repressor and Sensitizer targets were associated with differences in the favorability ratings which perceiver-raters assigned to the targets. However, in view of the uncertainty surrounding the actual construct validity of the R-S Scale, this finding must be interpreted with a measure of caution. The outcome of this study also indicates that the affect of depression may be a hitherto underemphasized concomitant of high R-S scores. While it was noted that the results of this study were congruent with a linear relationship between the R-S Scale and psychopathology, it must be emphasized that this was an inference which was not based on directly tested hypotheses. It is also acknowledged that all too frequently the socially undesirable and deviant are equated with psychopathological. The possibility that Sensitizers were actually being more honest than Repressors remains open.

Although there were no positive findings to link the R-S Scale to processes of person perception, it would unquestionably be premature to conclude that personality style is unrelated to impression formation. Although the experimental literature is replete with equivocal findings or outright failures to demonstrate the existence of this type of relationship, the belief that such a relationship does exist has long constituted a fruitful working assumption for clinical and experimental practitioners. To relinquish this assumption at the present time because of the inability to obtain clear experimental verification would be ill-advised. That the subtlety of this process has frequently eluded experimental demonstration is a cause for renewed efforts.

The following set of experimental hypotheses deal with a number of issues which have been raised in this study and which might be explored by future investigators.

1. What is the role played by the stimulus continuum in rated favorability?

The design of this study used two target conditions in which either extreme Repressor or Sensitizer stimuli were presented. Alternate designs might include the introduction of middle level stimuli, i.e., Neutrals. A repeated measures design could be employed to determine the effect of having the same subject rate Repressor, Sensitizer and Neutral target persons.

2. What effect does defensive arousal have upon rater behavior? It was noted that the failure to demonstrate perceiver effects may in part have been a function of the absence of threat for the raters. Future studies might attempt to create anxiety and arouse defenses through such techniques as mis-informing the perceivers that norms would be used to assess their ratings and informing them that accuracy in person perception was correlated with intelligence.

3. What is the role played by the "real" versus the "apparent" level of personality in determining rater favorability? Matkom's (1963) research indicates that counterposing the real to the apparent dimension can serve as a meaningful distinction for subjects in person perception experiments. Since there is some evidence to suggest that the social perceptions of Sensitizers and Neutrals are more complex than those of Repressors (Altrocchi, 1960), it is quite possible that the former would manifest a greater capacity to distinguish between these two levels than would Repressors. Ss might be asked to rate the favorability of traits for the same target person at the real and the apparent level.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY

The logic of the present study has been informed by the central proposition that favorability is a meaningful dimension underlying the perception of others. In order to illuminate this proposition, an experimental design was created to test the hypothesis that the level of judged favorability and differentiation of impression formation has a significant relationship to personality style. Personality style was defined by scores on the Repression-Sensitization (R-S) Scale. The study proceeded upon the assumption that differences in defensive style would be reflected in differences in both perception and behavior. Thus, on the one hand, it was felt that differences in defensive style would exercise an impact upon the implicit personality theories held by perceiver raters. And, on the other hand, differences in defensive styles were predicted to exercise an impact upon the self-presentational behavior of target subjects.

The study was conducted in three experimental phases. The first phase involved the creation of a pool of perceiver raters through the administration of the R-S scale to 197 female undergraduate students. Repressor, Neutral and Sensitizer perceiver-raters were operationally defined by their positions in the lower, middle, and upper thirds of the obtained R-S distribution. In order to control for the possible confounding effects of familiarity, the second experimental phase utilized a sample of 96 female students attending a community college. This sample provided the Ss for the

target condition. Extreme Repressor and Sensitizer targets, operationally defined by their respective positions in the lower and upper deciles of the obtained R-S distribution, were selected to participate in videotaped recorded interviews. Brief semi-structured interviews were conducted using a schedule comprised of questions pertaining to attitudes towards school, others, and the self. The fact that the target Ss were cognizant of the operation of the videotape recording apparatus was considered to be sufficiently threatening to arouse differential defense mechanisms. The 16 videotaped interviews of target Ss were rated on a six-point defensive scale by three preinformed judges. A statistically significant, but only moderate ( $r = .45$ ) relationship was found between the ratings of the pre-informed judges and the R-S scores of target Ss. The five Repressor and Sensitizer targets most accurately identified by the pre-informed judges were utilized in the final phase of the study, which involved the rating of the target persons by the perceiver Ss. The selected target persons were rated on ten bi-polar adjective trait dimensions by 156 of the original 197 perceiver Ss. The ten adjective trait dimensions were as follows: sincere-insincere, trustworthy-untrustworthy, intelligent-unintelligent, thoughtful-thoughtless, warm-cold, kind-unkind, broadminded-narrowminded, cheerful-depressed, courteous-rude, and ambitious-lazy.

The specific experimental hypotheses predicted that:

(1) Repressor perceiver-raters would give more favorable ratings to target persons than would either Sensitizer or Neutral perceiver-raters. (2) The ratings given to the Repressor targets by all perceiver-rater groups would be more favorable than the ratings given to the Sensitizer targets. (3) There would be a discernible interaction effect between the personality style of the perceiver-rater and the target person with respect to those adjective dimensions

deemed to be less amenable to impression management. Consequently, Sensitizer and Neutral perceiver-raters would give less favorable ratings to the Repressor targets than would Repressor perceiver-raters.

Only the second hypothesis received confirmation; there were highly significant differences between the favorability ratings received by the Repressor and Sensitizer targets. The cheerful-depressed dimension yielded the largest difference between the Repressor and Sensitizer targets; the target personality factor accounted for 67% of the total variance in favorability ratings on this dimension. The apparent resemblance between the selected Sensitizer targets and clinically depressed individuals was noted. A subsequent analysis of the R-S scale revealed that a substantial number of items were associated with measures of depression. Specifically, it was determined that scores on the Depression Brooding Scale of the MMPI accounted for about 66% of the total variance in target R-S scores. Explanations involving social desirability, depression, anxiety, psychopathology, and differences in the utilization of approach versus avoidance defenses are consistent with the obtained ratings of Sensitizer targets. It was also surmised that there was a negative halo effect associated with the Sensitizer targets and a positive halo effect associated with the Repressor targets. This suggests that the perceiver-raters may have been employing implicit behavioral norms as standards against which to compare the targets. Some evidence was obtained which indicated that the perceiver-raters were attending to information present in the immediate situation rather than analyzing the stimulus target in terms of inferential categories.

None of the hypotheses relating the personality style of the perceiver-raters to impression formation were substantiated. One explanation for the failure to demonstrate the influence of personality style on person

perception is that the conditions to which the perceiver-raters were exposed did not arouse differential defenses because they were insufficiently threatening. Further, the extreme nature of the target stimuli may have created a simple psychophysical task and may have thereby masked the more subtle person perception effects that had been predicted.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES FOR INDIVIDUAL ADJECTIVE  
TRAIT DIMENSIONS

TABLE 16  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR CHEERFUL-DEPRESSED

Source	Sums of Squares	df	MS	F	P
Targets (A)	3,830.42	1	3,830.42	304.73	<.001
Raters (B)	.89	2	.45	.04	n.s.
A x B	69.87	2	34.89	2.78	n.s.
Error	1,810.24	144	12.57		
Total	5,711.33	149			

Cell Means

Raters	Targets		Mean
	Repressor	Sensitizer	
Repressor	2.98	4.74	3.86
Neutral	2.63	5.03	3.83
Sensitizer	2.92	4.82	3.87
Mean	2.84	4.86	

Omega Squared ( $\omega^2$ ) = .67

TABLE 17  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR COURTEOUS-RUDE

Source	Sums of Squares	df	MS	F	p
Targets (A)	1,120.66	1	1,120.66	87.08	<.001
Raters (B)	14.52	2	7.26	.56	n.s.
A x B	8.50	2	4.25	.33	n.s.
Error	1,852.96	144	12.87		
Total	2,996.64	149			

Cell Means

<u>Raters</u>	<u>Targets</u>		Mean
	Repressor	Sensitizer	
Repressor	2.37	3.59	2.98
Neutral	2.32	3.38	2.85
Sensitizer	2.48	3.48	2.98
Mean	2.39	3.48	

Omega Squared ( $\omega^2$ ) = .37

TABLE 18  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR WARM-COLD

Source	Sums of Squares	df	MS	F	P
Targets (A)	1,131.62	1	1,131.62	85.79	<.001
Raters (B)	10.57	2	5.29	.40	n.s.
A x B	6.34	2	3.17	.24	n.s.
Error	1,899.44	144	13.19		
Total	3,047.97	149			

Cell Means

		<u>Targets</u>		
<u>Raters</u>	Repressor	Sensitizer	Mean	
Repressor	3.02	4.22	3.62	
Neutral	2.97	4.08	3.53	
Sensitizer	3.15	4.14	3.65	
Mean	3.05	4.15		

Omega Squared ( $\omega^2$ ) = .37

TABLE 19  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR AMBITIOUS-LAZY

Source	Sums of Squares	df	MS	F	p
Targets (A)	826.02	1	826.02	69.88	<.001
Raters (B)	22.65	2	11.33	.96	n.s.
A x B	37.06	2	18.53	1.57	n.s.
Error	1,702.56	144	11.82		
Total	2,588.29	149			

Cell Means

<u>Raters</u>	<u>Targets</u>		Mean
	Repressor	Sensitizer	
Repressor	3.35	4.38	3.86
Neutral	3.11	4.24	3.68
Sensitizer	3.46	4.13	3.80
Mean	3.31	4.25	

Omega Squared ( $\omega^2$ ) = .31

TABLE 20  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR KIND-UNKIND

Source	Sums of Squares	df	MS	F	p
Targets (A)	640.72	1	640.72	55.71	<.001
Raters (B)	7.88	2	3.94	.34	n.s.
A x B	66.72	2	33.36	2.90	n.s.
Error	1,656.50	144	11.50		
Total	2,371.80	149			

Cell Means

<u>Raters</u>	<u>Targets</u>		Mean
	Repressor	Sensitizer	
Repressor	2.89	3.58	3.23
Neutral	2.54	3.75	3.14
Sensitizer	2.93	3.54	3.25
Mean	2.79	3.62	

Omega Squared ( $\omega^2$ ) = .26

TABLE 21  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TRUSTWORTHY-UNTRUSTWORTHY

Source	Sums of Squares	df	MS	F	p
Targets (A)	588.06	1	588.06	41.15	<.001
Raters (B)	2.28	2	1.14	.08	n.s.
A x B	21.16	2	10.58	.74	n.s.
Error	2,058.24	144	14.29		
Total	2,669.74	149			

Cell Means

<u>Raters</u>	<u>Targets</u>		Mean
	Repressor	Sensitizer	
Repressor	2.76	3.74	3.25
Neutral	2.93	3.61	3.27
Sensitizer	2.97	3.58	3.27
Mean	2.88	3.64	

Omega Squared ( $\omega^2$ ) = .21

TABLE 22  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR BROADMINDED-NARROWMINDED

Source	Sums of Squares	df	MS	F	p
Targets (A)	384.00	1	384.00	25.84	<.001
Raters (B)	36.48	2	18.24	1.23	n.s.
A x B	3.36	2	1.68	.11	n.s.
Error	2,140.16	144	14.86		
Within	2,564.00	149			

Cell Means

<u>Raters</u>	<u>Targets</u>		Mean
	Repressor	Sensitizer	
Repressor	3.71	4.43	4.07
Neutral	3.52	4.14	3.83
Sensitizer	3.69	4.26	3.98
Mean	3.64	4.28	

Omega Squared ( $\omega^2$ ) = .13

TABLE 23  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THOUGHTFUL-THOUGHTLESS

Source	Sums of Squares	df	MS	F	p
Targets (A)	294.00	1	294.00	23.15	<.001
Raters (B)	11.64	2	5.82	.46	n.s.
A x B	15.16	2	7.58	.60	n.s.
Error	1,829.44	144	12.70		
Total	2,150.24	149			

Cell Means

<u>Raters</u>	<u>Targets</u>		Mean
	Repressor	Sensitizer	
Repressor	3.22	3.66	3.44
Neutral	3.03	3.77	3.40
Sensitizer	3.28	3.78	3.53
Mean	3.18	3.74	

Omega Squared ( $\omega^2$ ) = .13

TABLE 24  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SINCERE-INSINCERE

Source	Sums of Squares	df	MS	F	p
Targets (A)	201.83	1	201.83	11.25	<.001
Raters (B)	30.81	2	15.41	.86	n.s.
A x B	27.65	2	13.83	.77	n.s.
Error	2,583.20	144	17.94		
Total	2,843.49	149			

Cell Means

<u>Raters</u>	<u>Targets</u>		Mean
	Repressor	Sensitizer	
Repressor	2.89	3.11	3.00
Neutral	2.50	3.06	2.78
Sensitizer	2.61	3.22	2.92
Mean	2.67	3.13	

Omega Squared ( $\omega^2$ ) = .06

TABLE 25

## ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR INTELLIGENT-UNINTELLIGENT

Source	Sums of Squares	df	MS	F	p
Targets (A)	94.40	1	94.40	7.33	<.01
Raters (B)	24.33	2	12.17	.95	n.s.
A x B	11.06	2	5.53	.43	n.s.
Error	1,853.60	144	12.87		
Total	1,983.39	149			

## Cell Means

<u>Raters</u>	<u>Targets</u>		Mean
	Repressor	Sensitizer	
Repressor	3.30	3.48	3.39
Neutral	3.15	3.59	3.37
Sensitizer	3.38	3.72	3.55
Mean	3.28	3.60	

Omega Squared ( $\omega^2$ ) = .04

APPENDIX B  
REPRESSION-SENSITIZATION SCALE

Health and Opinion Survey

This survey consists of numbered statements. Read each statement and decide whether it is true as applied to you or false as applied to you.

You are to mark your answers on the answer cards provided. If a statement is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken the space in the column headed A (See #1 at the right).

If a statement is FALSE or NOT USUALLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken the space in the column headed B (See #2 at the right). If a

	A	B
1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

statement does not apply to you or if it is something that you do not know about, make no mark on the answer sheet.

You may find a few questions, therefore, which you cannot or prefer not to answer. These may be omitted but try to avoid this. In marking your answers on the answer sheet, please make sure that the number of the statement is the same as the number on the answer sheet.

Your answers are to be used for research purposes only and will be held in strict confidence. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

1. I have a good appetite.
2. I wake up fresh and rested most mornings.
3. I am easily awakened by noise.
4. I like to read newspaper articles on crime.
5. My hands and feet are usually warm enough.
6. My daily life is full of things that keep me interested.
7. I am about as able to work as I ever was.
8. There seems to be a lump in my throat much of the time.
9. I enjoy detective or mystery stories.
10. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.
11. I am very seldom troubled by constipation.
12. At times I have fits of laughing and crying that I cannot control.
13. I am troubled by attacks of nausea and vomiting.
14. I feel that it is certainly best to keep my mouth shut when I'm in trouble.
15. At times I feel like swearing.
16. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job.
17. I seldom worry about my health.
18. At times I feel like smashing things.
19. I have had periods of days, weeks, or months when I couldn't take care of things because I couldn't "get going."
20. My sleep is fitful and disturbed.
21. Much of the time my head seems to hurt all over.
22. I do not always tell the truth.
23. My judgment is better than it ever was.
24. Once a week or oftener I feel suddenly hot all over, without apparent cause.
25. I am in just as good physical health as most of my friends.

26. I prefer to pass by school friends, or people I know but have not seen for a long time, unless they speak to me first.
27. I am almost never bothered by pains over the heart or in my chest.
28. I am a good mixer.
29. Everything is turning out just like the prophets of the Bible said it would.
30. I do not read every editorial in the newspaper every day.
31. I sometimes keep on a thing until others lose their patience with me.
32. I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be.
33. I think a great many people exaggerate their misfortunes in order to gain the sympathy and help of others.
34. I get angry sometimes.
35. Most of the time I feel blue.
36. I sometimes tease animals.
37. I am certainly lacking in self-confidence.
38. I usually feel that life is worth-while.
39. It takes a lot of argument to convince most people of the truth.
40. Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
41. I think most people would like to get ahead.
42. I do many things which I regret afterwards (I regret things more or more often than others seem to).
43. I go to church almost every week.
44. I have very few quarrels with members of my family.
45. I believe in the second coming of Christ.
46. My hardest battles are with myself.
47. I have little or no trouble with my muscles twitching or jumping.
48. I don't seem to care what happens to me.
49. Sometimes when I am not feeling well I am cross.
50. Much of the time I feel as if I have done something wrong or evil.

51. I am happy most of the time.
52. Some people are so bossy that I feel like doing the opposite of what they request, even though I know they are right.
53. Often I feel as if there were a tight band about my head.
54. My table manners are not quite as good at home as when I am out in company.
55. I seem to be about as capable and smart as most others around me.
56. Most people will use somewhat unfair means to gain profit or an advantage rather than to lose it.
57. The sight of blood neither frightens me nor makes me sick.
58. Often I can't understand why I have been so cross and grouchy.
59. I have never vomited blood or coughed up blood.
60. I do not worry about catching diseases.
61. At times my thoughts have raced ahead faster than I could speak them.
62. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it.
63. I commonly wonder what hidden reason another person may have for doing something nice for me.
64. I believe that my home life is as pleasant as that of most people I know.
65. Criticism or scolding hurts me terribly.
66. My conduct is largely controlled by the customs of those about me.
67. I certainly feel useless at times.
68. At times I feel like picking a fist fight with someone.
69. I have often lost out on things because I couldn't make up my mind soon enough.
70. It makes me impatient to have people ask my advice or otherwise interrupt me when I am working on something important.
71. I would rather win than lose in a game.
72. Most nights I go to sleep without thoughts or ideas bothering me.

73. During the past few years I have been well most of the time.
74. I have never had a fit or convulsion.
75. I am neither gaining nor losing weight.
76. I cry easily.
77. I cannot understand what I read as well as I used to.
78. I have never felt better in my life than I do now.
79. I resent having anyone take me in so cleverly that I have had to admit that it was one on me.
80. I do not tire quickly.
81. I like to study and read about things that I am working at.
82. I like to know some important people because it makes me feel important.
83. What others think of me does not bother me.
84. It makes me uncomfortable to put on a stunt at a party even when others are doing the same sort of things.
85. I frequently have to fight against showing that I am bashful.
86. I have never had a fainting spell.
87. I seldom or never have dizzy spells.
88. My memory seems to be all right.
89. I am worried about sex matters.
90. I find it hard to make talk when I meet new people.
91. I am afraid of losing my mind.
92. I am against giving money to beggars.
93. I frequently notice my hand shakes when I try to do something.
94. I can read a long while without tiring my eyes.
95. I feel weak all over much of the time.
96. I have very few headaches.
97. Sometimes, when embarrassed, I break out in a sweat which annoys me greatly.

98. I have had no difficulty in keeping by balance in walking.
99. I do not have spells of hay fever or asthma.
100. I do not like everyone I know.
101. I wish I were not so shy.
102. I enjoy many different kinds of play and recreation.
103. I like to flirt.
104. In walking I am very careful to step over sidewalk cracks.
105. I frequently find myself worrying about something.
106. I gossip a little at times.
107. I hardly ever notice my heart pounding and I am seldom short of breath.
108. I have at times stood in the way of people who were trying to do something, not because it amounted to much but because of the principle of the thing.
109. I get mad easily and then get over it soon.
110. I brood a great deal.
111. I have periods of such great restlessness that I cannot sit long in a chair.
112. I dream frequently about things that are best kept to myself.
113. I believe I am no more nervous than most others.
114. I have few or no pains.
115. Sometimes without any reason or even when things are going wrong I feel excitedly happy, "on top of the world."
116. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong.
117. Sometimes at elections I vote for men about whom I know very little.
118. I have difficulty in starting to do things.
119. I sweat very easily even on cool days.
120. It is safer to trust nobody.
121. Once a week or oftener I become very excited.

122. When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.
123. When I leave home I do not worry about whether the door is locked and the windows are closed.
124. I do not blame a person for taking advantage of someone who lays himself open to it.
125. At times I am all full of energy.
126. My eyesight is as good as it has been for years.
127. I have often felt that strangers were looking at me critically.
128. I drink an unusually large amount of water every day.
129. Once in a while I laugh at a dirty joke.
130. I am always disgusted with the law when a criminal is freed through the arguments of a smart lawyer.
131. I work under a great deal of tension.
132. I am likely not to speak to people until they speak to me.
133. I have periods in which I feel unusually cheerful without any special reason.
134. Life is a strain for me much of the time.
135. In school I found it very hard to talk before the class.
136. Even when I am with people I feel lonely much of the time.
137. I think nearly anyone would tell a lie to keep out of trouble.
138. I am easily embarrassed.
139. I worry over money and business.
140. I almost never dream.
141. I easily become impatient with people.
142. I feel anxiety about something or someone almost all the time.
143. Sometimes I become so excited that I find it hard to get to sleep.
144. I forget right away what people say to me.
145. I usually have to stop and think before I act even in trifling matters.

146. Often I cross the street in order not to meet someone I see.
147. I often feel as if things were not real.
148. I have a habit of countings that are not important such as bulbs on electric signs, and so forth.
149. I have strange and peculiar thoughts.
150. I get anxious and upset when I have to make a short trip away from home.

TEST 2

1. I have been afraid of things or people that I knew could not hurt me.
2. I have no dread of going into a room by myself where other people have gathered and are talking.
3. I have more trouble concentrating than others seem to have.
4. I have several times given up doing a thing because I thought too little of my ability.
5. Bad words, often terrible words, come into my mind and I cannot get rid of them.
6. Sometimes some unimportant thought will run through my mind and bother me for days.
7. Almost every day something happens to frighten me.
8. I am inclined to take things hard.
9. I am more sensitive than most other people.
10. At periods my mind seems to work more slowly than usual.
11. I very seldom have spells of the blues.
12. I wish I could get over worrying about things I have said that may have injured other people's feelings.
13. People often disappoint me.
14. I feel unable to tell anyone all about myself.
15. My plans have frequently seemed so full of difficulties that I have had to give them up.

16. Often, even though everything is going fine for me, I feel that I don't care about anything.
17. I have sometimes felt that difficulties were piling up so high that I could not overcome them.
18. I often think, "I wish I were a child again."
19. I have often met people who were supposed to be experts who were no better than I.
20. It makes me feel like a failure when I hear of the success of someone I know well.
21. I am apt to take disappointments so keenly that I can't put them out of my mind.
22. At times I think I am no good at all.
23. I worry quite a bit over possible misfortunes.
24. 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.
25. I find it hard to set aside a task that I have undertaken, even for a short time.
26. I have several times had a change of heart about my life work.
27. I must admit that I have at times been worried beyond reason over something that really did not matter.
28. I like to let people know where I stand on things.
29. I have a daydream life about which I do not tell other people.
30. I have often felt guilty because I have pretended to feel more sorry about something than I really was.
31. I feel tired a good deal of the time.
32. I sometimes feel that I am about to go to pieces.

APPENDIX C  
DEPRESSION-BROODING SCALE

DEPRESSION-BROODING SCALE (D<sub>5</sub>)\*

---

---

True Items

- 1 (19). I have had periods of days, weeks, or months when I couldn't take care of things because I couldn't "get going."
- 2 (32). I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be.
- 3 (48). I don't seem to care what happens to me.
- 4 (65). Criticism or scolding hurts me terribly.
- 5 (67). I certainly feel useless at times.
- 6 (76). I cry easily.
- 7 (91). I'm afraid of losing my mind.
- 8 (110). I brood a great deal.

False Items

- 9 (38). I usually feel that life is worthwhile.
- 10 (51). I am happy most of the time.

\* Numbers in parentheses refer to R-S scale item number

APPENDIX D  
PERSON-PERCEPTION RATING INSTRUMENT

Instructions for Person Perception Rating Form

The purpose of this study is to learn something about how people see others. On the rating sheets in front of you are 10 scales which you will use in describing a number of people. Each of these scales describes the two opposite ends of a trait and consists of seven spaces. For example:

Imaginative    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    Unimaginative

You will put a circle around the number that you feel best describes the person. For example, if you see the person as being very Unimaginative, you would rate the person as follows:

Imaginative    1    2    3    4    5    6    (7)    Unimaginative

If you feel that the person in question is slightly Unimaginative, you would rate them as follows:

Imaginative    1    2    3    4    (5)    6    7    Unimaginative

If you see the person in question as being moderately Imaginative, you would rate them as follows:

Imaginative    1    (2)    3    4    5    6    7    Unimaginative

You will now see five persons being interviewed. Please rate each person as honestly as you can and in terms of how you really see them. Your ratings will be used for research purposes only and will be held in strict confidence. Remember to read each individual scale before making your rating.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

CLASS \_\_\_\_\_

INTELLIGENT	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	UNINTELLIGENT
-------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	---------------

THOUGHTFUL	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	THOUGHTLESS
------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-------------

LAZY	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	AMBITIOUS
------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

RUDE	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	COURTEOUS
------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

UNTRUSTWORTHY	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	TRUSTWORTHY
---------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-------------

NARROW-MINDED	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	BROAD-MINDED
---------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	--------------

CHEERFUL	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	DEPRESSED
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

KIND	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	UNKIND
------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	--------

SINCERE	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	INSINCERE
---------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

COLD	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	WARM
------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

CLASS \_\_\_\_\_

TRUSTWORTHY	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	UNTRUSTWORTHY
UNKIND	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	KIND
BROAD-MINDED	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	NARROW-MINDED
AMBITIOUS	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	LAZY
WARM	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	COLD
DEPRESSED	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	CHEERFUL
COURTEOUS	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	RUDE
THOUGHTLESS	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	THOUGHTFUL
INSINCERE	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	SINCERE
UNINTELLIGENT	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	INTELLIGENT

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

CLASS \_\_\_\_\_

BROAD-MINDED	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	NARROW-MINDED
DEPRESSED	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	CHEERFUL
THOUGHTLESS	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	THOUGHTFUL
UNKIND	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	KIND
UNINTELLIGENT	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	INTELLIGENT
WARM	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	COLD
INSINCERE	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	SINCERE
COURTEOUS	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	RUDE
TRUSTWORTHY	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	UNTRUSTWORTHY
AMBITIOUS	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	LAZY

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

CLASS \_\_\_\_\_

SINCERE	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	INSINCERE
LAZY	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	AMBITIOUS
INTELLIGENT	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	UNINTELLIGENT
COLD	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	WARM
KIND	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	UNKIND
RUDE	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	COURTEOUS
CHEERFUL	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	DEPRESSED
UNTRUSTWORTHY	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	TRUSTWORTHY
THOUGHTFUL	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	THOUGHTLESS
NARROW-MINDED	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	BROAD-MINDED

APPENDIX E  
DEFENSIVE-STYLE RATING FORM

Rater \_\_\_\_\_

Subject \_\_\_\_\_

Repressors

Repressors deal with anxiety-evoking stimuli through the utilization of such "avoidance" type responses as denial and repression. They are more likely, compared to sensitizers, to present themselves as normal, while verbalizing socially desirable feelings and beliefs. They are more likely to avoid expression of such negative affects as anxiety and hostility. At the same time, they may indicate non-verbal evidence of such experience. They tend to be more rigidly constricted and moralistic, while presenting a more positive self-concept.

Sensitizers

Sensitizers deal with anxiety-evoking stimuli through the utilization of such "approach" type behaviors as intellectualization, obsessionalism, and ruminative worrying. They are more likely, compared to repressors, to verbalize socially undesirable beliefs and feelings, while displaying a critical and impatient attitude. They are more likely to admit to feelings of anxiety, emotional upset, and hostility. They are more open to inner experience, but are more likely to present a negative self-concept.

Repressor    1    2    3    4    5    6    Sensitizer

APPENDIX F  
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. How do you like Greater Hartford Community College?  
What do you think of the teachers?
2. What types of people do you like or respect the most in general?  
Why?
3. What types of people bother or upset you the most? Why?
4. If you could magically change your personality tomorrow, what  
would you do?
5. Are you basically satisfied with life? Why?
6. What do you think most people are after in life?

APPENDIX G  
RAW DATA PERCEIVER-RATER SAMPLE

## E.C.S.C. RATER SAMPLE

## KEY

- A. Subject
- B. Repression-Sensitization Score
- C. Trustworthy-Untrustworthy Rating
- D. Kind-Unkind Rating
- E. Broad-Minded-Narrow-Minded Rating
- F. Ambitious-Lazy Rating
- G. Warm-Cold Rating
- H. Cheerful-Depressed Rating
- I. Courteous-Rude Rating
- J. Thoughtful-Thoughtless Rating
- K. Sincere-Insincere Rating
- L. Intelligent-Unintelligent Rating
- M. Total Rating

TABLE 26

## REPRESSOR RATERS-REPRESSOR TARGETS

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	12	15	14	19	18	18	16	16	16	14	20	166
2	14	13	20	17	20	20	23	14	22	18	20	187
3	16	14	16	20	13	16	13	12	15	16	12	147
4	17	16	17	20	15	16	14	13	14	15	15	155
5	17	17	11	23	14	13	16	10	15	16	17	152
6	17	12	12	15	18	13	10	14	14	11	16	135
7	18	18	17	20	18	17	17	14	17	18	18	174
8	20	14	15	17	17	15	15	12	12	12	14	143
9	21	20	21	21	19	16	20	16	22	21	23	199
10	22	18	16	18	22	24	19	20	20	16	21	194
11	22	12	12	23	17	13	12	10	15	16	16	146
12	24	13	13	19	20	17	12	11	16	10	17	148
13	24	21	18	17	15	15	15	14	17	21	18	171
14	25	13	8	15	12	10	8	5	13	11	12	107
15	25	11	16	19	13	19	15	10	16	16	15	150
16	26	6	10	11	11	13	11	5	12	7	10	96
17	28	11	13	18	13	12	14	10	17	15	15	138
18	28	11	10	18	20	11	12	5	13	13	13	126
19	28	12	16	19	17	16	14	11	15	15	15	150
20	29	12	12	13	17	10	13	8	12	8	17	122
21	30	12	11	19	16	16	13	16	14	10	16	143
22	31	19	17	23	18	14	18	15	18	20	18	162
23	32	12	14	18	15	15	17	10	16	16	20	153
24	32	12	12	25	22	14	15	10	23	8	18	159
25	32	11	20	17	19	15	20	16	18	18	17	170

TABLE 27  
NEUTRAL RATERS-REPRESSOR TARGETS

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
26	33	15	13	18	20	15	11	12	16	9	16	145
27	34	11	8	21	18	12	10	8	10	10	8	126
28	35	12	11	14	11	12	6	5	13	8	11	103
29	35	14	13	20	20	17	12	15	15	15	20	161
30	36	14	14	13	15	16	15	14	14	13	16	144
31	37	23	18	26	17	19	19	18	21	16	24	201
32	38	20	17	23	18	21	24	17	22	21	25	208
33	38	11	8	11	12	6	12	5	12	7	16	100
34	38	13	13	15	9	17	12	15	15	11	15	135
35	39	15	14	17	15	13	12	14	12	11	11	134
36	39	17	16	19	19	19	19	16	19	13	18	175
37	40	11	15	15	16	12	14	10	17	16	17	143
38	40	12	11	15	13	15	12	10	13	9	14	124
39	40	10	8	19	10	10	8	8	11	9	10	103
40	40	13	15	16	15	18	11	10	21	13	16	148
41	42	10	12	15	12	17	12	7	13	10	13	121
42	42	9	10	18	14	15	11	9	8	7	18	119
43	43	16	13	18	17	17	16	9	21	11	14	152
44	43	13	13	14	15	18	14	12	14	12	15	140
45	43	11	11	16	16	13	9	11	12	10	15	124
46	45	13	11	17	15	12	14	12	13	11	11	129
47	45	23	11	20	21	18	18	17	15	20	16	179
48	46	12	11	16	12	11	10	11	13	11	12	119
49	46	13	11	19	17	16	12	11	20	12	18	149
50	47	21	18	25	22	12	16	14	22	20	23	193

TABLE 28  
SENSITIZER RATERS-REPRESSOR TARGETS

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
51	50	17	18	22	18	19	19	13	19	15	21	181
52	50	13	14	14	15	17	15	10	14	11	14	137
53	50	13	14	19	19	15	15	15	14	12	15	151
54	50	16	17	19	18	16	20	12	19	19	16	172
55	51	15	7	22	24	11	12	5	19	7	22	144
56	51	13	9	13	12	11	10	11	12	7	9	107
57	51	10	15	26	22	15	6	5	25	12	14	150
58	54	17	15	21	19	17	14	14	17	13	18	165
59	56	21	15	15	13	13	9	9	14	12	12	133
60	56	18	19	22	20	19	20	19	18	17	19	191
61	57	15	19	23	21	19	13	21	16	18	22	187
62	57	19	16	21	20	18	15	22	20	14	19	184
63	58	13	15	17	21	18	19	14	14	14	17	162
64	58	14	19	19	17	16	18	13	19	14	21	170
65	58	13	16	17	17	16	16	12	18	9	19	153
66	59	12	15	16	17	13	13	10	15	9	19	139
67	60	16	14	15	12	15	16	11	16	12	14	141
68	66	12	10	15	13	12	15	11	12	12	13	125
69	66	21	21	24	20	23	19	17	20	20	21	206
70	72	6	7	8	9	9	7	6	7	8	7	74
71	73	11	10	16	18	11	12	9	16	10	17	130
72	74	8	10	12	13	10	11	7	9	7	11	98
73	76	18	15	26	25	20	18	12	18	20	23	195
74	79	16	17	19	16	17	16	14	18	12	20	165
75	107	24	22	19	14	24	17	18	21	22	20	201

TABLE 29  
 REPRESSOR RATERS-SENSITIZER TARGETS

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
76	5	17	16	24	18	21	25	20	19	13	16	189
77	6	20	21	20	20	22	25	19	20	14	22	203
78	11	19	21	25	24	21	25	17	23	21	16	212
79	11	27	22	22	26	21	23	20	23	20	20	224
80	18	15	16	25	24	23	22	19	22	16	20	202
81	18	20	18	31	28	28	28	18	22	14	15	222
82	19	13	15	21	18	15	23	15	12	13	14	159
83	20	16	20	22	20	26	24	18	19	18	17	200
84	20	14	11	17	21	16	18	12	16	11	19	155
85	20	20	17	24	25	21	23	20	20	19	16	205
86	21	18	17	22	24	19	23	17	22	20	22	204
87	22	11	17	17	21	17	23	21	18	13	17	175
88	22	15	15	17	16	20	25	14	10	14	14	160
89	23	24	20	20	24	23	26	22	20	20	18	217
90	23	18	18	19	20	18	19	18	16	11	13	170
91	24	20	20	26	19	27	28	17	18	7	19	201
92	24	16	15	22	19	21	18	16	17	15	14	173
93	24	21	16	21	19	19	23	20	12	11	15	177
94	25	24	16	24	21	13	25	17	16	14	14	184
95	28	23	20	22	21	20	23	17	19	15	16	196
96	29	22	21	18	23	23	25	20	20	22	23	217
97	29	18	14	19	22	25	24	16	15	15	16	184
98	29	17	23	30	25	25	27	19	22	20	24	232
99	30	21	21	26	27	22	26	20	20	17	17	217
100	32	18	17	20	22	21	22	17	16	16	18	187

TABLE 30  
NEUTRAL RATERS-SENSITIZER TARGETS

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
101	33	21	22	24	24	26	31	20	19	14	20	221
102	35	20	19	21	22	17	26	16	20	16	22	199
103	35	20	25	27	21	26	25	20	25	23	22	234
104	36	24	21	19	22	24	25	20	16	18	16	205
105	37	21	21	26	25	28	26	21	22	15	17	222
106	37	15	23	25	27	22	29	14	24	27	24	230
107	37	19	20	20	24	19	25	16	16	16	20	195
108	40	17	18	21	17	18	20	20	17	13	15	176
109	40	20	23	20	25	25	28	15	20	20	15	211
110	40	20	17	19	19	21	25	18	16	16	18	189
111	40	10	7	12	14	8	20	9	12	9	12	113
112	40	20	16	23	25	22	20	20	24	15	20	205
113	40	14	14	17	23	17	24	18	16	16	13	172
114	42	12	14	24	18	21	23	11	21	11	14	172
115	42	20	21	21	19	16	26	19	19	13	13	187
116	44	23	18	27	25	21	27	20	22	17	23	223
117	44	18	22	19	18	20	25	14	21	13	21	191
118	45	19	14	20	25	15	28	18	16	14	19	188
119	46	18	19	20	21	17	29	18	17	20	19	198
120	46	20	20	19	25	23	29	21	22	22	21	222
121	47	9	19	14	16	19	25	7	15	10	12	146
122	47	17	19	20	16	20	24	18	16	10	19	179
123	47	20	22	20	23	23	24	17	21	18	19	207
124	47	18	18	21	19	25	27	15	21	9	22	195
125	49	16	16	19	17	17	18	15	13	7	13	151

TABLE 31  
 SENSITIZER RATERS-SENSITIZER TARGETS

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
126	50	9	10	14	14	14	18	12	16	11	11	129
127	50	20	20	19	25	23	28	21	22	20	21	219
128	50	19	21	29	22	23	23	22	21	22	20	222
129	52	25	19	29	19	24	30	16	18	19	16	215
130	53	14	20	19	20	23	25	18	23	19	21	202
131	56	14	16	18	18	18	21	15	16	14	13	163
132	56	17	17	22	22	23	26	16	17	17	19	196
133	57	26	18	28	28	25	27	22	20	14	18	226
134	59	20	20	24	24	20	25	20	18	17	15	203
135	59	16	18	16	20	24	21	13	18	24	16	186
136	59	18	17	20	21	21	23	20	16	16	19	191
137	61	19	18	19	20	23	24	19	16	21	18	197
138	61	14	20	18	20	21	28	18	19	15	18	181
139	61	19	19	27	22	21	25	18	24	22	24	221
140	63	16	13	12	17	17	14	12	14	14	18	147
141	63	17	16	23	22	21	26	16	19	14	21	195
142	65	22	16	20	21	14	21	15	18	19	19	185
143	70	15	14	19	18	15	18	16	15	15	15	160
144	71	17	17	19	19	20	28	21	18	11	16	186
145	74	19	17	26	29	24	30	17	18	11	24	215
146	74	20	20	26	19	21	27	17	25	12	27	214
147	77	17	16	24	18	21	19	15	18	17	14	179
148	78	21	19	18	23	23	23	21	21	17	18	204
149	88	20	26	25	18	22	26	22	28	18	22	227
150	92	13	16	19	17	17	26	13	15	5	22	163

TABLE 32  
DISCARDED PERCEIVER-RATER SUBJECTS

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
151*	22	16	17	20	15	16	14	13	14	13	15	153
152**	24	15	19	18	19	22	24	15	13	13	14	172
153**	37	14	17	13	17	21	29	13	16	16	20	176
154**	40	8	10	19	10	13	18	9	15	15	10	127
155**	49	15	14	22	24	16	22	21	16	12	17	179
156**	57	14	19	19	19	21	21	17	15	14	15	174

\* Repressor target group

\*\* Sensitizer target group

APPENDIX H  
RAW DATA-TARGET STIMULI SAMPLE

TABLE 33  
 REPRESSION-SENSITIZATION AND DEPRESSION-BROODING SCORES  
 G.H.C.C. SAMPLE

Subject	R-S	D	Subject	R-S	D
1	7	1	26	37	3
2	8	0	27	37	3
3*	11	1	28	38	2
4	12	1	29	39	2
5	12	0	30	39	4
6*	14	2	31	39	5
7	16	0	32	39	5
8	18	2	33	40	2
9	20	2	34	40	0
10*	21	1	35	41	2
11	21	2	36	43	5
12	23	1	37	44	5
13	25	0	38	44	3
14	27	3	39	45	2
15	27	0	40	45	4
16	27	2	41	47	2
17*	28	1	42	48	3
18*	28	3	43	48	5
19	29	0	44	48	4
20	29	2	45	49	3
21	30	3	46	50	2
22	32	3	47	50	3
23	32	0	48	50	4
24	35	2	49	50	3
25	36	4	50	50	2

\* Selected Repressor Target

TABLE 33 (Continued)

Subject	R-S	D	Subject	R-S	D
51	50	3	76	67	4
52	51	4	77**	69	7
53	51	6	78	73	5
54	52	3	79	73	7
55	52	4	80	74	9
56	53	3	81**	75	7
57	53	4	82	75	5
58	54	2	83	77	7
59	54	3	84	79	5
60	55	2	85**	80	7
61	55	3	86	81	6
62	55	4	87	82	5
63	59	3	88	83	8
64	59	5	89	86	4
65	60	5	90	86	8
66	61	5	91	86	6
67	62	3	92**	87	9
68	62	2	93	88	6
69	63	4	94	92	6
70	63	4	95	100	6
71	66	6	96**	100	8
72	66	4			
73	66	4			
74	67	6			
75	67	4			

\*\* Selected Sensitizer Targets

APPENDIX I  
FAW DATA-PRE-INFORMED JUDGES' RATINGS OF  
TARGET PERSON STIMULI

TABLE 34  
PRE-INFORMED JUDGES' RATINGS

A	B	C	D	E	F
1	82	5	2	2	3.0
2*	21	2	1	1	1.3
3*	28	1	1	3	1.7
4*	11	3	2	3	2.7
5	27	5	2	6	4.3
6**	87	5	4	2	3.7
7*	28	2	1	2	1.7
8*	14	2	1	2	1.7
9**	69	3	4	5	4.0
10**	100	6	6	6	6.0
11**	80	6	6	6	6.0
12	75	1	2	1	1.3
13**	75	6	5	6	5.7
14	27	4	5	4	4.3
15	86	2	2	1	1.7
16	86	5	3	3	3.7

## KEY

A = SUBJECT

B = R-S SCORE

C = RATER 1

\* SELECTED REPRESSOR TARGET

D = RATER 2

E = RATER 3

F = AVERAGE RATING

\*\* SELECTED SENSITIZER TARGET

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allport, G. W. Pattern and growth in personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.
- Altrocchi, J. Interpersonal perception of Repressors and Sensitizers and component analysis of assumed dissimilarity scores. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 528-534.
- Altrocchi, J., Parsons, O., and Dickoff, H. Changes in self-ideal discrepancy in Repressors and Sensitizers. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 67-72.
- Altrocchi, J., Shrauger, S., and McCleod, M. A. Attribution of hostility to self and others by Expressors, Sensitizers, and Repressors. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1964, 20, 223.
- Anderson, N. H. Likeableness ratings of 555 personality trait words. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 354-362.
- Argyle, M. Social interaction. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.
- Asch, S. E. Forming impressions of personality. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1946, 41, 258-290.
- Axtell, B. and Cole, C. W. Repression-Sensitization response mode and verbal avoidance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 18, 133-137.
- Baker, R. P., and King, H. Relationship between the Repression-Sensitization Scale and the Incomplete Sentences Blank. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1970, 492-496.
- Beach, L. and Wertheimer, M. A free response approach to the study of person cognition. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 367-374.
- Bieri, J., Atkins, A. L., Briar, S., Leaman, R. L., Miller, H., and Tripodi, T. Clinical and social judgment; the discrimination of behavioral information. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Block, J. The challenge of response sets; unconfounding meaning, acquiescence, and social desirability in the MMPI. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.

- Bonime, W. The psychodynamics of neurotic depression. In S. Arieti (Ed.), The American handbook of psychiatry. Vol. III. New York: Basic Books, 1966.
- Braginsky, B., Braginsky, D. D., and Ring, K. Methods of madness. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.
- Brofenbrenner, U., Harding, J., and Gallwey, M. The measurement of skill in social perception. In D. C. McClelland (Ed.), Talent and society. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1958, 29-111.
- Brown, R. Social psychology. New York: Free Press, 1965.
- Bruner, J. S. and Postman, L. Tension and tension release as organizing factors in perception. Journal of Personality, 1947, 15, 300-308.
- Bruner, J. S. and Tagiuri, R. Person perception. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), The handbook of social psychology. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- Bruner, J. S., and Shaprio, D., and Tagiuri, R. The meaning of traits in isolation and combination. In R. Tagiuri (Ed.), Person perception and interpersonal behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958, 277-288.
- Byrne, D. The Repression-Sensitization Scale: rationale, reliability and validity. Journal of Personality, 1961, 29, 334-349.
- Byrne, D., Barry, J., and Nelson, D. Relation of the revised Repression-Sensitization Scale to measures of self-description. Psychological Reports, 1963, 13, 323-334.
- Byrne, D. Repression-Sensitization as a dimension of personality. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), Progress in Experimental Personality Research. New York: Academic Press, 1964, Vol. 1 169-220.
- Byrne, D., Golightly, C., and Sheffield, J. The Repression-Sensitization Scale as a measure of adjustment: relation with the CPI. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 586-589.
- Byrne, D., Griffitt, N., and Stefaniak, D. Attraction and similarity of personality characteristics. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 1, 82-90.
- Byrne, D., Steinberg, M. A., and Schwartz, M. S. Relationship between repression-sensitization and physical illness. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 154-155.
- Carrera, R. N. and Cohen, A. M. Discussion patterns of homogeneous groups of Repressors and Sensitizers following success and failure. Psychological Reports, 1968, 22 7-14.
- Carson, R. C. Interaction concepts of personality. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.

- Cattell, R. B. The scientific analysis of personality. Baltimore: Penquin Books, 1965.
- Clark, L. F. and Neuringer, C. Repressor-sensitizer personality style and associated levels of verbal ability, social intelligence, sex knowledge, and quantitative ability. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 18, 183-188.
- Crockett, W. H. Cognitive complexity and impression formation. In B. Maher (Ed.), Progress in Experimental Personality Research, Vol. II. New York: Academic Press, 1965.
- Cronbach, L. J. Proposals leading to analytic treatment of social perception scores. In R. Tagiuri (Ed.), Person perception and interpersonal behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958.
- Crowne, D. P. and Marlowe, D. The approval motive. New York: J. Wiley, 1964.
- Dahlstrom, W. G., Welsh, G. S., and Dahlstrom, L. E. An MMPI Handbook: clinical applications. Vol. I. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1972.
- Dohrenwend, B. P. and B. S. Social status and psychological disorder. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1969.
- Dornbusch, S. M., Hastorf, A. H., Richardson, S. A., Muzzy, R. E., and Vreeland, R. S. The perceiver and the perceived: their relative influence on the categories of interpersonal cognition. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 434-440.
- Dublin, J. E. Perception and reaction to ambiguity by Repressors and Sensitizers: a construct validity study. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 198-205.
- Duke, R. B. and Wrightsman, L. S. Relation of repression-sensitization to philosophies of human nature. Psychological Reports, 1968, 22, 235-238.
- Edwards, A. L. The social desirability variable: a broad statement. In I. A. Berg (Ed.), Response set in personality assessment. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.
- Edwards, A. L. Experimental design in psychological research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1972.
- Epstein, W. and Shontz, F. Progress in psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1972.
- Exline, R. V. Explorations in the process of person perception: visual interaction in relation to competition, sex and need for affiliation. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 1-20.

- Feder, C. Z. Relationship of repression-sensitization to adjustment status, social desirability, and acquiescence response set. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 401-406.
- Freud, S. The problem of anxiety. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1936.
- Freud, S. The Complete introductory lectures on psychoanalysis. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1966.
- Gardiner, R., Holzman, P. S., Klein, G. S., Linton, H., and Spence, D. Cognitive Controls. Psychological Issues, 1959, 1 (4).
- Glass, D. C. Individual differences and the resolution of cognitive inconsistencies. In R. P. Abelson (Ed.), Theories of Cognitive Consistency. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968.
- Goffman, E. The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959.
- Goffman, E. Strategic Interaction. New York: Ballantine Books, 1969.
- Golin, S., Herron, E. W., Lakota, R., Reineck, L. A factor analytic study of the Manifest-Anxiety, Extraversion, and Repression-Sensitization Scales. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 564-569.
- Gordon, J. E. Interpersonal predictions of Repressors and Sensitizers. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 686-698.
- Guilford, J. P. and Furchter, B. Fundamental Statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Hakel, M. D. Significance of implicit personality theories for personality theory and research. Proceedings, 77th. Annual Convention, A.P.A., 1969, 403-404.
- Halverson, C. C. Interpersonal perception: cognitive complexity and trait implication. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 86-90.
- Hamilton, D. L. and Gifford, R. K. Influence of implicit personality theories on cue utilization in interpersonal judgment. Proceedings, 78th. Annual Convention, A.P.A., 1970, 415-416
- Hastorf, A. H., Schneider, D. J., and Polefka, J. Person perception. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1970.
- Hays, W. L. Statistics for psychologists. New York: Holt, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- Heider, F. Consciousness, the perceptual world, and communicating with others. In R. Tagiuri (Ed.), Person perception and interpersonal behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958.

- Hoffman, H. A. Use of approach and avoidance by Repressors and Sensitizers, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 91-96.
- Hunt, W. A., Schwartz, M. L. and Walker, R. E. Reliability of clinical judgment as a function of range of pathology. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1965, 70, 32-33.
- Ihilevich, D. and Gleser, G. C. Relation of defense mechanisms to field dependence-independence. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1971, 77, 296-302.
- Izzett, R. R. and Leginski, W. Impression formation as a function of self versus other as a source of information. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1972, 87, 229-233.
- Kanouse, D. E. and Hanson, L. R. Negativity in evaluation. In E. Jones (Ed.) Attribution: perceiving the causes of behavior. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1972.
- Kaplan, M. F. Interview interactions of repressors and sensitizers. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 515-16 (a).
- Kaplan, M. F. Repression-sensitization and prediction of self-description behavior. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1967, 72, 354-359. (b)
- Kelly, G. A. The psychology of personal constructs. New York: Norton, 1955.
- Kelly, H. H. The "warm-cold" variable in first impressions of persons. Journal of Personality, 1950, 18, 431-439.
- Koltuv, B. B. Some characteristics of intrajudge trait intercorrelations. Psychological Monographs, 1962, 76, no. 33 (552).
- Korman, M. Implicit personality theories of clinicians as defined by semantic differential structures. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 180-186.
- Kraus, S. Judging personality from voice: a cross-cultural approach to an old issue in interpersonal perception. Journal of Personality, 1972, 40, 191-210.
- Lazarus, R. S. and Alfert, E. Short-Circuiting of threat by experimentally altering cognitive appraisal. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1964, 69, 195-205.
- Lefcourt, H. M. Repression-sensitization; a measure of evaluation of emotional expression. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 30, 444-449.
- Levy, L. and Dugan, R. B. A constant error approach to the study of dimensions of social perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61 (1), 21-24.

- Levy, L. Conceptions of personality. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Lomont, J. F. The Repression-sensitization dimension in relation to anxiety responses. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 84-86.
- Matkom, A. J. Impression formation as a function of adjustment. Psychological Monographs, 1963, 77, (whole no. 568).
- Mendels, J. Concepts of depression. New York: Wiley, 1970.
- Merbaum, M., Badia, P. Tolerance of Repressors and Sensitizers to noxious stimulation. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1967, 72, 349-353.
- Miller, H. and Bieri, J. An informational analysis of clinical judgment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 317-325.
- Nidorf, L. J. and Crockett, W. H. Some factors affecting the amount of information sought about others. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 69, 98-101.
- Norman, W. T. Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 474-483.
- Parsons, O. A. and Felgenzi, L. B. Overt and covert hostility in Repressors and Sensitizers. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1968, 27, 537-538.
- Passini, F. T. and Norman, W. T. A universal conception of personality structure? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 44-49.
- Rosenberg, S. and Olshan, K. Evaluative and descriptive aspects in personality perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16, (4), 619-626.
- Rosenberg, S. and Jones, R. A method for investigating and representing a person's implicit personality theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 22, 373-386.
- Sarbin, T. R. Role Theory. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- Schafer, R. The clinical application of psychological tests. New York: International Universities Press, 1948.
- Schneider, D. J. Implicit personality theory: a review. Psychological Review, 1973, 79, (5), 294-309.
- Shapiro, D. Neurotic styles. New York: Basic Books, 1965.

- Shapiro, D. and Tagiuri, R. Sex differences in inferring personality traits. Journal of Personality, 1959, 47, 127-136.
- Shrauger, S. and Altrocchi, J. The personality of the perceiver as a factor in person perception. Psychological Bulletin, 1964, 62, 289-308.
- Singer, E. Key concepts of psychotherapy. New York: Random House, 1965.
- Smith, B. Clinical judgment and repression-sensitization: a methodological investigation. Journal of Clinical psychology, 1969, 25, 397-398.
- Smith, H. C. Sensitivity to people. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Snider, J. G. and Osgood, C. E. Semantic Differential Technique. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.
- Sullivan, P. F. and Roberts, L. K. Relationships of Manifest Anxiety to repression-sensitization on the MMPI. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25, 763-764.
- Szasz, T. The myth of mental illness. New York: Dell, 1961.
- Tagiuri, R. Introduction. In R. Tagiuri and L. Petrullo (Eds.), Person perception and interpersonal behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958, ix-xvii.
- Tagiuri, R. Person Perception. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.). The Handbook of Social Psychology. Vol. III. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1969, 394-449.
- Tempone, V. and Lamb, W. Repression-sensitization and its relationship to measures of adjustment and conflict. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1967, 31, 131-136.
- Thelen, M. H. Repression-sensitization: its relation to adjustment and seeking psychotherapy among college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33, 161-165.
- Thompson, R. The Pelican history of psychology. Baltimore: Penquin Books, 1968.
- Tripodi, T. and Bieri, J. Cognitive complexity and perceived conflict and uncertainty. Journal of Personality, 1966, 34, 144-153.
- Turk, H. Norms, persons, and sentiments. Sociometry, 1963, 26, 163-177.
- Warr, P. B. and Simms, A. A study of cojudgment processes. Journal of Personality, 1965, 33, 598-604.
- Warr, P. B. and Knapper, C. The perception of people and events. London: J. Wiley and Sons, 1968.

- Weinstein, J., Averill, J. R., Opton, E. M., and Lazarus, R. S. Defensive style and discrepancy between self-report and psychological indexes of stress. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 406-413.
- Weissman, N. H. and Ritter, K. Openess to experience, ego strength, and self-description as a function of repression-sensitization. Psychological Reports, 1970, 26, 859-864.
- Wertheimer, M. Values in person cognition. In D. Willner (Ed), Decisions, values, and groups. Vol. I, New York: Pergamon Press, 1960, 135-145.
- Wiggins, N. and Hoffman, P. J. Types of judges and cue utilization in judgments of intelligence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 12, 52-59.