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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Historically, the guilt construct has played an important role in personality theory. If one were to catalogue the frequency of usage of various constructs appearing in clinical case reports, the guilt construct would certainly appear near the top of the list. Not only is the sense of guilt frequently discussed, but the construct is imputed to possess powerful explanatory utility. Conflicts involving feelings of guilt are considered to be the cardinal problem in depressive disorders, and guilt feelings are cited as the decisive motive for the pathogenic defense in compulsive neurotics. The so-called "psychopathic personality" is supposedly marked by an absence of the sense of guilt. No clinical case conference would be considered complete without mentioning an assessment of the patient's sense of guilt.

However, if one surveys the experimental literature for research related to the guilt construct, one is struck by its paucity. A recent exception to this relative dearth of empirical research was the publication of Inner conflict and defense by Miller and Swanson(1960). Perhaps, one reason
for the failure of psychologists to more actively pursue the investigation of the theoretical relationships involving guilt has been the lack of suitable operations to define guilt. Quantitative measures of guilt have been slow to appear. Levy (1961) has poignantly remarked on the tendency of psychologists to increase the output of research in various areas following the publication of a technique of measurement. He questions whether the opportunism implied by technique control is in the best interest of science. While we would agree that the availability of a measurement technique should not be the dominant reason for selecting a research problem, the availability of a measure is a necessary prerequisite for empirical research. Ideally, as theories are expanded, new measurement techniques will be forthcoming. There is a reciprocity in the development of theory and measuring instruments. Theory dictates the necessity of developing measures; the measures permit the accumulation of empirical evidence which leads to theoretical expansion or revision, and the cycle begins again. The experimental explication of the myriad hypotheses employing the guilt construct demands an adequate measure of that construct. In this study, we shall be concerned with the development of a sentence completion measure of guilt which purports to be suitable for use in both clinical and research settings. Some experimental evidence will be
offered pertaining to the validation of the sentence completion measures of guilt.

Psychologists (Anastasi, 1954; Cronbach, 1960) have discussed several methods or types of test validation. Predictive validity involves the correlation of a measure with a criterion of the performance that one wishes to predict. This is a straight-forward empirical check on the usefulness of a measure in an "applied" situation. Most personality constructs, guilt included, are not amenable to such a simple procedure, since there is no single criterion which can be universally accepted as encompassing the "meaning" of the construct. The "meaning" of a construct is a function of its theoretical relationships to other constructs and its operational referents. When we propose a measure of guilt, we are offering a set of operations which can be used to separate individuals on a guilt construct dimension on the basis of their responses to the measure.

The particular referents used as the basis for quantifying responses should stem from the theoretical notions concerning the guilt construct. The validity of the measure increases when it is employed as the operational definition, or empirical referents, of the construct, and an hypothesis stemming from the theory is made, and the prediction is verified. Positive experimental evidence serves to validate the measure and verify the theory. As favorable experimental evidence is gathered, confidence in the systematic structure
of relationships (theory), the utility of the particular construct with which we are concerned, and the validity of the operational measure of the construct, increases. This approach, which emphasizes the importance of the nomological net utilizing the construct, has been called construct validity by Cronbach and Meehl (1955).

Whereas Cronbach and Meehl (1955) stressed the role of theory in generating experimentally testable hypotheses utilizing the construct, other psychologists have indicated the importance of theory in constructing the measure of the construct. Jessor and Hammond (1957) have argued that psychological theory should have implications for the development as well as the validation of tests. "Our contention is that the test situation itself, and the kinds of test behavior it elicits, must be coordinated to the theory in exactly the same manner as the experiments aimed at validating the test" (Jessor and Hammond, 1957, p. 162). These authors acknowledge the contributions of Peak (1953) and Butler (1954) in stressing the importance of a consideration of psychological theory in test construction.

Perhaps, one of the first attempts to apply the behavior theory approach to test construction was Liverant's (1958) development of the Goal Preferences Inventory which stemmed from Rotter's Social Learning Theory. In citing the
advantages of employing theory in test construction

Liverant stated,

The use of behavior theory in test construction can be of great potential benefit to both theory and test building. The construction of instruments to measure theoretical constructs should enable more adequate verification or refutation of hypotheses deduced from the system and these lead to a more valid and powerful conceptualization of the theory. This in turn should provide a means of constructing measures of greater validity (Liverant, 1958, p. 2).

Rotter (1960) has offered the most recent presentation of this viewpoint which stresses the role of theory in increasing the prediction of goal directed behaviors from testing procedures. These ideas have directly influenced the conceptualization in this dissertation in the attempt to develop and offer evidence towards the construct validity of the Mosher Incomplete Sentences Test (MIST) as a measure of guilt.

At times, concurrent validity has been discussed as a separate method of establishing the validity of a measure. This usually involves correlation of the suggested measure with other established methods of measurement. For example, the sentence completion measure of guilt could be correlated with the therapist's rating of guilt, or with any other measure of guilt such as questionnaires. High correlations would tend to provide some evidence supporting the validity of both measures. If one set of operations has more face validity or predictive validity, correlation with the
accepted measure boosts the confidence in the less established measure. Of course, this process can be subsumed under construct validity when the theory which generates the construct also suggests the referents utilized in the two measures of the construct.

Campbell (1960) has recently emphasized the importance of providing evidence about discriminant validity as well as convergent validity. Convergent validity is concerned with demonstrating relationships between traits that the theory predicts would occur. Discriminant validity is concerned with examining relationships which should not occur on the basis of theoretical expectations or under conditions of adequate test construction. Discriminant validity involves a demonstration that methods variance resulting from response sets such as social desirability does not contribute the major portion of the variance in trait correlations. Also it entails demonstrating the absence of non-theoretically generated relationships, e.g., the absence of a correlation between guilt and intelligence.

It may have become apparent that predictive validity, face validity, concurrent validity, and discriminant validity are all subsumable under construct validity. In every instance, we are concerned with the empirical existence of expected relationships. The "prime mover" underlying the psychologist's choice of a particular validity indicator may
be the explicitness of the nomological net or theory which generated the construct and the hypothesized relationship. In predictive validity, often, the inference involved is so obvious that we do not stop to consider if there is a system of assumed relationships underlying our prediction. Most concurrent validity studies are also rather informal theoretically, and the authors do not attempt to explicate the theory, however vague, or implicit, or obvious, which leads them to relate these two measures out of all the possible measures in the universe. However, the validation process is essentially the same in all instances, and it is essentially the same process which underlies the verification of theories in all of science.

In this dissertation, we shall summarize some of the theoretical relationships involving guilt. We shall examine the relevant empirical research. We shall attempt to indicate how the scoring principles used in our measure of guilt are generated by theory. We shall offer as evidence of the validity of our measure, two studies generated by the nomological net involving the guilt construct. We shall examine evidence of discriminant validity, specifically the relationship of guilt to intelligence and social desirability. At a later date, further evidence of construct validity should be presented. The establishment of the validity of the measuring operations of a construct and of the predictive utility of the nomological net employing the construct is a cumulative process, as is all theory verification.
CHAPTER II

THE THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF GUILT

Psychoanalysis

As Freud developed his psychoanalytic theory, the guilt construct played an increasingly important role. Freud reorganized many of the ideas previously contained in his topographical ideas of conscious-unconscious into the structural view of personality in The Ego and the Id (1927) and in his New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis (1933). The superego, and hence, the sense of guilt, was conceptualized as one of three harsh masters the ego must placate. In Civilization and Its Discontents (1930) the formation of the superego or the incorporation of society's moral dictates, which is a prerequisite to the sense of guilt, is seen as basic to the very existence of civilization. The trend within some psychoanalytic circles to view inner conflict and ego defense as underlying the development of psychoneurotic symptomatology has likewise increased the frequency and scope of the guilt construct's explanatory usage.

According to Alexander (1938, p. 43) "The psychological content of guilt feeling can be verbalized about as
follows: 'I am not good. What I want to do (or what I did) is mean or low. I deserve contempt and punishment.' When- ever a person makes such statements we infer the presence of guilt.

What we mean by guilt, then, is painful feelings of self-blame, self-criticism, or remorse which result from deviation (real or imagined) from proper behavior. Feelings of guilt typically motivate either a quest for self-punishment,..., or an effort at restitution or undoing of the deviation.... This usage of the term guilt corresponds in the main with generally accepted usage in psychoanalytic writings" (Whiting and Child, 1953, p. 219).

In psychoanalytic theory, guilt and the superego are intimately related conceptualizations. The superego is the structural component of personality concerned with coercing the ego into considering its moral, ethical, or religious standards of proper behavior. The superego influences the ego through the medium of guilt feelings. The superego is said to develop with the passing or partial resolution of the oedipus complex. The child, who has harbored incestuous wishes toward the opposite-sexed parent and murderous desires toward the same-sexed parent, experiences tremendous anxiety since he is quite helpless and dependent in his relationship with them. In males, the anxiety over possible castration, in accordance with the principle of Talion, is decisive in leading the boy to replace his hostile and sensual wishes with an identification with the father. In females, the most important anxiety, in this connection, is said to be separation anxiety or fear over loss of love; in
addition, shame and disappointment, and fear over physical injury centering around the genitalia are also specified as having an effect. The frustration resulting from the conflict of the Oedipal desires leads to a regression from object relations to a more primitive introjection and oral-ity. Identification with the parents occurs, and the child introjects the standards and values of the parent. Freud has described the identification process in the following quotation:

The role, which the super-ego undertakes later in life, is at first played by an external power, by parental authority. The influence of the parents dominates the child by granting proofs of affection and by threats of punishment, which, to the child, mean loss of love, and which must also be feared on their own account. This objective anxiety is the forerunner of the later moral anxiety; so long as the former is dominant one need not speak of super-ego or of conscience. It is only later that the secondary situation arises, which we are far too ready to regard as the normal state of affairs; the external restrictions are introjected so that the super-ego takes the place of the parental function, and thence-forward observes, guides and threatens the ego in the same way as the parents acted to the child before. ... The basis of the process is what we call an identification, that is to say, that one ego becomes like another, one which results in the first ego behaving itself in certain respects in the same way as the second; it imitates it, and as it were takes it into itself. This identification has been not inappropriately compared with the oral cannibal-istic incorporation of another person (Freud, 1933, pp. 89-90).
The identification process leads to the adoption of standards of proper behavior, and if these standards of proper behavior are perceived as in danger of violation or as having been violated, then, the individual is beset by guilt feelings.

In the above quotation, Freud discusses the replacement of objective anxiety by moral anxiety. Freud distinguishes between objective anxiety, which is used by the ego as a warning signal, and moral anxiety, which is a topically defined anxiety of superego towards ego in which the pain feared is the guilt feeling proper. A third type of anxiety, neurotic anxiety, refers to the fear of being in an unbearable state of tension due to the break-through of instinctual impulses from the id. The prototype of anxiety is the birth situation in which the individual is suddenly flooded with unmasterable excitation. As the ego develops it is able to "tame" the traumatic, unspecific anxiety and begins to use it as a warning of future danger. The ego attempts to control the intensity of the anxiety by reality-oriented behavior if the source of the anxiety is external and the stress is not so great that ego adaptive functions fail. If the anxiety is a reaction against an

---

1By standards of proper behavior we do not imply the acceptance of an "ultimate" moral code, but refer to the individual's moral, ethical, or religious standards which usually involve conformity to the cultural rules of conduct.
unacceptable instinctual drive, the ego may employ the mechanisms of defense. Fenichel (1945), in his discussion of anxiety, guilt, and defense, draws a parallel between anxiety and guilt. Both anxiety and guilt are seen as motives for defense. Both are seen, when under ego control, as warning signals of danger. The important difference between anxiety and guilt is related to the development of the decisive identification which transforms anxiety over external loss of love or narcissistic supplies, to an internal anxiety or fear of loss of narcissistic supplies which are now controlled by the superego. From this it can be seen that the presence of defensive reactions, while implying prior anxiety does not, per se, distinguish whether the source is moral anxiety (guilt) or objective and neurotic anxiety.

Fenichel further distinguishes between guilt feeling proper and the warning function of conscience.

Guilt feeling proper—that is, the feeling "I have done wrong," a painful judgment about past occurrence which has the character of remorse—must be distinguished from feelings of conscience which do not judge the past but the future: "I should do this," or "I should not do that." This part of conscience has a warning function and directs future action of the personality.... The warning function of conscience expresses the ego's tendency to avoid the pains of intense guilt feelings. These pains constitute a specific displeasure, the avoidance of which is the aim of the conscientious person. As long as real punishment is feared, or hell is thought of as a threatening reality, there is no true conscience yet, for the tendency to avoid punishment and hell does not differ from
other anxiety signals. In "conscience" the fear is internalized, and the danger threatens from within (Fenichel, 1945, p. 134).

Psychoanalytic theorists, then, distinguish between guilt feelings proper and the warning anticipation of guilt feelings which serves to inhibit unacceptable behavior. The fear is based on an internal not on an external threat of punishment. In the following quote, Alexander (1938, p. 43) stresses the inhibitory effect of guilt. "As a form of anxiety, the fearful expectation of an inevitable and deserved suffering, the sense of guilt is primarily an inhibitory phenomenon. Under its pressure the individual is apt to avoid the expression of those impulses which have evoked and contributed to his guilt feelings."

Some psychoanalytic writers have not made sharp distinctions between guilt and shame. The lessened self-worth common to both is pointed out. Should we view, then, an admission of lessened self-worth as an indicator of guilt? English's definition, which says, "UNCONSCIOUS GUILT is manifested by various indirect expressions, esp. lessened sense of worth, although the person denies the offenses" (English, 1958, p. 234), would suggest such a practice is acceptable.

Fenichel places great emphasis on the relation of loss of self-esteem to guilt feelings. He views control of self-esteem as the specific function of the superego after it is established. Piers (1953, p. 11) has made an unusual distinction between shame and guilt. He states, "Whereas
guilt is generated whenever a boundary (set by the Super-Ego) is touched or transgressed, shame occurs when a goal (presented by the Ego-Ideal) is not being reached. It thus indicates a real "shortcoming." Guilt anxiety accompanies transgression; shame, failure." Fenichel would see such a separation as artificial. "Sometimes attempts have been made to distinguish ego ideals, the patterns of what one would like to be, from the superego, which is characterized as a threatening, prohibiting, and punishing power. But it was Freud's insight into the origin of the superego that showed how closely interwoven these two aspects are (Freud, 1927). They are as intermingled as were the protecting and threatening powers of the parents" (Fenichel, 1945, p. 106). **Shame** is ordinarily defined as feelings of discomfort which occur when an external figure witnesses the individual's transgression of a moral standard. **Shame** is also used to describe an unpleasant accompaniment of witnessed failure.

It appears that the important distinction is not between transgression of superego boundaries and failure to obtain the goals dictated by the ego-ideal, but, rather, whether the source of discomfort comes from within or without. Just as we distinguished between fear of punishment or external anxiety and guilt, we may distinguish between loss of self-esteem based on external comparison to others and loss of self-esteem following failure to attain the inner ego-ideal.
Guilt, ala Fenichel, may be seen as encompassing loss of self-esteem from within.

In our discussion of psychoanalytic conceptions of guilt several important considerations became apparent. Guilt refers to painful feelings of self-blame, self-criticism, self-remorse which arise from violation of internalized standards of proper behavior. The violation may be real or imagined. Guilt may result from failure to attain goals and to live in accordance with ideals, as well as by transgressions of internalized standards of proper behavior. Presumably, the presence of others as witnesses is not necessary for the sense of guilt to occur. Shame, but not guilt, requires the presence of witnesses and is therefore closely aligned with a fear of punishment. Lowered self-esteem may serve as a referent for guilt when the lowered self-esteem is related primarily to transgressions or failure to attain internal standards. Guilt may lead to self-punishment. Guilt may lead to attempts at restitution or undoing. Guilt may serve to motivate the employment of defense mechanisms. Anticipation of guilt serves a warning function and inhibits behavior which would lead to the guilt feeling proper.

Behavior Theory

While psychoanalysis has been a valuable, heuristic source of hypotheses, some of its conceptualizations have proven resistant or incapable of operational specification.
In part, this may be because psychoanalytic theory was
developed through clinical investigation for use in treating
patients. Since Freud was not primarily concerned with
laboratory investigation or more structured research, his
hypotheses were not always cast in a rigorous model of
theoretical relationships which are connected to observables
to be used as a basis for quantitative measurement. Some
psychologists (Dollard and Miller, 1950; Whiting and Child,
1953), convinced of the value of psychoanalytic observation,
have attempted to translate Freudian notions into general
behavior theory. Usually, these theorists have felt a
strong commitment to a learning theory. For example, the
psychoanalytic conception of guilt might be related to
Miller's conflict theory. Miller and his associates have
conducted fairly extensive investigations of conflict be-
havior using rats in a straight alley maze in which a con-
flict is engendered between an approach motive for a primary
reinforcer (e.g., food) and an avoidance motive of fear of
noxious stimulation (e.g., shock). Dollard and Miller
(1950, p. 90) have speculated that fear may be a major com-
ponent of guilt and other socially learned drives. Miller
(1959, p. 226), in discussing the application of conflict
theory to psychotherapy, has extended the definition of
avoidance to cover repression and inhibitory responses.
These statements indicated that conceptualizing guilt as an
avoidance mechanism would not be unacceptable to Miller.
Miller (1959, pp. 205-206) can account for many conflict phenomena with the following postulates:

(A) The tendency to approach a goal is stronger the nearer the subject is to it.

(B) The tendency to avoid a feared stimulus is stronger the nearer the subject is to it.

(C) The strength of avoidance increases more rapidly with nearness than does that of approach.

(D) The strength of tendencies to approach or avoid varies directly with the strength of the drive upon which they are based.

(E) Below the asymptote of learning, increasing the number of reinforced trials will increase the strength of the response tendency that is reinforced.

(F) When two incompatible responses are in conflict, the stronger one will occur.

Miller has indicated that all of these assumptions except (C) have been used before to account for other data. Miller (1959) has recently reviewed the deductions made from this postulates and the experimental evidence bearing upon them.

If one employed Miller's model, he would primarily be interested in guilt as an inhibitor. For example, one might conceive a sex as an approach tendency and guilt over sex as an avoidance tendency. Several interesting hypotheses might be suggested by such a model. If a subject has an approach-avoidance conflict concerning sex-guilt, and if the strength
of the approach drive increases (as in postulate (D)) until the gradients no longer intersect and the sexual response is made, then, according to a drive reduction theory, the approach gradient would fall and conflict behavior would be reinstated. This is an analogue of the situation commonly seen in humans where the inhibitory effect of guilt is not sufficient to prevent the occurrence of a behavior, but following the commission of the "unacceptable" act, the individual is plagued by guilt feelings.

Miller's work is, likewise, suggestive when stimulus similarity is considered, and his deductions concerning displacement are examined. The relationship of guilt to overt act and to fantasy may follow generalization gradients similar to those discussed by Miller as displacement. Whiting and Child (1953) have discussed the displacement of aggressive responses when inhibited by high and low anxiety over aggression. Assuming that the state of conflict is in itself drive-producing, and following Hull's postulate that effective habit strength is a multiplicative function of habit strength and drive strength, they obtain a theoretical model which predicts that the habit potential of extremely displaced responses will be greater with high anxiety than with low anxiety. They (Whiting and Child, 1953, p. 299) indicate that "This represents a major difference between Miller's analysis of displacement and ours, as a result of including consideration of drive strength. Miller's model
predicts that for every point along the base line the effective habit strength of the aggressive response will be greater with low anxiety than with high anxiety. Our model predicts that this relationship may be reversed with a sufficient degree of displacement." One might attempt to investigate such opposing deductions by dividing Ss into groups on the basis of high and low scores on a guilt measure and presenting them with TAT cards ranging from depicting overtly aggressive situations to depicting neutral situations. If Ss high on guilt over aggression told aggressive themes to neutral stimuli but not to overtly aggressive stimuli depicted in the TAT, then Whiting and Child's model would be supported. If Ss high on guilt over aggression tended to inhibit aggressive themes in general, then Miller's deduction would be supported.

The above discussion is intended to illustrate that Miller's conflict model is, at least, heuristically useful in considering guilt as an avoidance tendency. However, certain aspects of Miller's theoretical approach reduce its usefulness for explaining conflict involving guilt in human Ss. For example, Miller's present conflict model does not permit the important distinction between fear of external punishment and the fear of internal punishment so important to the psychoanalytic notion of guilt. Likewise, postulate (C) which assumes the greater steepness of the avoidance gradient, is particularly troublesome. Miller has offered
an explanation for the greater steepness of the avoidance gradient as a function of fear being a learned drive elicited primarily by situational cues whereas hunger is more dependent on internal physiological cues.

Since fear is a learned drive, it will be most strongly aroused by cues originally most closely associated with reinforcement. Therefore, when the subject is confronted with cues at a distance, the gradient of reinforcement will have a double effect—it will weaken not only the specific responses involved in withdrawal, but also the fear motivating these responses. This double effect will cause the avoidance to fall off rapidly. On the other hand, since the hunger motivating approach is more dependent on internal physiological factors, it will be less influenced by distance from the point of reinforcement so that its strength will remain relatively constant (Miller, 1959, p. 213).

This explanation is not applicable if the approach tendency is also based on a learned drive, and with human Ss many needs are hypothesized which are not easily related to physiological drives and cues. Perhaps, this leads us to a major difficulty in extending some S-R concepts to humans. S-R theory has traditionally employed physiological drives as the basis of its motivational system and the drive-reduction hypothesis as its principle of reinforcement. The extension of these physiological constructs to complex human behavior has proven difficult. What tissue needs underly behavior categorized as the psychological needs of aggression, affiliation, autonomy, achievement, and dependency? While one can approach such a problem utilizing learned drives and secondary reinforcement, there appears to be no
inherent advantage in this approach as compared to a system utilizing "completely" psychological constructs. A motivational and reinforcement system can be developed utilizing psychological constructs which do not pretend to have or to be concerned with a physiological substratum or interpretation of events. The employment of such a learning system has certain advantages in discussing a guilt construct whose foci of convenience seems to be at a level of abstraction more amenable to the use of psychological constructs.

Of course, the decision to use psychological or physiological constructs is eventually justified by the empirical fruitfulness of the different systems for predicting particular events.

**Social Learning Theory**

Rotter (1954) has originated a social learning theory of personality which may be more easily adapted to studying the guilt construct. "It seeks to use only psychological constructs in prediction without recourse to physiological concepts. It is a social learning theory because it stresses the fact that the major or basic modes of behaving are learned in social situations and are inextricably fused with needs requiring for their satisfaction the mediation of other persons" (Rotter, 1954, p. 84). Rotter assumes that the study of personality is the study of learned behavior. "Behavior as described by personality constructs has a directional aspect. It may be said to be goal-directed."
The directional aspect of behavior is inferred from the effect of reinforcing conditions" (p. 97). Reinforcement is defined in terms of its effect on movement towards a goal and is inferred from an empirical law of effect similar to that discussed by Skinner (1938) and Meehl (1950). Needs employ the same referents of functionally related movement towards a learned goal, and their values or strengths are a function of the kinds of reinforcement with which they have been associated. The most useful categorization of needs is believed to be an empirical question.

Social learning theory, whose aim is the prediction of human behavior, utilizes three basic personality constructs in a prediction formula which also considers the influence of the situational variable. The personality constructs are behavior potential, expectancy, and reinforcement value. Rotter has defined these constructs as follows:

Behavior potential may be defined as the potentiality of any behavior's occurring in any given situation or situations as calculated in relation to any single reinforcement or set of reinforcements.
Expectancy may be defined as the probability held by the individual that a particular reinforcement will occur as a function of a specific situation or situations. Expectancy is independent of the values or importance of the reinforcement. The reinforcement value of any external reinforcement may be ideally defined as the degree of preference for any reinforcement to occur if the possibilities of their occurring were all equal (1954, pp. 105-107).
These definitions are summarized in the basic formula employing the constructs:

\[ B \cdot P(x-n), s(l-n) = f(E(x-n), s(l-n), r(a-n) \& R.V. (a-n)) \]

"This may be read as follows: The potentiality of the functionally related behaviors x to n to occur in the specific situation l to n in relation to potential reinforcement a to n is a function of the expectancies of these behaviors leading to these reinforcements in these situations and the values of these reinforcements" (Rotter, 1954, p. 109).

In relating these conceptions to the guilt construct, the expectancy variable is seen as subsuming guilt. In situations where the behavior leading to the attainment of a positively valued goal is inhibited by the individual, it is necessary to distinguish between inhibition based on fear of external punishment and inhibition based on the anticipation of guilt. The expectancy construct used in Rotter's basic formula may be viewed as comprised of an \( E^e \) (expectancy for external positive or negative reinforcement) and an \( E^i \) (expectancy for internal positive or negative reinforcement). In situations involving the presumed presence of guilt, the individual's \( E^e \) is a function of situational cues as to the probability of his behavior leading to positive or negative reinforcement. The \( E^e \) incorporates the same idea that is contained in the previously discussed notion of shame. The \( E^i \) is assumed to be a generalized expectancy based on the
individual's past reinforcement history, which is to some degree independent of situational cues in regard to the probability of external reinforcement.

The guilt construct may be defined as a generalized expectancy for self-mediated punishment (i.e., negative reinforcement) for violating, anticipating the violation of, or failure to attain internalized standards of proper behavior. The standards of proper behavior are seen as encompassing both the internalized prohibitions ("should nots") and the internalized positively valued ideal-goals ("ought to's") which are related to the individual's feelings of self-worth. The generalized expectancy for guilt is a function of the person's past reinforcement history in regards to violating standards of proper behavior. The internalization of the standards of proper behavior determines its relative independence from situational cues. While situational cues would lead to the categorization of the situation as a "guilt" situation, the inhibitory potential of the $GE^G$ (generalized expectancy for guilt) is a function of behavior (including anticipatory behavior) - internal reinforcement sequences which are relatively independent of $E^E$'s based on behavior-external reinforcement sequences. Situational cues effect the $GE^G$ only by activating the expectancies for internal negative reinforcement which were established as a function of previous experiences. The $E^E$ is a direct function of situational cues as to the subjective
probability that behavior \( x \) will lead to an external negative reinforcement. This type of conceptualization permits
the retention of the important distinction between fear of external punishment and fear of internal punishment. At present, it does not seem feasible to distinguish, as an independent construct, a reinforcement value to be associated with \( GE^G \). Reinforcement value, in this case, is not the preference for an external reinforcement with the probabilities of their occurring being equal. The \( GE^G \) is related to an internal negative reinforcement, whose strength or avoidance potential is a confounded function of subjective probability (which must be also the "objective" probability in some sense of the word) and the negative valence of the internal reinforcement.

In a guilt situation, which would be defined on a consensual or cultural basis, a person's behavior would be a function of the expectancies and reinforcement values relevant to the establishment of the behavior potentials activated in the situation. In a guilt situation, conflict is engendered because of the goal response may lead to both positive and negative reinforcement. Presumably, the behavioral response made in the situation is a function of the relative strengths of the expectancies and values of the conflicting reinforcements. In Social Learning Theory, every situation is seen as a conflict situation as long as alternative responses or expectations for alternative
outcomes following behavior are possible. Perhaps, the important distinction implicit in designating a situation as "conflictual" is that, in these situations, the behavior potentials are closer in "strength" than in other situations.

Combining Miller's model of conflict behavior with Rotter's Social Learning constructs may serve as a useful clarification of our thinking. Rotter's basic formula (discussed above) may be viewed as a combination of a behavior potential to approach and a behavior potential to avoid a goal in a guilt situation.

\[ B.P^{AP} \cdot x, s_g, r(a-n) = f (E_x, s_g, r(a-n) \& R.V.(a-n)) \]

\[ B.P^{AV} \cdot x, s_g, r(a'-n) = f(E_{x'}, s_g, r(a'-n) \& R.V.(a'-n) \& G.E.G) \]

The first formula may be read: the potential for approach behavior \( x \) to occur in a guilt situation in relation to positive reinforcements \( a \) to \( n \), is a function of the expectancy that approach behavior \( x \) will lead to positive reinforcements \( a \) to \( n \) in the guilt situation, and the values of the positive reinforcements \( a \) to \( n \). The second formula may be read: The potential for avoidance behavior \( x' \) to occur in the guilt situation in relation to external negative reinforcements \( a' \) to \( n \) is a function of the expectancy that behavior \( x' \) will lead to external negative reinforcement \( a' \) to \( n \), the values of external reinforcements \( a' \) to \( n \), and the generalized expectancy for self-mediated punishment for
violating, anticipating the violation of, or failure to attain internalized standards of proper behavior related to behavior x. The behavior with the higher potential in the situation would occur.

It is to be noted that the above are complex formulae. The function relating the various variables is unknown. The variables involved can only be crudely measured, if at all. However, such a model should not be disparaged if it serves to focus our exploratory attempts at prediction, measurement, and theoretical conceptualization.

The acquisition of inhibitory behavior potentials is seen to follow typical learning patterns. The E's and RV's associated with external negative reinforcement are a function of past experiences in which tabooed behaviors have been followed by immediate and concrete negative reinforcement. For example, if a child is seen masturbating or engaging in other unacceptable behavior, the child's mother may spank him or use other non-love-oriented techniques of punishment. (In the next chapter, there is a discussion of love-oriented and non-love-oriented techniques of punishment.) The potentiality of the acceptable response occurring is a function of the expectancy that it will be followed by an immediate and concrete negative reinforcement and the value of the negative reinforcement.

The E's and RV's associated with what we have called internal negative reinforcement are a function of past
experience in which unacceptable behaviors have been followed by delayed and vague negative reinforcements. For example, if a child is seen masturbating or engaging in other unacceptable behavior, the child's mother may tell him that he is being naughty and she does not love "bad" children or she may use some other love-oriented technique. The exact consequences which may follow the withdrawal of the mother's love are not specified. It is the vagueness in regards to the consequences of the loss of the mother's love which is seen as being the decisive factor. The child's behavior is not followed by an immediate, concrete negative reinforcement whose relative value can be ascertained and weighed against the E's and RV's associated with the positive reinforcements connected with the masturbatory act. The loss of love is a particularly powerful reinforcement because it has been associated with a large number of past satisfactions.

In social learning theory,

It is hypothesized that the value of any acquired reinforcement is a function of its relationship to other reinforcements. Each pairing of a reinforcement changes its value in the direction of the reinforcement with which it is paired. More specifically, the value of a reinforcement is determined by the value of subsequent reinforcements with which it has been associated and the expectancy or degree of relationship that has been developed between it and these subsequent reinforcements. That is, the value of a reinforcement or the strength of the psychological need, which is the internal referent for a reinforcement, is determined by the kinds of reinforcement it occurred in relation to, and is not necessarily
lowered by the failure to continue to be associ-ated with the original reinforcements (Rotter, 1954, pp. 116-117).

The generalized expectancy for self-mediated punishment for violating, anticipating the violation of, or failure to attain internalized standards of proper behavior is seen in this way to become relatively independent of the reinforce-ments which led to its development. To the extent that the GE\textsuperscript{G} has become functionally autonomous it is not likely to depend on other immediately following reinforcements. The internalized standards of proper behaviors dictate goals toward which the organism strives and which may become stronger than the original set of reinforcements which served to establish them. The behavior potentials associated with the GE\textsuperscript{G} will maintain its strength unless paired with other positive or negative reinforcements. Avoidance behaviors are particularly difficult to unlearn because the individual inhibits the behavior which might lead to an association of the behavior with a positive reinforcement.

It is the vagueness in regards to the consequences of the loss of the mother's love which is seen as being the decisive factor. The child's behavior is not followed by an immediate, concrete negative reinforcement whose relative value can be ascertained and weighed against the E's and RV's associated with the positive reinforcements connected with the masturbatory act. The loss of love is a particularly
powerful reinforcement because it has been associated with a large number of past satisfactions.

Another type of learning experience which should lead to a relatively high $GE^G$ involves religious training which teaches the child that evil conduct is sinful and may incur God's wrath. The punishment associated with "sin" is portrayed as taking place in the future, and often, is not clearly specified. Earlier, we quoted Fenichel's view that the fear of hell is an external anxiety. We would predict, all things being equal, that religious training which portrays reward as a function of behaving in a way which is pleasing to God and loss of God's love as a punishment for sin would lead to a higher $GE^G$ than religious training which depicts material rewards and punishment in the form of heaven and hell. The obvious analogy is between love-oriented versus non-love-oriented techniques of punishment. However, there is one important difference in that heaven and hell are not immediate reinforcements. The child cannot compare them with pleasurable, but forbidden acts in the same way he can compare masturbation and a spanking. Experiences which lead to the development of a high $GE^G$ have, as a common characteristic, vague, negatively valenced consequences which are not capable of being tested by the individual.
CHAPTER III

A REVIEW OF THE EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE RELATED TO GUILT

Child Rearing Antecedents of Guilt

While this dissertation is not concerned with the child rearing antecedents of guilt, the majority of the empirical research employing the guilt construct has investigated the antecedent conditions for the acquisition of the sense of guilt. Freudian and learning theorists have focused the most attention upon these aspects of the nomological net involving guilt, and the empirical research has flourished in the area of clearest conceptual exposition.

Earlier, we quoted Freud's account of the development of superego. It stressed the importance of the identification process in the transition from objective anxiety as a means of controlling societally condemned behavior to the internal control of moral anxiety. Some learning theory interpretations of socialization have ignored the distinction between fear of external and internal punishment. Such an approach is not concerned with the identification process, rather, it is concerned only with the conditions that facilitate the child's acquisition of a fear of punishment for wrongdoing. Other learning theorists, such as
Whiting and Child (1953) have sought to operationalize the Freudian conceptualizations. In this section, we shall examine the age and severity of socialization as it may influence the inhibition of unacceptable behavior through fear of punishment, and then, we shall examine the evidence directly related to the identification process in the development of conscience.

Age and Severity of Socialization

The rationale behind the hypothesis that severity of socialization is related to the control of unacceptable behaviors is quite straightforward. Some learning theorists (see the earlier discussion of Miller's conflict theory) view the restraint of socially disapproved behavior as an avoidance response motivated by fear of punishment. Severe socialization practices should lead to a strong fear of punishment.

Whiting and Child (1953), in their cross-cultural study of Child Training and Personality, devote a chapter to the origins of guilt. A cultural indicator of the strength of guilt is inferred from the extent to which the people in the culture blame themselves for becoming sick. When precise medical knowledge is absent, some cultures attribute the blame for their illnesses to witches or evil spirits while others consider their own violation of taboos as the etiologic cause of their illness. This self-blame as a response to illness may serve to reflect the extent and
severity of guilt feelings in a particular culture. Their cultural indicant of guilt was related to a measure of socialization anxiety based on ratings of the severity and frequency of punishment, the brevity of the transition between childhood indulgences to the complete acceptance of cultural inhibitions, and signs of emotional disturbance in children. They report a small but significant relationship between the severity of socialization and their cultural index of guilt.

Both Freudian and general behavior theory predict that severity of socialization in the area of aggression is particularly relevant to guilt. Freud in Civilization and Its Discontents (1930) discussed the importance of aggression turned inward against the self. Some learning theorists (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, and Sears, 1939, p. 48), have hypothesized that the turning inward of aggression should be related to the inhibition of more direct forms of aggression. To investigate this hypothesis Whiting and Child related socialization anxiety in the area of aggression to the 'patient's responsibility for illness' measure of guilt, and they reported a significant relationship ($r = +.28$) between the variables.

Whiting and Child report another result which is relevant to the hypothesized relationship between severity of socialization and strength of guilt. The age of socialization
is relevant to the severity of socialization, if one assumes that earlier socialization is more severe. The authors related their cultural index of guilt to the age of onset of various aspects of socialization. The hypothesized negative relationship between age of socialization and strength of guilt yielded significant correlation coefficients, ranging from \( r = -0.34 \) to \( r = -0.74 \) for the areas of independence training, weaning, modesty training, and training in heterosexual inhibition. The relationship was reversed, but not significant, for the area of toilet training.

Miller and Swanson (1960) have recently published some research findings based on the investigations of themselves and their associates which are relevant to the influence of age and severity of socialization on guilt. A story completing task was used to measure the severity of guilt in junior high school boys. The mothers of the boys were interviewed to obtain evidence concerning age of weaning and toilet training and the severity of parental practices. While evidence of some relationship among the variables is apparent, the directions of the relationships are, at times, unexpected. The severity of guilt over death wishes yielded a curvilinear relationship. Early weaning and severe toilet training were related to medium guilt. The authors discuss the possibility, "that subjects who expressed only a medium amount of guilt were really the highest in guilt, but were
inhibited by its very severity from expressing it adequately" (p. 157). Perhaps, this is why Allinsmith (1957, p. 470) states in apparently summarizing the same data which originally came from his doctoral dissertation that "The overall direction of the results indicates associations between high guilt about aggression and early weaning, early bowel training, and psychological discipline." Miller and Swanson found that low guilt over disobedience is related to early weaning and severe toilet training. Here, the positive direction of the relationship is opposite the one usually predicted.

While the evidence is somewhat ambiguous, it appears that age and severity of socialization may be important child rearing antecedents of guilt. On the basis of past research it is impossible to untangle the relative influence of a fear of internal and external punishment as the dominant factor leading to response inhibition. The research, we have reviewed, has been done by psychologists who have a commitment to psychoanalytic theory as it pertains to the origins of guilt, and the research was not designed to answer the question we have posed. While Whiting and Child related socialization from anxiety to guilt as a test of the behavioristic hypothesis concerning fear of punishment, their inferred measure of guilt (the patient's responsibility for illness) does not make the distinction between fear of internal and external punishment
which seems necessary for a clear interpretation of the results. Miller and Swanson were not able to state the exact nature of the relationship which was to be expected between frustration in the areas of weaning and toilet training and severity of guilt. Miller and Swanson were not concerned with the distinction we have been urging, and, in their opinion, there was no clear theoretical rationale which dictated a firm directional prediction between the variables they studied.

The Role of Parental Warmth

Psychoanalytic theory has discussed the important role the child's fear over loss of love plays in the development of superego. This psychoanalytic conception has suggested the hypothesis that the child's concern with maintaining close affectional or dependent ties with his parents is related to the development of a stronger sense of guilt. It is difficult to obtain a direct measure of the child's drive for dependence upon his parents; usually such a drive is inferred from the nurturance or warmth displayed by the parent toward the child.

Whiting and Child (1953) extracted from their cross-cultural data a measure of the initial indulgence or nurturance of the child's dependence upon his parents for various cultures, which they compared with the patient's responsibility for illness (the cultural indicant of guilt) in various
cultures. The hypothesis was not supported by the cross-cultural data. Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957) found a small \( r = +.10 \) but significant correlation between maternal warmth and amount of conscience. Their data was gathered by interviewing 379 mothers of nursery school children and by rating questions in the interview schedule on selected dimensions. They regarded the reported correlations as some slight evidence supporting the hypothesis that the child's dependency on the mother increases his motivation for adopting maternal values. However, Heinicke (1953) reported a significant negative relationship between parental warmth or nurturance and guilt as measured in a doll play situation. Shaplin (1954) found that preadolescent boys whose mothers were either cold or extremely warm showed less self-control, than did boys whose mothers were moderately warm. At best, the evidence bearing upon the hypothesis is ambiguous.

**Identification with the Aggressor**

In contrast to these studies concerned with the role of parental nurturance and warmth, some attention (Brofenbrenner, 1960) has been focused on the mechanism of identification with the aggressor as it may apply to the development of conscience. Here the identification takes place not so much because the parents' nurturance increases the child's dependence and motivation to gain parental approval by adhering to the socially reinforced behavior patterns,
but, rather, because the parent is a threatening powerful figure who is capable of harming the child who encroaches upon his domain. This conception is much closer to the psychoanalytic discussion of the resolution of the oedipal conflict.

Recently, Whiting (1959) has offered cross-cultural evidence to support this type of identification process which he calls the status envy hypothesis of identification.

Suggested by Freud's formulation of the Oedipal conflict the hypothesis is simply that a person will identify with, and hence accept the moral values of any person who is a successful rival with respect to resources which he covets but cannot control. Specifically, here it is assumed that where a child and father frequently compete for love, affection, recognition, food, care, and even sexual gratification from the mother, and where the father is often successful—that is, he is nurtured by the mother at a time when the child is in need—then the child should envy the father and hence identify with him (Whiting, 159, p. 188).

Whiting, utilizing the family structure data of Murdock (1957) related the patient's responsibility for illness in various cultures (his cultural index of guilt) to family and household structures (higher status envy is assumed to be present in monogamous and nuclear families as opposed to societies which have polygynous and extended families). Whiting's cross-cultural data supported the predicted relationship between status envy and guilt. Heinicke (1953) offered some additional supporting evidence for the hypothesis when he found a measure of guilt in children to be positively related to the mother's evaluation of the father.
Also, Faigen and Hollenberg (1953), in a comparative study of three societies, found that guilt in children is positively related to the prestige of the father. There appears to be some empirical evidence to support Whiting's status envy hypothesis of identification.

**Types of Punishment**

Perhaps, the role of the type of punishment used by the parent has gained the most attention in research related to identification and guilt. Earlier we discussed guilt as a general fear of punishment dependent on the severity of the child's socialization. Next, we examined the role of nurturance and warmth in the development of conscience. At first blush, it may appear that these hypotheses contradict one another. However, certain aspects of these ideas may be successfully combined. Parental displays of affection and warmth build up the reinforcement value of the parent. Punishment serves as a threat of loss of love, which is a strongly valenced reinforcement. Severity of punishment, per se, may not be as important as the particular type of punishment employed.

This analysis suggests that the crucial thing about the technique of punishment used by the parents is whether they are likely to have the dual effect of keeping the child oriented toward the goal of parental affection and at the same time arousing uncertainty about the attainment of this goal. It appears to us that all punishment of the child by its parents is likely to have the second of these two effects. But it
also appears that techniques of punishment differ in the extent to which they at the same time contribute to maintaining the child's orientation toward this goal (Whiting and Child, 1953, p. 242).

Techniques which seem likely to have this effect, according to Whiting and Child, include punishment by denial of love, punishment by threats of denial of reward, and punishment by threats of ostracism; and these are called love-oriented techniques. Non-love-oriented techniques include physical punishment, threats of physical punishment, and punishment by ridicule. These latter techniques may lead to avoidance of the parents rather than to a pursuit of parental affection. Whiting and Child found the predicted relationship between type of punishment and guilt feelings as measured by patient's responsibility for illness. Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957) investigated the same hypothesis in their previously mentioned research. They found that "high conscience" children had mothers who reported using love-oriented techniques of praise, isolation, and withdrawal of love. "Reasoning" as a technique of punishment was found to be related to these love-oriented techniques. Techniques of punishment which related inversely to "high conscience" included the use of tangible rewards, deprivation of privileges, and physical punishment. Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957) emphasize that withdrawing love where little exists should have little effect on conscience. Strong effectional
bonds must precede the effective use of love-oriented techniques of punishment in conscience development.

The empirical evidence strongly supports the relationship between the type of punishment and the sense of guilt. Faigen (1953) working with rural whites, found a significant relationship between love-oriented techniques of punishment and the generalization of guilt feelings in children as measured by the children's stories to projective techniques. Hollenberg (1953) found that the same relationship that Faigen reports holds true among Pueblo Indians. Allinsmith and Greening (1955) found that college males who score high in guilt over death wishes, as measured by a story completing technique, report that their mothers used "psychological" as opposed to physical punishment when they were 10 or 12 years old. Miller and Swanson, using similar measures on junior high school boys, report a similar trend for the middle-class boys. "Psychological" techniques include manipulation by shaming, appeals to pride and to guilt, and expressions of disappointment, which have considerable overlap with love-oriented techniques. In an early study related to guilt, Mackinnon (1938) found that subjects who did not violate prohibitions against cheating report that their fathers used more "psychological" punishment, whereas violators of prohibitions against cheating report a higher percentage of fathers who used physical punishment. Because of a relatively small n for this portion of the study, the
difference was not statistically significant. Glueck and Glueck (1950) report that parents of delinquents, who are often assumed to have a poorly developed superego, use physical punishment significantly more frequently than did the parents of the matched non-delinquents. The delinquents' parents utilize "reasoning" as a technique significantly less frequently than parents of non-delinquents. Miller and Swanson (1960) report that boys whose parents have explained their requests write significantly more stories in which the hero resists temptation. In general, the evidence relevant to the hypothesis that the type of punishment used by the parent is related to the strength of the sense of guilt in children seems consistently favorable.

**Sex Identity**

Miller and Swanson (1960) report a study of moral behavior and sex identity based on Aronfreed's (1955) doctoral dissertation which is tangentially related to the identification process we have been discussing. The authors assumed that each boy initially identifies with his mother and later identifies with the father. A second assumption concerned fixation and the lack of maturity it entails for the femininely identified male. Essentially, the rationale underlying their hypotheses related to guilt is as follows. The male who is consciously and unconsciously feminine is less mature than the male who is consciously masculine and unconsciously feminine. The most mature male is both
consciously and unconsciously masculine. The males with a feminine sex identification, being less mature, have not adequately learned to inhibit their expression of anger. They, therefore, violate their standards more frequently, and hence experience more severe guilt feelings than do males with a masculine sex identification. The authors also imply that the parents of the more feminine boys have punished his attempts to try out masculine behaviors. The child adopts the standards of parents in regard to the restriction of assertiveness. When he violates the prohibition against aggression, his guilt is proportional to the severity of his parent's punishment.

They presented no evidence about differences in child rearing practices and sex identity. Unconscious sex identity was measured by analyzing the style and content of the subject's performance on the Franck Drawing Completion Test (Franck and Rosen, 1949). The measure of the subject's conscious sex identity was a true-false scale of activities and interests relevant to sex identity developed by Gough (1952). A story completing test was used to measure guilt. A shift score was obtained by comparing the males' performance on three stories administered after a guilt arousal situation with three stories written before. Guilt was aroused by having a subject perform a task on a "delicate electronic" machine which was rigged to break-down in the middle of the subject's performance. From the projective
stories, inferences were made about the relative frequencies of severe guilt, direct expression of guilt, defenses against standards, and loss of control in the college males who had been classified into a consciously and unconsciously feminine group (FF), a consciously masculine, unconsciously feminine group (FM), and a consciously and unconsciously masculine group (MM). The results consistently supported the hypothesis that MM showed a smaller shift in the above four areas than did non-MM. None of the comparisons between FM and FF were greater than what would be expected on a chance basis. From these results, one can conclude that the factors which lead to the establishment of a masculine sex identification in males may also be involved in the development of a "moral" identification.

Summary of the Child Rearing Antecedents
Guilt

In summary, we shall examine the theoretically "ideal" child rearing antecedents for the development of conscience which have been suggested by the review of the literature. The parents should display a great deal of warmth and nurturant behavior towards the child. After a strong bond of love and dependence has developed, the undesirable behaviors of the child should be punished through the use of love-oriented techniques. If the same-sexed parent frequently gains the goals desired by the child, this should enhance the identification process. Reinforcing the child's attempts
to adopt the role of the same-sexed parent, should lead to an increase in both sexual and "moral" identification. While severe socialization practices should increase the child's fear of punishment, it is not clear that these practices lead to an internalization of standards of proper behavior.

The above discussion outlines the process by which the child learns the internal control of unacceptable behavior. It does not specify the content of the standards of proper behavior taught by the parents. If one is interested in the relationship of guilt to psychological disorders, then content may be an important variable. There seems to be some confusion of the roles of content and the acquisition process in discussion of the relationship of guilt to pathology. Sometimes, the erroneous implication is conveyed that the patient's difficulty stems from the acquisition of too strong or too weak a sense of guilt when the content of the standards he has acquired may be more correctly specified as the villain. The interaction of the acquisition process with the content of standards of proper behavior should be considered when discussing the relationship of guilt to psychological disorders.
Relevant Guilt Literature

Turning now to the research literature which is more pertinent to this dissertation, we shall examine research which has studied guilt as an inhibitor and as a characteristic of diagnostic groups.

Guilt as an Inhibitor

One of the problems in studying guilt is the creation of life-like situations where guilt may be aroused. Aronfreed (1955) utilized a technique in the study discussed in the last section which presumably arouses everyone's guilt. Another approach has been to tempt the subjects to violate prohibitions in situations in which they feel the violation cannot be detected. If fear of external punishment is controlled, the influence of guilt as an inhibitor can be most clearly studied in these situations. One of the early studies of guilt utilized such an approach. MacKinnon (1938) presented subjects with problems to solve; for some of the problems the subjects could check their answers, for other problems they were instructed not to check their answers in the answer booklets which were available. After leaving the room, MacKinnon observed their behavior through a one-way mirror. Forty-six per cent of his subjects violated the prohibition against cheating. He observed the spontaneous comments and motor actions of the subjects. Violators deprecated the test material, pounded their fists when frustrated, and so forth. Non-violators made more
self-deprecating comments, showed less aggressive motor movements, and demonstrated more "regressive" oral activity. "Regardless of the interpretation of the findings, the fact that the violators express their aggression and non-violators inhibit theirs is clearly indicated in both verbal and non-verbal behaviours of the subjects" (MacKinnon, 1933, p. 494). Later the subjects were interviewed. Subjects who admitted violations or who had violated the prohibition but denied it gave few indications of guilt feelings. Whereas subjects who were non-violators reported guilt feelings over other acts, and said they would have felt guilty if they had violated the prohibition against cheating. MacKinnon reports his results in terms of percentages of subjects who fall in various groups without using any statistical tests to see if the reported differences are significantly greater than chance expectations.

Attempts to predict overt aggressive behavior from aggressive fantasy have not always been successful. Rotter (1960) has stressed the importance of considering expectancies as well as need potentials in predicting overt behavior from fantasy. When an expectancy for punishment is considered, in addition to a simple count of aggressive themes, prediction of overt aggressive behavior improves. Studies utilizing the Thematic Apperception Test have pointed out some of the factors that need to be considered as inhibitors of the expression of aggression. Mussen and Naylor (1954),
Kagan (1956), and Lesser (1957) have all made contributions to this area of investigation. Rader (1957) attempted to predict the overt verbal aggression of prisoners in a group therapy session from Rorschach content. He scored the Rorschach for both aggression and inhibition of aggression. "Hosility" and "mutilation" were the content categories related to aggression, while inhibitory content categories included "passive or friendly," "guilt," "depression," and "inadequacy." Aggressive content on the Rorschach was correlated with the overt verbal aggression of prisoners. Including a consideration of the inhibition variable improved the prediction. The amount of "guilt" content in the protocols was small, and it was not clearly related to overt verbal aggression.

Clark (1952) reported three experiments involving sex imagery and sex-involved guilt imagery in the TAT stores of male subjects. In Experiment A the subjects in the experimental group were exposed to photographic slides of attractive nude females and then administered the TAT. The control group was shown slides of landscape, architecture, and other control material, and, then, the TAT was administered. In Experiment B, the sexual arousal condition for the experimental group consisted of employing an attractive female as administrator of the TAT while a male administered the TAT for the control group. Experiment C employed alcohol in an attempt to reduce anxiety over the expression
of sexual themes. The experimental group was exposed to nude slides prior to the TAT, the control group had no arousal, and both groups were drinking beer at a fraternity party. The aroused experimental groups in Experiments A and B had less sexual imagery in their stories than did their control groups. In Experiment C, the alcohol condition, the aroused experiment group displayed more sexual imagery than did their control group. The three groups which told the stories containing the most sexual imagery also exhibited the themes containing the greatest guilt over sexual activity. Clark explained his results by employing Miller's conflict model. Briefly, he explained his results as follows. The arousal situation serves to increase the strength of stimulus-produced sex and stimulus-produced guilt. In Experiments A and B the aroused group's higher guilt gradient inhibited the expression of sexual imagery. In the control groups, the sex gradient is higher than the inhibition gradient, hence more sexual imagery. In Experiment C, the aroused group's guilt gradient lowered past the point of intersection as a function of the alcohol, so they exhibited more sexual imagery than did the control group, since they are operating under a higher stimulus-produced sex drive. The groups which displayed the most sexual imagery also exhibited the most guilt. These groups told stories involving the most primary (explicitly or implicit evidence for sexual intercourse) sexual activity as opposed to secondary
(kissing, dancing, fondling, and so forth) and tertiary (sweethearts, on date, courting, in love, but no primary or secondary sex) sexual activity. The guilt in the stories is a function of the degree of sexual activity, and guilt seems to be response-produced. Telling a primary sexual story leads to response-produced guilt, and guilt imagery accompanies the primary sexual imagery in the story.

Collectively, the studies of MacKinnon, Rader, and Clark provide slight evidence supporting the hypothesis that guilt serves to inhibit morally tabooed behavior, such as cheating, the expression of verbal aggression, and the telling of sexual stories to TAT cards. However, this hypothesis could profit from further investigations.

**Known Groups**

A final area of research utilizing the guilt construct has involved the selection of various diagnostic groups which are supposed to differ in guilt. For example, delinquents and non-delinquents according to psychoanalytic personality theory differ in regards to the strength of superego. In their study of 500 delinquents and 500 matched controls, Glueck and Glueck (1950) offer evidence based on the Rorschach of group differences in strength of conscience. Bandura and Walters (1959) in their book on Adolescent Aggression report a similar finding. Their "aggressive" boys, who were selected on the basis of contact with courts,
schools, and child guidance agencies for acting-out, showed significantly less guilt on TAT-type stories and in interviews than did the matched group of controls. Recently, Caine (1960) has studied the expression of hostility and guilt in paranoid and melancholic women. According to psychoanalytic theory we would expect the melancholic women to express more guilt and self-criticism than the paranoid women. Caine reported that the melancholic women expressed more guilt than the paranoid women as measured by a "guilt" scale from the MMPI and as measured by a sentence building test fashioned after the one introduced by Watson, Pritzker, and Madison (1955).

After surveying the above studies, two conclusions seem justified. First, there are very few studies which have investigated guilt, even though the construct is frequently cited as an important explanatory variable. Second, most of the studies which have been done have taken measures developed for other purposes and attempted to rescore the measures as operational definitions of guilt. If these attempts cannot show theoretical reasons for selecting their referents, then Rotter's criticism of this general type of approach is applicable.

In many instances rather than devising tests which measure specific theoretical constructs which are carefully defined and for which the test behavior can be understood as a logical referent, the descriptive constructs used to classify test response do not logically relate to the new theoretical
constructs but are bent or twisted to measure the new variables (Rotter, 1960, p. 301).

The development of another measure of guilt seems warranted. Hopefully, the new measure will provide an impetus to increase the empirical investigation of hypotheses related to guilt. A new measure which explicitly considers the theory which generates the referents used as the measuring operations may have advantages over adaptations of existing tests.
CHAPTER IV

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SENTENCE

COMPLETION MEASURE OF GUILT

In developing a measure of guilt, our purpose was to provide a reliable, quantitatively scorable instrument suited for research which would also be acceptable for clinical use. If clinicians use a measure routinely in the evaluation of their clients, then, we find this instrument is often later adapted for research purposes. Most of the psychological tests devised for use in the clinic have proven difficult to adapt for use as a research measure. While the questionnaires developed by research psychologists have not been favorably received for use in a clinical setting. To use Cronbach's (1955) distinction, the clinician has been primarily interested in broad "bandwidth," while the researcher has sought high "fidelity." It appears that we can get broad coverage by sacrificing accuracy and dependability and vice-versa. The sentence completion technique seems suited to meet many of the demands of both the clinician and researcher.
Advantages of the Sentence Completion Technique

The sentence completion method is a semi-projective technique. There is a limited disguise of the purpose of the test. It allows for freedom of response, but it does not tap information that the subject is not more or less willing to reveal. It is a flexible technique, in which stems can be devised to elicit a variety of content. It is easily administered in a group situation which provides a desirable economy of time. It is limited to use with subjects who are literate, unless orally administered. Poorly developed language skills of children or mentally retarded individuals preclude its use, as is true of most tests. While responses to the sentence completion blanks are often qualitatively evaluated, reliable scoring systems have been developed which permit quantitative scoring (Rotter and Rafferty, 1950; Fitzgerald, 1958; Wiener, Carpenter, and Carpenter, 1956). The sentence completion technique can provide some control of social desirability and other response sets (Rozyko, 1959). It is not always easy for the respondee to determine what is a "good" or "bad" response.

Construction of the Mosher Incomplete Sentences Test

The first step in developing the sentence completion measure of guilt, entitled the Mosher Incomplete Sentence Test (MIST), was the formation of a pool of over 200 stems
which were thought to be related to guilt on the basis of notions contained in psychoanalytic theory. Inspection of the stems yielded six a priori categories: (1) morality-conscience, (2) sex, (3) anger-hostility, (4) past-childhood, (5) failure-inadequacy, (6) religion. The author selected 156 stems which appeared to have the most face validity while offering a variety of content which psychoanalytic theory suggests would be related to guilt. These stems were divided by inspection into two approximately equivalent sentence completion blanks. Each blank contained 78 stems related to guilt and 20 filler stems taken from the Rotter Incomplete Sentences Blank (1950). These preliminary forms of the MIST were administered to a total of 38 patients at the Chillicothe Veterans Administration Hospital. The patients' responses to each stem were listed on a card, and two clinical psychologists independently selected the stems which best elicited information on the guilt dimension. Psychoanalytic discussions of guilt provided the framework used in selecting the stems. The raters attempted to select stems which had elicited a wide range of response. Stems which yielded stereotyped responses or extremely brief responses were eliminated. The selected stems tended to elicit responses which could be clearly judged as indicative of guilt or as indicative of a relative absence of guilt reactions. Stems which elicited responses that could be scored at both ends of the guilt dimension were regarded as
better than stems which yielded a sample of responses which were restricted to one pole of the guilt dimension. After discussing the psychoanalytic theory of guilt, the raters independently ranked the 10 "better" and 10 "poorer" stems in each category keeping the above criteria in mind. Also, the six categories were ranked and qualitatively evaluated. The raters agreed on their placement of 37 stems in the "better" category. After discussing differences in selections, seven more stems were selected. The religion category was dropped as non-discriminative. Only four past-childhood stems were judged to be acceptable. Since these stems dealt with sex and hostile content they were combined into the sex and hostile categories. The 45 stems were submitted to the dissertation adviser for his evaluation and six more stems were dropped.

This tentative form of the MIST, which contained 12 sex stems, 12 hostile stems, 10 conscience-morality stems, five failure stems, and six filler stems taken from the Rotter ISB dealing with interpersonal relations and attitudes towards parents, was administered to 51 males and 60 females enrolled in an introductory psychology course. Their responses formed the basis of the scoring examples contained in the scoring manual which are used to quantitatively score for guilt. Inspection of the responses of these subjects led to a decision to drop the failure category and seven more stems.
The form of the MIST used in the studies reported in this dissertation consisted of 50 stems. There were 15 hostile stems, 14 sex stems, 13 morality-conscience stems, and eight filler stems taken from the Rotter ISB. Since a number of stems had been dropped as non-discriminative, 10 stems were tentatively added to increase the number of stems in the subscales. Appendix A contains the Scoring Manual for Guilt, as well as the 50 stems used in the MIST. The scoring manual contains sections devoted to scoring principles, scoring categories, and scoring examples. The scoring examples consists of sample completions to 32 of the stems for males and for females. There are no scoring examples for the eight filler stems, nor for the ten stems that were tentatively added to the MIST.

The Role of Theory

In constructing a measure of a construct, such as guilt, the referents or sentence completions scores as indicative of guilt should be generated by the theory which utilizes guilt as a construct. In order to illustrate how psychoanalytic theory specified the referents used in the MIST scoring system, we have reproduced the section of the Scoring Manual for Guilt concerned with scoring principles:

Guilt may be defined as a generalized expectancy for self-mediated punishment for violating, anticipating the violation of, or failure to attain internalized standards of proper behavior. The referents for guilt include painful feelings of self-criticism, self-blame, and self-remonse which
arise from violating or anticipating the violation of internalized standards of "proper" conduct. Guilt may involve a lessening of self-esteem for failing to live in accordance with ideals or from failure to attain certain "ought to" goals. The proper behavior, ideals, and goals vary from subculture to subculture. It is assumed that the scorer is familiar with the socially accepted moral code or standards of proper behavior of Western society, and of college students in particular. Further referents for the presence of guilt include attempts at restitution or undoing; inhibition and suppression of hostile and sexual impulses; self-punishment and ascetic denial; the employment of defense mechanism; scientifically unsupported beliefs that condemned acts are physically or mentally damaging; confession of sinfulness and anticipation of punishment; depression; and marked interest in or involvement with religion and morality.

Indicators of guilt accompanied by very strong affect receive a scoring weight of 5. Completions to be given this scoring weight include the following general types of completions: (a) statements of extreme disgust or revulsion generally considered to be out of proportion to the stimulus, (b) statements that people who commit condemned acts are abnormal or insane, (c) reports of physical illness to feelings of anger or thoughts of sex, (d) reports of extreme feelings of being or doing evil, (e) reports that the individual will never forgive himself for committing condemned acts. This scoring weight is used relatively infrequently and for some stems no scoring examples are provided.

Indicators of guilt accompanied by moderate to strong affects receive a scoring weight of 4. The general types of completion to be assigned this scoring weight include the following: (a) admissions or anticipations of feelings of guilt, shame, remorse, or sinfulness, (b) statements that certain acts are harmful or detrimental, (d) statements indicating fear of unacceptable thoughts, (e) statements that persons who commit condemned acts should seek moral or mental help, (f) statements indicating that certain acts lead to depression, (g) admission of "general" wrong doing, and (h) statements indicating a need for punishment or ascetic denial, (i) reports involving the individual's attempts at restitution or undoing.
Indicators of mild to moderate guilt receive a scoring weight of 3. Often there is guilty content with little emotional involvement. Condemnation of improper behavior or moral platitudes which are in keeping with society's moral code but which lack evidence of personal involvement are used to infer mild guilt since the probability of the inhibition of unacceptable acts increases with their presence. The general types of completions which are assigned scoring weights of (3) include the following: (a) statements that the condemned behavior is "wrong" or "bad" with little evidence of affective concern, (b) statements that society condemns certain behaviors, (c) moral platitudes, (d) statements that the person attempts to control or should control impulses, (e) admission of a "specific" wrong-doing, (f) statements that if a condemned act is committed, then punishment will follow, (g) statements that when faced with hostility or sexual impulses one should think of something else or leave the field, (h) statements that when one does wrong he should confess, (i) reports indicating inability to recall past sexual or hostile events, (j) reports indicating slight depression, (k) and statements which belittle condemned acts as silly, stupid or ridiculous.

Most neutral completions receive a scoring weight of 2. All omissions are assigned a weight of 2. Omissions should be discouraged and there are usually very few when the scale is administered in small groups. Omissions may be prorated if they are frequent. Definitions, blatant denial or avoidance of the stem content, cultural cliches, incomplete thoughts or phrases, and completions which otherwise defy classification are assigned scoring weights of 2.

Sentence completions which seem to be mildly to moderately non-guilty receive a scoring weight of 1. The general types of statements assigned the weight include the following: (a) statements that condemned acts are natural or normal, (b) statements that socially condemned acts are a common occurrence or have been committed by the individual, (c) statements indicating that the individual seldom engages in proprietary acts, (d) statements indicating that the person openly admits or wishes to express socially condemned feelings, (e) statements indicating the person expresses aggression verbally on non-living objects, (f) hostility toward the blank or examiner, (g) statements indicating some acceptance of hostile
or sexual needs, (h) statements that provide a justification for committing socially condemned acts.

Completions which indicate an absence of guilt receive a scoring weight of 0. The general types of completions which are scored 0 include the following: (a) statements that socially condemned acts are normal and desirable, or natural with some affective involvement, (b) statements concerning hypothetical situations in which plans to avoid detection are made, (c) statements which deny feelings of guilt, (d) statements indicating that hostile and sexual needs are satisfied or satisfaction is actively sought, (e) statements that hostile or sexual acts are pleasurable.

In the main, the referents we have selected are in keeping with conceptions suggested by psychoanalytic theory. In every instance, it is not possible to clearly decide whether a completion reflects fear of an internal or external punishment. This is a limitation of this measure as it presently stands, and, in general, is a major research problem in the investigation of the guilt construct.

Also, the MIST cannot adequately handle what is loosely called unconscious guilt. If the commission of an earlier unacceptable act is repressed, then presumably some indicants of guilt feelings will be reflected by the scale. However, if the affective state associated with the sense of guilt is not in awareness, then the scale does not contain adequate referents to measure unconscious guilt. The usual referent for unconscious guilt is masochistic behaviors or an inability to be successful caused by symptomatic self-defeating behaviors. It must be noted that such behaviors are usually accompanied by manifest avowals of self-criticism,
self-blame, and loss of self-esteem, and if such is the case, the scale should be predictive. Our problem is eased if we remember Freud's comment on this issue.

Patients do not easily believe what we tell them about an unconscious sense of guilt. They know well enough by what torments (pangs of conscience) a conscious feeling of guilt, the consciousness of guilt, can express itself, and so they cannot admit that they could harbour entirely analogous feelings in themselves without observing a trace of them. I think we may meet their objection by abandoning the term 'unconscious feeling of guilt' which is in any case an incorrect one psychologically, and substitute for it a "need for punishment" which describes the state of things observed just as aptly (Freud, 1924, p. 263).

The MIST is not seen as a direct measure of this type of "need for punishment." Rather, the MIST is seen to measure a relatively manifest admission of moralistic standards and feelings of self-blame, self-reproach, and self-criticism for failing to live in accordance with internalized moral ideals.

**Intercorrelations of the MIST**

Pearson correlation coefficients were computed between the various combinations of the total guilt, hostile guilt, sex guilt, and conscience-morality guilt scales of the MIST. Table 1 contains the intercorrelations of the subscales and the total guilt scale for 80 male subjects.

Table 2 contains the intercorrelations of the total guilt and subscales for 105 female subjects.
### TABLE 1

**INTERCORRELATIONS OF TOTAL GUILT AND SUBSCALES FOR 80 MALES SUBJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hostile Guilt</th>
<th>Sex Guilt</th>
<th>Morality-Conscience Guilt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Guilt</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile Guilt</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Guilt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality-Conscience Guilt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Spurious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* p &lt; .05.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** p &lt; .01.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

**INTERCORRELATIONS OF TOTAL GUILT AND SUBSCALES FOR 105 FEMALE SUBJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hostile Guilt</th>
<th>Sex Guilt</th>
<th>Morality-Conscience Guilt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Guilt</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile Guilt</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Guilt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality-Conscience Guilt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Spurious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* p &lt; .05.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** p &lt; .01.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of Tables 1 and 2 indicates that their is considerable variance in the subscales which does not overlap. The implications of this finding are explicated in the **Discussion** chapter.
Reliability of the MIST

The technical requirements of test construction have emphasized the importance of reliability. In constructing a quantitative scoring manual for guilt, a principal concern is the accuracy with which MIST protocols can be scored. A sample of MIST protocols were randomly selected and independently scored by two clinical psychologists. Pearson correlation coefficients were computed between the scores obtained by the two raters. Table 3 contains the interrater reliability coefficients for 30 male and 30 female MIST protocols.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Guilt</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile Guilt</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Guilt</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality-Conscience Guilt</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These reliability coefficients reported in Table 3 are highly significant and indicate that the scoring categories can be reliably scored by trained raters familiar with the scoring manual.

Split-half Reliability of the MIST

A measure of the internal consistency of the scoring categories is provided by examining the split-half reliability coefficients of the scoring categories on the MIST.
Thirty male and 30 female protocols were randomly selected and a Pearson correlation coefficient was computed between the sum of the scores for the odd and even items within the various scoring categories. The 10 items which were tentatively added to the scale were scored for the males but not for the females. Table 4 contains the split-half reliability coefficients which have been corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula for 30 MIST protocols. Table 5 contains the corrected split-half reliability coefficients for 30 female MIST protocols. The tables indicate the number of stems used to compute the reliability coefficients.

**TABLE 4**

**SPLIT-HALF RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR 30 MALE MISTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Guilt Stems</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>Hostile Guilt Stems</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>Sex Guilt Stems</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>Morality-Conscience Guilt Stems</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r = .92*</td>
<td>r = .54*</td>
<td>r = .72*</td>
<td>r = .49*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p &lt; .01.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5**

**SPLIT-HALF RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR 30 FEMALE MISTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Guilt Stems</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>Hostile Guilt Stems</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>Sex Guilt Stems</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>Morality-Conscience Guilt Stems</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r = .59**</td>
<td>r = .38*</td>
<td>r = .06</td>
<td>r = .43*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* p &lt; .05.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** p &lt; .01.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is to be noted that the coefficients for the males which are based on a larger number of stems are generally
higher than those reported for the females. Reliability is, in part, a function of the length of a test. Since we computed scores based on as few as five odd stems and five even stems, the reliability coefficients were smaller than would be the case with a longer test. It is difficult to determine why the sex guilt category is not significantly correlated for the females, but yields the highest coefficient of any subscale for the males. Higher coefficients might have been obtained if we had followed the practice of matching similar stems which Rotter and Rafferty (1950) suggest, rather than taking an odd-even split. The attempt to sample a wide variety of content within the scoring categories also served to reduce the internal consistency.

The internal consistency of the subscales may be improved by an item-analysis designed to eliminate items which are not discriminative. This would be the next step in attempting to improve the formal structure of the MIST.

As yet, the data has not been gathered which would permit the computation of test-retest reliability coefficients to determine the stability of the scoring categories over a period of time.
CHAPTER V

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

In this chapter, we shall examine a variety of topics which led up to the specific experimental procedures which were employed in the studies used to validate the MIST. First, we shall review a portion of the perceptual defense literature since we used a perceptual defense task as a measure of the dependent variable in the first of the studies involving guilt. Next, we shall examine the most pertinent operant verbal conditioning literature since this technique was used in the second study to investigate hypotheses about the effects of guilt on verbal conditioning. Finally, we shall examine three subsidiary measures which were included to provide some evidence of the discriminative validity of the MIST.

Perceptual Defense

The perceptual defense literature has teamed with controversy. McGinnies (1949) did an early study which evoked much of the controversy. McGinnies tachistoscopically presented obscene and neutral words to his subjects. He found his subjects had higher recognition thresholds for the obscene words, and that, prior to their verbal report, they
gave higher galvanic skin responses to the obscene words. It was suggested that the elevated GSR implied perceptual recognition, and that the subjects defended against the threat by not allowing the material conscious awareness and expression.

Howes and Solomon (1950) indicated that McGinnies employed no control for word frequency or familiarity, and that his design could not distinguish between a conscious suppression of verbalizing socially disapproved "dirty" words from an unconscious repression. The variable of the frequency of taboo words as an artifactual explanation of the phenomenon led to several experiments. Postman, Bronson, and Gropper (1953) controlled for the frequency of occurrence of threat and neutral words and found no difference in recognition times. Lazarus (1954) criticized Postman, Bronson, and Gropper for believing that words like capon, tiara, cleat, and mixer were equivalent in familiarity or word frequency to raped, whore, kotex and penis. Cowen and Beier (1954) found no evidence of relationship between recognition time and familiarity of the word. Wiener (1955) demonstrated that familiarity and structural components could not account for all of the variance in differential recognition time. Using double entendre words such as "fairy," "pussy," and "balls," he fostered a threat or neutral connotation by embedding the critical words in lists of neutral or sexual words which were read to the subjects.
Structural determinants and word frequency were identical, but "meaning" and recognition time differed. Eriksen (1954) has concluded that word frequency plays a minor role in perceptual recognition. We, therefore, deemed it proper to employ taboo and neutral words in our perceptual defense task, and to infer that differential responding was not an artifact of word familiarity or frequency.

It seems clear that generally, subjects are slower to verbalize threat words than neutral words when given a perceptual recognition task. Although the phenomenon of perceptual defense (perceptual defense is used descriptively, not as an explanation) has been adequately demonstrated (McGinnies, 1949; Cowen and Beier, 1954; Beier and Cowen, 1953; Carpenter, Wiener, and Carpenter, 1956; Lazarus, Eriksen, and Fonda, 1951), the interpretation of the phenomenon is still controversial. Blum (1954) has argued that the unconscious is capable of perceiving the threatening nature of stimuli at levels below that of conscious awareness and defenses are mustered to inhibit perceptual recognition.

Eriksen (1958, 1960) after abandoning his earlier position (1954) which accepted psychoanalytic notions of the unconscious, has reviewed the experimental literature related to "awareness" and concluded that there is no evidence that the human organism can discriminate external stimuli at a level which is more acute or sensitive than
verbal report. He explained the phenomenon offered as evidence for unconscious discrimination in terms of the partial independence of different response systems to near-threshold level perceptual cues, or by a lack of awareness for above-threshold cues. For example, the subception effect reported by Lazarus and McCleary (1951) is attributed to the partial independence of verbal report, GSR, and perception. A model of partial correlation in which the errors in the response systems are imperfectly correlated may explain the subception effect. The same effect can be found when two types of verbal categories are employed, one response involving naming the nonsense syllable, the other involving a classification of the nonsense syllable as "pleasant" or "unpleasant." When the subject is not able to name the correct syllable, he will still discriminate the category "pleasant" or "unpleasant" at a better than chance level.

Eriksen and Browne (1956) explained the perceptual defense phenomenon in terms of principles derived from studies of punishment and avoidance conditioning. The anxiety associated with the stimulus decreases the probability of the response occurring. The anxiety is believed to extend to the implicit verbal report and is not simply a function of conscious suppression of tabooed verbal behavior. Perhaps, the controversy of unconscious discrimination has been over-emphasized, since the latter explanation is not
contrary to psychoanalytic theory and is more parsimonious in terms of necessary assumptions.

A more important question revolves around the influence of personality as opposed to situational variables. Studies by Lazarus, Eriksen, and Fonda (1951) and by Carpenter, Wiener, and Carpenter (1956) have reported successful attempts to predict the perceptual defense phenomenon from personality measures of defensive behavior. However, Bitterman and Kniffen (1953) concluded on the basis of their controversial study (see Chordorkoff's 1955 criticism) that differential readiness to report is more explanatory of differential thresholds than the anxiety engendered avoidance reaction explanation put forth by McGinnis and Sherman (1952), which is similar to Eriksen's explanation. The design of our study permits the comparison of the relative influence of situational cues leading to response suppression as compared to the influence of the personality variable of guilt which is relevant to this issue.

**Operant Verbal Conditioning**

Ever since Greenspoon (1955) demonstrated that subjects would increase the frequency of plural nouns which they emitted when the experimenter reinforced the response class with an "mmm-hmm," psychologists have been interested in the conditioning of verbal behavior. Two recent articles have reviewed the steadily mounting literature on operant
verbal conditioning. Krasner (1958) surveyed 31 studies in terms of setting, verbal responses, reinforcing stimuli, populations, controls, length of sessions, relationships to personality variables, results and "awareness." Salzinger (1959) conducted his review within an experimental framework stemming from learning theory. He attempted to specify variables underlying verbal behavior and discussed the literature in terms of these variables, such as, the response, number of reinforcements, delay of reinforcement, and the like. There is ample evidence that an experimenter can influence subjects' verbal behavior so that the frequency of a class of responses emitted by the subjects will increase when the experimenter reinforces the class through the use of generalized conditioned reinforcers such as "good" and "mmm-hmm."

The investigations which have related personality correlates to operant verbal conditioning have been primarily concerned with indicating the personality dynamics of a person who is most susceptible to influence or social reinforcement. The response class that has been reinforced has usually been "neutral" (i.e., without conflict) such as plural nouns or pronouns. Taffel (1955), in the first experiment to employ the completing sentences task in which the subjects are presented pronouns and verbs on a card and asked to select a pronoun and verb and make a sentence, found that subjects scoring higher on the Taylor Anxiety Scale conditioned
more readily than subjects scoring lower on the Taylor Anxiety Scale. The high anxiety was construed as increased drive following the usual Taylor-Spence rationale.

I. Sarason (1958) investigated personality correlates of conditionability using therapists' ratings and personality scales as measures of the independent variables. Patients rated by their therapists as "compliant" had a higher level of conditioning. His subjects who scored high on test anxiety and "lack of protection" scales conditioned more readily, whereas subjects who scored high on a "defensiveness" scale conditioned less readily, as predicted. Therapists' ratings of "hostility" and "dependency" were not systematically related to conditionability.

Weiss, Ullmann, and Krasner (1960) reported that subjects high on a measure of susceptibility to hypnosis devised by Weitzenhoffer and Hilgard (1959) were more responsive to verbal operant conditioning. These authors also reported a significant negative correlation between the "achievement via independence" subscale of the California Psychological Inventory and responsivity to verbal conditioning. Krasner, Ullmann, and Weiss (1960) successfully replicated both of these relationships.

Crowne and Strickland (1960) have related the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, which is conceptualized as a manifestation of a need for approval, to conditionability. Crowne and Strickland demonstrated a significant relationship
between his S-D scale and an increase in the emission of plural nouns as a function of the verbal reinforcement "mmm-hmm."

To summarize, the individual believed to be most responsive to verbal operant conditioning might be described as anxious, compliant, suggestive, dependent, and approval-seeking. The individual who is believed to be most resistant to conditioning might be described as defensive and hostile, as well as the opposite of the above adjectives.

General studies have been interested in hostile verbs as a response category to be reinforced in the operant conditioning situation. Here, the reinforced response may be conflictual. These studies have employed the sentence completing task using hostile verbs as one category of verbs available for selection by the subjects. Binder, McConnell, and Sjoholm (1957) found that the use of hostile verbs could be increased by using the reinforcer "good." They found that an attractive, petite, female examiner conditioned significantly more hostile verbs from her subjects than did a husky, ex-Marine Captain. Ferguson and Buss (1960) presented evidence that aggressiveness of the examiner, and not the sex of the examiner per se, leads to significant differences in the rate of conditioning hostile verbs. Buss and Durkee (1958) failed to substantiate their prediction that women subjects would condition less rapidly than men to hostile verbs. They found that hostile verbs
conditioned faster than neutral verbs and explained this on the basis of the smaller response class of hostile verbs. Weis, Krasner, and Ullmann (1960) using a story telling technique demonstrated that a situational variable involving a hostile interaction between experimenters and subjects significantly decreased responsiveness to verbal operant conditioning. While most of these studies (except the last mentioned) have employed hostile verbs as a content category, they have been concerned with sex differences in examiner and subjects, and examiner characteristics rather than with personality variables of the subject. So far, there have been no attempts to relate personality variables to differential rates of conditioning as a function of the content of the reinforced category.

**Subsidiary Measures**

**The Edwards Social Desirability Scale**

In developing this scale items were obtained from a number of MMPI scales. One hundred fifty items were submitted to a group of ten judges who were asked to give the socially desirable response. The judges were in 100 percent agreement on 79 items. These 79 items were item analyzed by selecting groups of high and low scorers and determining which items best differentiated the high and low scorers. The item analysis yielded 39 most discriminative items which were used in this study. A list of the
items, as well as a scoring key can be found in Edwards' (1957) book *The Social Desirability Variable in Personality Assessment and Research*.

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale

The scale was devised by Marlowe and Crowne as a measure of social desirability which is independent of psychopathology. Whereas, Edwards was interested in social desirability as a function of the test item, Crowne and Marlowe were interested in the tendency to endorse items which are unlikely to occur in usual behavior as a personality characteristic. A need for social approval is cited as the personality characteristic underlying the tendency to endorse the items contained in the scale. The 33 items and the scoring key used in this study can be found in Crowne and Marlowe (1960).

The Ohio State Psychological Examination

The OSPE is a group administered test of general mental ability or intelligence developed by H. A. Toops. The test has been validated against college grades and academic success. Correlation coefficients in the vicinity of $r = .60$ are common. Scores are reported in terms of percentile placement.
CHAPTER VI

TWO STUDIES RELATED TO THE CONSTRUCT

VALIDITY OF THE MIST

Before presenting the hypotheses and procedures for the two studies, it seems appropriate to clarify the functions served by psychoanalytic theory and learning theory in the conceptualization of this dissertation. Psychoanalytic theory has contributed the construct of guilt and the major portion of the nomological net of hypotheses related to guilt. While psychoanalytic theory has dictated the content, learning theory seems most applicable to the process of acquiring and selecting guilt-related behaviors. A commitment to learning theory interpretations of psychoanalytic concepts eliminated the necessity of adhering to libido theory as an explanation of the acquisition of behavior patterns.

Miller's conflict theory has influenced our conception of guilt as an inhibitor variable in conflict situations. The suggestion of two motives for inhibition inherent in psychoanalytic theory has been retained. Rotter's Social Learning Theory has offered a vehicle for the reinterpretation of psychoanalytic conceptions into constructs which may be easier to operationalize. SLT has been particularly
influential in its introduction of a situational variable which has not been explicitly considered in psychoanalytic theory which is preoccupied with the internal determinants of behavior. The reconceptualization of guilt in SLT terms has served to clarify the, at times, nebulous notions contained in psychoanalytic discussions of guilt.

Study I

Hypotheses

To validate the MIST, we utilized it as the operational definition of guilt in an experimental test of some hypotheses generated by theoretical conceptions of guilt. Throughout our earlier discussion, we have been concerned with the role of an internal as opposed to an external fear of punishment in the inhibition of unacceptable behavior. We have previously defined guilt as a generalized expectancy for self-mediated punishment for violating, anticipating the violation of, or failure to attain internalized standards of proper behavior. This generalized expectancy for self-mediated punishment was predicted to function as an inhibitor of responses which would violate internalized standards of proper behavior. This prediction was our first general hypothesis.

Our second general hypothesis concerned the influence of situational cues on the expectancy for external punishment, which is the second prominent factor related to the
inhibition of unacceptable behavior. It was predicted that situational cues designed to arouse or alleviate anxiety and fear about other peoples' reactions to unacceptable behavior would influence the inhibition of unacceptable responses. In Social Learning terms, situational cues influence the individual's expectancy that behavior x will lead to an external positive or negative reinforcement.

The rationale for our third general hypothesis involved a prediction based on a combination of the influence of "the generalized expectancy for self-mediated punishment" and of the expectancy that behavior x will lead to negative reinforcement on the inhibition of unacceptable responses. Earlier, we speculated that situational cues largely determine the value of the external expectancy for negative reinforcement \( E^e \), while the generalized expectancy for self-mediated punishment \( G_E^G \) is relatively independent of situational cues related to the expectancy for reinforcement since it is based on **internal** behavior-reinforcement sequences. It was predicted that subjects who have a relatively weak \( G_E^G \) will be more influenced by situational cues related to external negative reinforcement than will subjects with a stronger \( G_E^G \). This does not mean that subjects with a strong \( G_E^G \) will not be influenced by situational cues. However, the influence of situational cues is seen as mainly effecting their \( E^e \) and not their \( G_E^G \). If subjects do not have a strong generalized expectancy for
self-mediated punishment, their inhibitory behavior will be almost entirely a function of situational cues relevant to their E<sup>o</sup>.

Restating the general hypotheses in terms of the specific measures that will be used to operationally define the constructs in them, we have the following three hypotheses:

1. Subjects who score high on a measure of sex guilt will have higher perceptual defense scores than subjects who score low on a measure of sex guilt.

2. Subjects who are in the Anxiety-Induction experimental condition will have higher perceptual defense scores than subjects who are in the Anxiety-Reduction experimental condition.

3. The perceptual defense scores of subjects who score low on a measure of sex guilt will be more influenced by the experimental conditions than the perceptual defense scores of subjects who score high on a measure of sex guilt.

**Procedure**

Eighty male Ss who were enrolled in an introductory psychology course were administered the MIST and the Edwards Social Desirability Scale in small groups. Most of the males had previously taken the Ohio State Psychological Examination and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. The Ss were randomly assigned to two groups. Group I was seen individually and received the Arousal condition, the
Anxiety-Induction condition, and the Perceptual Defense condition. Group II was seen individually and received the Arousal condition, the Anxiety-Reduction condition, and the Perceptual Defense condition.

The Guilt Measure

The Ss took the 50 stem Mosher Incomplete Sentences Test contained in Appendix A. The measure was scored according to the procedures outlined in the Scoring Manual. The ten items (not including the filler stems) for which there are no scoring examples were scored by adherence to the general scoring principles. Total guilt, sex guilt, hostile guilt, and conscience-morality guilt scores were found for each S.

The Arousal Condition

All Ss participated in this condition. The Ss were shown six "pin-ups" of nude and semi-nude females and asked to rate them on several characteristics. The following directions were read to the Ss:

Before we begin the main experiment, I'd like to take a few minutes to get your opinion about something else. Several men's magazines claim to have a large percentage of readers who are college students. We are interested in securing the reaction of male college students to see if it is as favorable as these magazines' claim and to determine what are the characteristics of the magazine that have the most appeal. In particular, we are interested in the college male's reaction to the "pin-up" pictures these magazines feature. In general, we are interested in seeing if college males agree on which women are most attractive. I am going to
show you six "pin-ups" taken from a popular men's
magazine and ask you to rate them on several
characteristics. I want you to look at the pictures
one by one. After you have finished with one
picture, you may go on to the next, but you may not
return to look at an earlier picture. You will
have to make your ratings from memory. Here is a
pencil and paper that you may use to take notes if
you so desire. Do you have any questions about
what you are supposed to do? Here is the first
picture.... I've forgotten something from my office.
Would you excuse me for a few minutes? Just keep
looking at the pictures and I should be back before
you finish.

When the experimenter left the room, he went next door to a
room containing a one-way mirror. He recorded the amount of
time the subject spent looking at the first three pictures,
and returned to the room where he surreptitiously recorded
the amount of time the subjects required to look at the
other three "pin-ups." After the subjects had finished
looking at the "pin-ups," they were asked the following
questions:

1. Which girl do you think has the prettiest face?
2. Which girl do you think has the best figure?
3. Which girls do you think is most sexually
desirable?
4. Which girl do you think would have the best
personality?
5. Which girl do you think would make the best
wife?

Their responses were recorded and the experimenter com-
mented, "As you may have guessed, one of our purposes in
asking these questions is to see what are the relationships
among beauty, personality, and marital choice for the
college male."
The Anxiety-Induction Condition

Forty Ss were randomly assigned to this condition. This condition was designed to create situational cues leading to a heightened expectancy for external negative reinforcement for behavior related to sex. The following directions were read to the Ss:

We are also interested in your opinion about the effects of looking at "pin-up" pictures. People have different opinions about such pictures, some opinions are favorable, some unfavorable. We are interested in how you feel about them. No matter what your personal opinion is, you may be sure that many other people would agree with you. I am going to read some opinions and statements taken from interviews with "experts" and other college students. After I read each statement, I want you to say "agree" or "disagree" depending on your own opinion about the statement. Time does not permit us to fully discuss any of these, and it may be hard for you to confine your answer to a simple "agree" or "disagree" only. After we have completed the main experiment we can discuss some of your answers in the remaining time if you so desire. Do you understand? (If the subject has any question, answer it by rereading the relevant portion of the instructions.) Then begin to read the statement. After completing the list of statements, say, "Now to turn to the main experiment."

The following ten statements were then read:

1. Looking at erotic pictures is sexually arousing.
2. Sex perverts often own large collections of erotic pictures.
3. I would be ashamed to show my mother erotic pictures.
4. Erotic pictures lead to increased masturbation.
5. To enjoy looking at erotic pictures is a sign of "loose" morals and a "morally" deprived background.
6. Many psychologists feel erotic pictures are sexually stimulating and may lead to sex crimes.
7. Erotic pictures are obscene and degrade those who enjoy them.
3. Erotic pictures should not be sold to young boys as they are damaging to suggestable individuals.

9. It is a sin to enjoy looking at erotic pictures.

10. Many prominent educators believe erotic pictures should not be sold on the newstands.

Every time the Ss said "agree," the experimenter encouraged them by saying "mm-hmm" and nodding his head affirmatively. This behavior coupled with the condemnatory statements about "pin-ups" was intended to increase the Ss' fear of external punishment for unacceptable behavior related to sex.

**The Anxiety-Reduction Condition**

Forty Ss were randomly assigned to this condition. This condition was designed to provide situational cues which would increase the Ss' expectancy that behavior related to sex would not receive external negative reinforcement. The Ss were read the same instruction which were read in the Anxiety Induction condition. Then, the following ten statements were read:

1. It is normal for college males to enjoy looking at "pin-up" pictures.

2. Court decisions are almost unanimous that "pin-ups" are not obscene; the judges must feel that such pictures are not damaging.

3. Kinsey, the famous investigator of sexual practices, believes excessive prudery, such as censoring "pin-ups," is often psychologically damaging.

4. "Pin-up" pictures have an artistic value which should not be thoughtlessly censored.

5. Most males look at "pin-ups," swear, and talk about sex; they should not be ashamed of these normal reactions.

7. Many psychologists believe "pin-ups" are a useful outlet for the expression of sexual needs.
8. "Pin-ups" should not be thoughtlessly classified as pornographic or obscene and banned from the newsstands.
9. If "pin-ups" and sex were not regarded as evil by narrowminded people, there would be less sexual problems and less divorce among married people.
10. I enjoy looking at "pin-ups" and feel this is a natural interest for college males to have.

Whenever, the Ss said "agree," the experimenter would say "mhm-hmhm" and nod his head "affirmatively." This behavior coupled with positively toned statements about "pin-ups was intended to decrease the Ss' fear of external punishment for socially condemned behavior related to sex.

The Perceptual Defense Condition

Both groups were presented the perceptual defense condition. Perceptual defense scores were used as a measure of the subjects' tendency to inhibit the expression of taboo sexual material. The Ss were presented five taboo and five neutral words in a random order by the successive carbons method (Lowen and Beier, 1960). Twenty carbon copies of each word were typed in capital letters on an electric typewriter and placed in a booklet. All of the words consisted of five letters. The measure of perceptual defense is the discrepancy between the total number of pages required to correctly identify the taboo and neutral words. The list of words and the instructions read to the subject appear in Appendix B.
Study II

Hypotheses

One area of overlap between psychoanalysis and learning theory has involved the acquisition and forgetting of conflictual material. The psychoanalytic emphasis on the mechanism of repression has stimulated research attempts to demonstrate the phenomenon. Similarly, psychologists have discussed the debilitating effect of anxiety on learning. It has frequently been assumed that conflict laden material is less readily learned because it gives rise to task irrelevant responses as a reaction to anxiety. It was hypothesized that Ss who score high on a measure of hostile guilt would increase the frequency of reinforced responses involving hostile content less readily than subjects who score low on a measure of hostile guilt.

The second hypothesis relating guilt to operant verbal conditioning assumed that Ss who score high on total guilt would be sensitized to "superego" content. By "superego" content we meant expressions related to self-criticism, inhibition of behavior, religion and morality. Because of their concern with these areas, we predicted that Ss who score high on a measure of total guilt would increase the frequency of reinforced responses involving superego content more readily than Ss who score low on a measure of total guilt.
Procedure

One hundred five females from an introductory psychology course served as Ss in this experiment. The Ss were administered the 50 item MIST in small groups. The MIST was scored according to the procedure outlined in the scoring manual. However, the ten stems (not including the filler stems) for which there are no scoring examples were not scored. The relatively infrequent omissions were pro-rated. Total guilt, sex guilt, hostile guilt, and conscience-morality guilt scores were found for each subject.

Most of the Ss had previously taken the Ohio State Psychological Examination and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.

The Ss were randomly assigned to two experimental conditions and were seen individually for the verbal conditioning task. Ss were presented with 120 3" by 5" card on which three pronouns, he, she, and I and three past tense verbs were typed. The pronouns were placed in a random order at the top of the card, while the verbs were randomly ordered and located on the lower portion of the card. One verb from each of the three categories was placed on each card. The three categories were hostile verbs, superego verbs, and neutral verbs which are related to motor activity. The 20 verbs comprising each category were randomly assigned to cards six times to make the total of 120 cards. Each group of 20 cards was shuffled after each subjects' performance
and the order of the six groups of 20 cards was also randomized.

The Ss' task was to make up a sentence using one of the pronouns as the first word in the sentence and to use one of the lower words on the card as the verb. The instructions and lists of verbs appear in Appendix C.

Fifty-two female Ss were randomly assigned to group A in which the use of hostile verbs was reinforced. Fifty-three female Ss were assigned randomly to group B in which the use of superego verbs was reinforced. The initial 20 trials were not reinforced to ascertain the Ss' operant level of responding. During the next 100 trials, each time the Ss composed a sentence employing a verb from the selected category, they received a verbal reinforcement. The reinforcement consisted of the E alternately saying "good" and "mmm-hmm" following the use of the proper verb.

After the last trial, the Ss were asked a series of seven questions to assess their awareness of the purpose of the experiment. The interview was rated for awareness. The questions which were asked as well as the rating categories employed are found in Appendix C.
CHAPTER VII

RESULTS

Three hypotheses were made concerning the MIST, the experimental conditions, and perceptual defense:

1. Ss who score high on a measure of sex guilt will have higher perceptual defense scores than Ss who score low on a measure of sex guilt.

2. Ss who are the Anxiety-Induction Experimental condition will have higher perceptual defense scores than Ss who are in the Anxiety-Reduction experimental condition.

3. The perceptual defense scores of Ss who score low on a measure of sex guilt will be more influenced by the experimental conditions than the perceptual defense scores of Ss who score high on a measure of sex guilt.

A double classification analysis of variance was used to analyze the data in testing the three hypotheses. The dependent variable was the perceptual defense score which was the total number of pages to recognize the five taboo words minus the total number of pages to recognize the five neutral words. One independent variable was the two experimental conditions. The other independent variable
reflected a splitting of the distribution of sex guilt scores at the median to obtain a high sex guilt group and a low sex guilt group. Since the perceptual defense task and the situational experimental conditions involved cues related to sex, the sex guilt subscale of the MIST was used as the measure of guilt. Table 6 contains the means, standard deviations, and N's of the four groups resulting from the double classification.

TABLE 6
THE MEANS AND SIGMAS OF THE PERCEPTUAL DEFENSE SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anxiety Reduction</th>
<th>Anxiety-Induction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Sex Guilt</strong></td>
<td>M = 4.72</td>
<td>M = 4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 4.19</td>
<td>SD = 5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 18</td>
<td>N = 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Sex Guilt</strong></td>
<td>M = 2.82</td>
<td>M = 7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 4.86</td>
<td>SD = 6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 22</td>
<td>N = 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 contains the results of the analysis of variance of the perceptual defense scores.
TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTUAL DEFENSE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Situations &amp; Sex Guilt &amp; Interaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84.64</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Guilt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Guilt X Experimental Conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>124.72</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>29.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A constant of 10 was added to all perceptual defense scores to simplify computations.

The same data was also analyzed by using Wilson's (1956) distribution free test of analysis of variance. The results of this analysis are reported in Table 8.

TABLE 8

WILSON'S CHI-SQUARED ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTUAL DEFENSE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Chi-squared</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex Guilt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (one-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>&lt;.02 (one-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Guilt X Experimental Conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>&lt;.08 (one-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>&lt;.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is evident from examining these tables that the second hypothesis is clearly supported. Both the parametric and non-parametric analyses of variance indicate that Ss who were in the Anxiety-Induction condition had significantly higher perceptual defense scores than Ss who were in the Anxiety-Reduction condition. A two by two chi-squared tests between the experimental conditions and the perceptual defense scores divided at the median yielded a $\chi^2 = 6.05$ which has a one-tailed significance beyond the .01 level.

The significance tests of the first and third hypotheses are harder to interpret. The parametric analysis of variance indicates that the sex guilt scale is not making a significant contribution to the variance as a main effect, while the results of distribution free analysis of variance indicate that the sex guilt effect is significant using a one-tailed test. A two by two chi-squared test between the sex guilt scores divided at the median and the perceptual defense scores divided at the median yield a $\chi^2 = 3.36$ which is significant beyond the .05 level using a one-tailed test.

The parametric analysis of variance yielded a significant interaction between sex guilt and the experimental conditions, while the distribution free analysis of variance yielded a trend in the direction of an interaction effect. An examination of the four group means in Table 6 indicates the interaction was the predicted one. Ss who scored low
on sex guilt were more influenced by the experimental conditions than Ss who scored high on sex guilt.

The difference in the results obtained by the non-parametric and parametric tests is a function of the greater sensitivity of the parametric tests to extreme perceptual defense scores which are opposite of what would be predicted by the sex guilt measure. When a case runs contrary to expectation in the chi-squared test, it is counted, but no method of weighting the magnitude of error in the contradictory score is present. In particular, the group of Ss who were low on sex guilt and were in the Anxiety-Induction condition contain a few individuals whose perceptual defense scores were quite high. The chi-squared tests only considers the frequency of these deviant scores while the parametric tests considers the magnitude of the scores. The difference in this cell appears to account for the parametric analysis revealing a clear interaction effect, as well as, no main effect for sex guilt. Since the parametric test utilizes more of the information contained in the data, greater reliance was placed on it in interpreting the results. Considering only the parametric analysis of the data, we conclude that hypothesis 1 is not supported, but hypotheses 2 and 3 are supported.

The same analyses of the data were undertaken using the total guilt score rather than the sex guilt score. An F ratio was obtained by dividing the mean square which was
composed of column, row, and interaction variance by the within groups or error variance estimates. Since the obtained $F = 1.21$ was not significant with three and 76 degrees of freedom, the variance was not further partitioned. Also, Wilson's distribution free test of analysis of variance was used to analyze the same data. The resulting total $\chi^2 = 5.43$ was not significant with three degrees of freedom. It appears that the total guilt measure is not as sensitive a predictor as the sex guilt subscale in situations involving sexual situational cues.

**Secondary Hypotheses**

As a secondary hypothesis, it was predicted that time spent looking at the "pin-ups" would be related to guilt as measured by the MIST. The total time spent looking was expected to be inversely related to guilt. A time difference score was computed by subtracting the time spent looking at the last three pictures when the examiner was present from the time spent looking at the first three "pin-ups" when the examiner was absent from the room. Ss who scored low on guilt were anticipated to be more influenced by the examiner's presence, and, hence, should yield larger time difference scores. Two by two contingency tables were formed relating both total guilt and sexual guilt to the dependent variables of total time and time difference. The results of these chi-squared tests are reported in Table 9.
TABLE 9

CHI-SQUARED TESTS RELATING GUILT TO TIME SPENT EXAMINING "PIN-UPS"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total time</th>
<th>Time difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Guilt</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = .20$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Guilt</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = -.20$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = .84$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A minus sign indicates an inverse relationship.

None of the chi-squared tests in Table 9 approach significance. The relationships are in the predicted direction for the sex guilt subscale.

Perceptual Defense and Social Desirability

Since Barthel (1961) has reported a relationship between a perceptual defense task and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, a two by two chi-squared test between the SD scores and perceptual defense scores of 57 Ss was computed. The chi-squared ($\chi^2 = .003$) was insignificant. A Wilson's distribution free analysis of variance with Marlowe-Crowne SD and the experimental conditions as main effects yielded an insignificant total $\chi^2 = 5.65$ with three degrees of freedom.

Study II

Hostile Verbs

The first hypothesis predicted that Ss who are low on a measure of hostile guilt will condition more readily to hostile content than Ss who score high on a measure of
hostile guilt. Figure 1 depicts the conditioning curves for all the Ss as well as for the Ss scoring high on hostile guilt and low on hostile guilt.

Block I consisted of 20 non-reinforced trials and was used to calculate each S's initial operant level. The last five blocks of 20 trials were the reinforced trials. A count of the number of hostile verbs used in each block of 20 trials were made. Table 10 contains the means for the occurrence of hostile verbs in the six blocks of 20 trials for all the subjects, the high hostile guilt Ss, and low hostile guilt Ss.

TABLE 10
THE MEANS OF THE NUMBER OF HOSTILE VERBS USED IN BLOCKS OF 20 TRIALS FOR THE TOTAL SUBJECTS, HIGH HOSTILE GUilt GROUP, AND LOW HOSTILE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Block I</th>
<th>Block II</th>
<th>Block III</th>
<th>Block IV</th>
<th>Block V</th>
<th>Block VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Subjects</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Hostile Guilt&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Hostile Guilt&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. N = 25.
2. N = 27.

In order to adequately test our hypothesis, conditioning should occur. A t test for matched individuals was computed between each S's score on Block I and Block VI. The t = 2.91 is highly significant (p < .01) with 51 degrees of freedom, which indicates that there is a significant increase
Fig. 1. CONDITIONING CURVES FOR HOSTILE VERBS.
in the use of hostile verbs from Block I to Block VI for the total group of subjects.

To test the hypothesis that there is a differential amount of conditioning for the high and low hostile guilt groups, a conditioning difference score was computed for each S by subtracting his frequency of usage of hostile verbs in Block I (operant level) from his frequency of usage of hostile verbs in Block VI (the last 20 conditioning trials). A t test for the significance of the difference between the mean conditioning difference scores for the high hostile guilt group and low hostile guilt group yield a $t = 2.03$ which is significant at the .05 level with 50 degrees of freedom. This t test indicates that Ss who score low on hostile guilt condition to hostile content more readily than Ss who score high on hostile guilt.

A more sensitive test of the hypothesis resulted from the application of an analysis of variance test. This test considered the difference between each S's operant level and each of the five blocks of reinforced trials. Difference scores were found by subtracting each S's operant level score from his hostile verb score on each of the other five blocks. An analysis of variance for repeated measurements on the same Ss for the two methods groups (high and low hostile guilt) was computed and is presented in Table 11.
TABLE 11

THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE CONDITIONING OF HOSTILE VERBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Methods (High Hostile Guilt Group and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>160.117</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Hostile Guilt Group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects in Same Group</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39.401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Trials (Blocks of 20 Conditioning Trials)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.648</td>
<td>1.646</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: Trials X Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.974</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: Pooled Subjects X Trials</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9.506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of variance presented in Table 11 indicates that the low hostile guilt group has significantly higher difference scores than does the high hostile guilt group. The between trials F was not significant. However, the sum of squares between trials does not take into consideration the fact that the scores are predicted to follow a learning curve and are not the usual between trials experimental conditions. The between trials variance can be partitioned into variance associated with linear and quadratic functions, and a remainder (cubic, quartic, etc.) following the orthogonal polynomial technique of Lewis (1948). Table 12 presents the resulting analysis of variance.
TABLE 12

THE PARTITIONING OF THE BETWEEN TRIALS VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear trend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.500</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>&lt; .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic trend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.659</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trials remainder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.716</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Pooled subjects X Trials</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9.506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F ratio of the between trials linear trend approaches, but does not reach, the .05 level of significance. This test is based on the mean scores for both the high hostile guilt and low hostile guilt groups. Since the methods variance of these groups is significant, separate analysis of variance were computed to see if the increase in the use of hostile verbs through the five trials would reach significance for one of the groups taken separately. Table 13 presents the analysis of variance for the low hostile guilt group and includes an analysis of the learning curve trends.

From Table 13 and Figure 1, we see that there is a significant difference between the block of trials for the low hostile guilt group. The curve follows an increasing linear trend.

The analysis of variance for the high hostile guilt group including the test for trend, is presented in Table 14.
TABLE 13
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE CONDITIONING OF HOSTILE VERBS
FOR THE LOW HOSTILE GUILT GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear Trend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.337</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>&lt;.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic Trend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trials Remainder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.207</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Trials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.730</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: Subjects</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 14
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE CONDITIONING OF HOSTILE VERBS
FOR THE HIGH HOSTILE GUILT GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear Trend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.724</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic Trend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.511</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trials Remainder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.677</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Trials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.892</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: Subjects</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis of variance indicates that there is no significant increase in the use of hostile verbs from blocks II to VI in the high Hostile guilt group.

The results of the analyses of variance reported in Tables 11 to 14 support the hypothesis that Ss low on
hostile guilt will increase the use of hostile verbs when that response category is reinforced more readily than Ss who are high on hostile guilt.

**Level of Awareness**

While the hypothesis in this study does not necessitate that the increase in the emission of hostile verbs be independent of conscious awareness, it seemed desirable to secure some estimation of the effect of the level of awareness of these Ss. The measure of awareness involved a rating of the Ss' responses to the seven post-conditioning questions. The Ss were placed in five categories by two independent raters. The raters placed the Ss in the same category 92 per cent of the time. Due to the small number of Ss in some of the five categories, they were combined into three categories (awareness, partial awareness, no awareness) in computing the analysis of variance reported in Table 15. The analysis of variance compares the effect of the three levels of awareness on a conditioning score computed by subtracting the Ss' operant level on the first block of 20 non-reinforced trials from the number of times hostile verbs were used in the final block of 20 reinforced trials.
TABLE 15
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE EFFECT OF LEVELS OF AWARENESS ON THE CONDITIONING OF HOSTILE VERBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.682</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the higher conditioning scores are found to increase with the level of awareness, the relationship is not significant. An analysis of variance using the three levels of awareness as the independent variable and the hostile guilt scores as the dependent variable is reported in Table 16.

TABLE 16
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RELATING LEVELS OF AWARENESS TO HOSTILE GUILT SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.400</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30.739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F test is not significant; in fact, the error variance is greater than the variance attributable to the grouping of Ss on the basis of levels of awareness during conditioning.

Secondary Hypotheses

Several additional measures were computed from the conditioning trials and compared to the guilt score. The number of times hostile verbs were used by the Ss during the
120 trials was counted. The frequency of usage of hostile verbs was expected to be inversely related to guilt. The number of times the Ss used the superego verbs during the 120 trials was counted. The frequency of usage of superego verbs was expected to be directly related to guilt. A difference score was obtained for each S by subtracting the total number of superego verbs (TS) from the total number of hostile verbs (TH) she used during the 120 trials. It was expected that this difference score would be inversely related to guilt. Two by two chi-squared tests were computed by dividing the various distributions of scores at the median. The results of the chi-squared tests are reported in Table 17.

TABLE 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Hostile Verbs</th>
<th>Total Superego Verbs</th>
<th>Difference (TH-TS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>-1.93 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4.89</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-7.74 &lt;.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;.03</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A minus sign indicates an inverse relationship.

All of the relationships in Table 17 are in the predicted direction. The hostile guilt subscale is significantly inversely related to the total hostile verb and difference (TH-TS) scores. The total guilt scale yielded the highest relationship to the frequency of usage of superego verbs.
Hostile Verbs and Social Desirability

Since Crowne and Strickland (In press) have reported a significant positive relationship between Marlowe-Crowne SD and the conditioning of plural nouns, the SD scores were compared with a measure of the conditioning of hostile verbs. Conditioning difference scores were obtained by subtracting the Ss' operant level score from their hostile verb score on the last 20 conditioning trials. A t test was used to test the significance of difference between the mean conditioning scores for Ss high or low on Marlowe-Crowne SD. The mean conditioning score for the high SD group was smaller than that of the low SD group. However, the t equaled 1.02 which is not significant with 38 degrees of freedom.

Superego Verbs

It was predicted that Ss who score high on a measure of guilt should condition more readily to guilt related content (i.e., superego verbs) than Ss who score low on a measure of guilt. Figure 2 depicts the conditioning curve for all the Ss, and the high total guilt group, and low total guilt group.

Block I consisted of 20 non-reinforced trials and was used to calculate each S's operant level. The last five blocks of 20 trials were the reinforced trials. A count of the number of superego verbs used in each block of
Fig. 2. CONDITIONING CURVES FOR SUPERGO VERBS.
20 trials was made. Table 18 contains the means of the frequency of usage of superego verbs for all the Ss and the high and low total guilt groups for all six blocks of trials.

**TABLE 18**

THE MEANS OF THE NUMBER OF SUPEREGO VERBS USED IN EACH BLOCK OF TRIALS FOR THE TOTAL SUBJECTS, HIGH TOTAL GUILT GROUP, AND LOW TOTAL GUILT GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Block I</th>
<th>Block II</th>
<th>Block III</th>
<th>Block IV</th>
<th>Block V</th>
<th>Block VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Subjects</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Total Guilt¹</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Total Guilt²</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. N = 27.

The statistical procedures which were applied to the conditioning of hostile verbs were applied similarly to the conditioning of superego verbs. A t test for matched individuals was used to compare the Ss' performance in Block I with Block VI. The mean usage of superego verbs for all Ss showed a significant increase from Block I to VI; hence, conditioning can be said to have occurred. The obtained $t = 4.08$ which is significant beyond the .001 level with 52 degrees of freedom.

A test of the difference between the two guilt groups in conditioning was made by subtracting each S's operant level score from his superego verb score on Block VI and computing a t test. While the mean of the high total guilt
group was larger than the mean of the low total guilt group, the obtained \( t = .80 \) which is insignificant with 51 degrees of freedom.

An examination of Figure 2 reveals that Block VI contains one of the smallest differences between the two curves. An analysis of variance for repeated measurements on the same subjects which compares the over-all performance of the high and low total guilt groups is presented in Table 19. Again, each S's operant level score was subtracted from the frequency of usage of superego verbs in each of the five conditioning blocks. The between trials variance has been partitioned and tested for trend through the use of orthogonal polynomials.

The analysis of variance indicates that the high and low total guilt groups differ in conditioning at about the .07 level of significance for a two-tailed test. Since the direction of the relationship was predicted, a one-tailed test would bring the probability level below the usually accepted .05 level of significance. The between trials variance is highly significant and the variance shows a definite linear trend as the examination of Figure 2 suggests.

An analysis of variance for the low total guilt group, including the partitioning of the between conditioning trials variance, is reported in Table 20.
## TABLE 19
THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE CONDITIONING OF SUPEREGO VERBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Methods (High and Low Total Guilt)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>134.710</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>&lt;.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects in the Same Group</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39.706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Trials (Blocks of 20 Conditioning Trials)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.032</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Trend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99.811</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic Trend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trials Remainder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.776</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: Trials X Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.909</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: Pooled Ss X Trials</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>5.534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TABLE 20
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE CONDITIONING CURVES OF THE LOW TOTAL GUILT GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Trials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.191</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Trend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.570</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic Trend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.153</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trials Remainder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.021</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder (Inter: Ss X Trials)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of variance for the high total guilt group is presented in Table 21.

TABLE 21

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE CONDITIONING CURVE OF THE HIGH TOTAL GUILT GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Trials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Trend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.015</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic Trend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.154</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trials Remainder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder (Interaction: Ss X Trials)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 20 and 21 indicate that for both high and low total guilt groups the between trials variance is significant and follows a linear trend.

Level of Awareness

The seven post-conditioning questions were rated for level of awareness. Two independent raters agreed 96 percent of their assignments. Because of the small number of Ss in some of the five categories, they were regrouped into three categories (no awareness, partial awareness, awareness). A single classification analysis of variance was computed using the conditioning difference score obtained by subtracting the number of superego verbs used in Block I from the number used in Block VI for each S as the
dependent variable. Table 22 contains the results of this analysis of variance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>138.482</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34.205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of the group means indicates that Ss who report noticing the reinforcer or who correctly identify the reinforced response class are significantly more likely to increase the frequency of usage of superego verbs than Ss who show less awareness.

The three awareness groups were used as a basis for classifying the total guilt scores in an analysis of variance which is reported in Table 23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.863</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>135.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 indicates that the error variance is much larger than the variance attributable to awareness. This result indicates that the difference between the high and low total guilt groups in the increase in mean usage of
superego verbs is not simply an artifact of greater awareness of the high total guilt group.

Secondary Hypotheses

Several additional measures were computed from the conditioning trials and compared to the total guilt score. The number of times each S used superego verbs during the 120 trials was counted. The frequency of usage of superego verbs was expected to be positively related to guilt. The number of times each S used hostile verbs during the 120 trials was counted. The total number of hostile verbs used was predicted to be inversely related to guilt. A difference score was obtained for each S by subtracting the total number of hostile verbs (TH) from the total number of superego verbs (TS) she used during the 120 trials. It was expected that this difference score would be positively related to guilt. Two by two chi-squared tests were computed by dividing the various distributions at the median. The results of the chi-squared tests are reported in Table 24.

TABLE 24

CHI-SQUARED TESTS OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF GUILT TO THE FREQUENCY OF USAGE OF SUPEREGO AND HOSTILE VERBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Superego</th>
<th>Total Hostile</th>
<th>Difference (TS-TH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Guilt</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A minus sign indicates an inverse relationship.
While all of the chi-squared tests in Table 24 are in the predicted direction, they do not approach an acceptable level of significance.

**Superego Verbs and Social Desirability**

The Marlowe-Crowne SD scale was compared to a conditioning difference score obtained by subtracting the frequency of usage of superego verbs in Block I from Block VI for each S. A $t$ test was used to test the significance of the difference between the mean condition score for Ss high and low on SD. The mean conditioning score for the high SD group was larger than the mean of the low SD group. However, the $t = 1.06$ which is not significant with 36 degrees of freedom.

**Discriminative Validity**

**Intelligence**

A Spearman Rank-Differences correlation between total guilt and scores on the Ohio State Psychological Examination (which were available for 73 male Ss) was computed. A $\rho = -.219$ was found. A $t$ test to test the significance of $\rho$ yielded a $t = 1.89$ which is not significant at the .05 level. For the 50 females for whom scores were available in the hostile verb condition, the Spearman rho between total guilt and the OSPE equaled -.04. A $\rho = -.02$ was found between the same variables for the 52 girls who participated in the superego verb condition.
Social Desirability

A Pearson correlation coefficient of $r = .004$ was obtained by relating total guilt to Edward's Social Desirability Scale for the 80 male Ss. A more extensive evaluation was made of the relationship between the guilt measure and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Table 25 reports the correlation of the Marlowe-Crowne SD and guilt scales for 57 male Ss.

**TABLE 25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morality-Conscience</th>
<th>Total Guilt</th>
<th>Hostile Guilt</th>
<th>Sex Guilt</th>
<th>Guilt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marlowe-Crowne SD</td>
<td>$r = .29^*$</td>
<td>$r = .26^*$</td>
<td>$f = .18$</td>
<td>$r = .14$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

The total guilt and hostile guilt scales are significantly related to Marlowe-Crowne SD.

Table 26 contains the correlations between the guilt measure and Marlowe-Crowne SD for 78 females.
### TABLE 26

**COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN GUILT AND MARLOWE-CROWNE SD FOR 78 FEMALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morality-Conscience Guilt</th>
<th>Total Guilt</th>
<th>Hostile Guilt</th>
<th>Sex Guilt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marlowe-Crowne SD r = .11</td>
<td>r = .16</td>
<td>r = -.01</td>
<td>r = .03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While none of the correlations reported in Table 26 are significant, the hostile guilt subscale was most highly correlated with Marlowe-Crowne SD.
CHAPTER VIII

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the two experiments, whose results we have just examined, is to provide some empirical evidence of the construct validity of the MIST measure of guilt. The hypotheses investigated were suggested by psychoanalytic and learning theory discussion of guilt. The same theoretical background which suggested the hypotheses that were investigated also suggested the referents that were used to score the MIST. The largely positive experimental findings reported in the results chapter offer evidence toward verification of the hypotheses and thus validation of the MIST.

While clinicians often discuss "guilt" as if it were a general unidimensional trait, the relatively low intercorrelations between the guilt subscales suggest that this is not an accurate conception. Although the shared variance reaches the .05 level of significance in most cases (in one of the six comparisons, the intercorrelation yielded a $r = .212$ when $r = .217$ is needed to reach the .05 level of significance) there is a statistically large portion of variance not shared with other subscales. In both
experiments, we found that the guilt subscale which related to the same content (i.e., sexual and hostile) as the dependent variable is more predictive than the total guilt score. These findings are not surprising. Even personality theories which rely primarily on "internal determinants" in predicting behavior recognize that dividing generalized constructs into more specific ones increases predictive utility. Personality theories which utilize a situational variable are even more cognizant that congruity of situational cues in the operational measure of a construct and in an independent behavioral response predicted by using the construct are important if prediction is to be successful. Rotter (1960) has cogently argued for an increased consideration of situational similarity in predicting behavior. Of course, the situational congruity of a sentence completion test and the experimental tasks in this study is quite disparate. However, sexual content in a sentence completion test and in a perceptual recognition task appears to be one type of situational cue. The sexual content may lead the subject to categorize both situations as related to sex and hereby evoke a similar set of behavior potentials, expectancies, and reinforcement values which are a function of prior experiences that have been similarly classified.

Other investigators have found it profitable to speak of "guilts" rather than "guilt." There is evidence
from another study that this is not simply an artifact of the MIST measure of guilt. Miller and Swanson (1960), on the basis of their results, in which they found no relationship between intensity of guilt in one moral area with intensity in other moral areas, have concluded that generalized statements about "guilt" may not be justified.

In Study I we examined the influence of sex guilt as an inhibitor of taboo sex-related responses. Psychoanalytic theorists have made a distinction between two motives for the inhibition of response. One motive for response inhibition is fear of external punishment. In this study our experimental conditions were designed to provide cues relevant to the subjects' expectancy for external punishment. The experimental results supported the hypothesis that the subjects' response inhibition is influenced by situational cues relevant to expectancies for external punishment. A second motive for response inhibition is a fear of internal punishment or the anticipation of the guilt feeling proper. The MIST purported to measure this generalized expectancy for self-mediated punishment which should lead to response inhibition. The experimental results did not clearly support this hypothesis. While the sentence completion measure of sex guilt influenced perceptual defense behavior as a component of a significant interaction with the experimental conditions, a direct relationship between sex guilt and perceptual defense was
not supported by parametric analyses of the data. An examination of the interaction effect revealed that the subjects who scored low on sex guilt were more influenced by the Anxiety-Induction and Anxiety-Reduction conditions, as we had predicted. The subjects who were low on sex guilt and were in the Anxiety-Reduction experimental condition had the lowest mean perceptual defense score. The subjects who were low on sex guilt and were in the Anxiety-Induction condition had the highest mean perceptual defense score. Both groups of subjects who were high on sex guilt had mean perceptual defense scores which were intermediate to those of the two low sex guilt groups.

This study highlights the importance of the distinction between expectancies for internal and external punishment as an inhibitor of tabooed behavior. Consideration of both motives for the inhibition of responses should increase the precision of prediction over either taken alone. If a situation could be found where the subjects were not influenced by expectancies for external punishment, perhaps the relationship between the guilt measure and the inhibition of tabooed behavior might reach significance.

While there are arguments that the isolation of a single variable for experimental investigation is a meritorious procedure, too frequently, the arguments are used inappropriately to defend an ignoring of relevant variables rather than a control of extraneous variables. If one
ignores rather than controls a subject's expectancy for external punishment while attempting to study guilt, then it is possible that the experimental results may be quite surprising. The interaction effect found in this study suggests that if situational cues lead to a high expectancy for external punishment for tabooed behavior in that situation, subjects who are low on guilt may show greater response inhibition than subjects who score high on guilt. While we had predicted that the inhibitory responses of subjects who were low on guilt would be more strongly influenced by situational cues, we had assumed that the effects of guilt and the expectancy for external disapproval would be additive. Our rationale for predicting that the behavior of low guilt subjects should vary more as a function of the experimental conditions was based on their relative lack of internalized standards opposing tabooed behavior. Since the Generalized Expectancy for self-mediated punishment for violating, anticipating the violation of, or failure to attain internalized standards of proper behavior (GEs) is relatively ineffective, the Expectancy for external negative reinforcement (Es) should contribute the major influence on the inhibitory behavior potential.

The problem is to explain why the low sex guilt subjects in the Anxiety-Induction condition should obtain
perceptual defense scores which are higher than the perceptual defense scores of the high sex guilt subjects in the same condition. The experimental results seem to indicate, that if the effect of $GE^G$ and $E^E$ are additive, then subjects who have a low $GE^G$ interpret the situational cues in such a way as to obtain a higher $E^E$ than those subjects who have a high $GE^G$. Perhaps, individuals who attend almost exclusively to external cues in governing their unacceptable behavior become more sensitive to situational cues regarding the probability of external positive or negative reinforcement, while individuals who have internalized standards of proper behavior may become relatively insensitive to situational cues since their behavior is guided by internalized standards. Also, it might be the case that the two effects are not additive. Additional experimental investigation is needed to determine the exact relationship between these two motives for response inhibition. Future studies might investigate the relative sensitivity of subjects who score high and low on guilt to situational cues related to external negative reinforcement.

In Study II, we examined the relationship of guilt to verbal conditioning. We predicted that guilt should be differentially related to operant verbal conditioning as a function of the content that is reinforced. We predicted that subjects high on hostile guilt would condition less readily to hostile content than subjects scoring low on
hostile guilt. The data supported this hypothesis. Again, the rationale for the hypothesis stemmed from psychoanalytic and learning theory notions that guilt over hostility should be aroused by the hostile content and lead to a tendency to inhibit the use of the hostile content or to a disruption of the learning process due to the evocation of irrelevant responses related to the guilt-motivated inhibitory response.

We predicted that subjects who scored high on guilt would condition more readily to superego content than subjects scoring low on guilt. The data tentatively supported this hypothesis. If a less stringent one-tailed test is applied, the difference in conditioning is significant beyond the traditionally acceptable .05 level. The rationale for this hypothesis was that subjects who score high on a measure of guilt are sensitized to guilt-related content and will select responses which permit the expression of feelings of self-criticism and self-remorse.

In testing this hypothesis the total guilt scale was used rather than the morality-conscience guilt subscale. The morality-conscience guilt subscale appears, upon inspection of the stems, to be much more heterogeneous in content than the other subscales. Likewise, the superego verbs are a more heterogeneous category than the hostile verbs. The use of a subscale rather than a total score would be advantageous only if the content of the scale
closely parallels the type of situational cues present in the performance to be predicted. Examination of the verbs and stems used does not show sufficient overlap to expect an increase in prediction on the basis of situational similarity. Therefore, the longer, more reliable total guilt score was used.

The relationship of awareness to conditioning deserves comment. The level of awareness was significantly related to the conditioning of superego verbs, but was not significantly related to the conditioning of hostile verbs. Approximately equal numbers of subjects from both conditions were classified as "aware," "partially aware," and "unaware." It is not clear why one relationship and not the other is significant.

Another problem related to awareness is whether the term "conditioning" is applicable where the subjects are able to verbalize some awareness of reinforcement-response class contingencies. The term "conditioning" has usually been reserved for the acquisition of relatively simple responses which are automatic or "reflex-like." Of course, the decision as to what work to use to label a phenomenon is arbitrary. Our hypotheses required only that the frequency of the emitted response class increase differentially to a social reinforcer as a function of scores on the MIST measure of guilt. For our purposes, it is not necessary to
demonstrate that the increase in frequency of usage of hostile or superego verbs occurs without awareness. The linguistic confusion surrounding "awareness" or "unconscious" and the role of such a construct in personality theory are subjects that require further clarification and investigation.

From these two studies, we conclude that there is empirical evidence that the MIST measure of guilt is an useful operational definition of the construct for certain purposes. Hypotheses generated by theoretical discussion of guilt received some verification using the MIST as a measure of the independent variable.

Another aspect of the construct validation of a measure involves the examination of relationships which should not exist under conditions of adequate test construction. Theoretical discussion of guilt do not predict a relationship with intelligence. The MIST measure of guilt is not significantly related to scores on the Ohio State Psychological Examination. The inverse relationship between the measures was higher for the males than for the females. If further investigations reveal the inverse correlation between guilt and intelligence to be relatively stable around the value reported in this study, then efforts should be made to eliminate the factors leading to the common variance from the scoring system.
The relationship of social desirability and guilt to the requirements of discriminant validity are more complex. Edwards (1957) has viewed social desirability as a characteristic of test items. It certainly is not desirable to construct a test whose items reflect a large portion of variance attributable to social desirability rather than to the construct the test purports to measure. Therefore, the absence of a relationship between the Edwards' SDS and guilt support the discriminant validity of the MIST.

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale was significantly related to the guilt scores of the males but not to the scores of the females. At first blush, this finding seems to indicate a defect in the MIST. However, the theoretical frameworks of social desirability and guilt are not sufficiently elaborated to insure that the common variance is not predictable. Crowne has interpreted social desirability as a personality rather than as a test characteristic. The behavior of endorsing the items on the scale is seen to reflect a need for social approval.

Breger (1961) has offered another interpretation of the personality characteristic measured by the Marlowe-Crowne SD scale. He indicated that an inspection of the scale reveals that 19 out of 33 items deal with a denial of hostility, e.g., "I have never intensely disliked anyone" (true), or "I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way" (false). After reviewing the experimental literature,
Breger concluded that an explanation involving the assumption that the scale measures repressed hostility may be feasible.

In the present study the correlation between the hostile guilt subscale and the Marlowe-Crowne SD scale was the highest of the subscale correlations for both males and females. There was an insignificant trend for SD to be inversely related to the conditioning of hostile verbs. Regarding the scale as a measure of a need for social approval Crowne and Strickland predicted and found a positive relationship to the conditioning of plural nouns (neutral content). When the content used in the verbal conditioning is non-socially approved (i.e., hostile), it is conceivable that the authors would make a different prediction. Since both the guilt and SD scales are related to the inhibition of socially disapproved behaviors, we can expect some overlap in their variance. If the argument presented by Breger is valid, we expect the greatest overlap to occur in the area of hostility. The two scales do reflect an attempt to measure different constructs. Presumably, the SD scale is more concerned with expectancies for external positive and negative social reinforcement, which the MIST purports to measure a generalized expectancy for internal negative reinforcement.

It appears that the initial efforts to provide evidence towards the construct validity of the MIST measure
of guilt have been largely successful. The experimental results of the two studies we have discussed suggest that the measure of guilt has some predictive utility. An examination of the discriminant validity reveals no gross imperfection in the measure as a function of social desirability and intelligence. However, further refinement of the measure should pay close attention to these potential contributors to error variance.
CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY

While personality theorists have imputed a powerful explanatory role to the guilt construct, relatively little research has been designed to investigate the nomological net involving guilt. Perhaps, one reason more research related to guilt has not been forthcoming is the lack of a suitable measure of guilt. The development and validation of a sentence completion measure of guilt may serve as an impetus for further research involving the guilt construct.

The Mosher Incomplete Sentences Test (MIST) is a 50 stem sentence completion blank which can be quantitatively scored for guilt. Trained raters can reliably score the MIST to obtain a total guilt score and three subscale scores, hostile guilt, sex guilt, and morality-conscience guilt.

A conviction that personality theory has an important role to play, not only in generating the hypotheses used to validate a measure of a construct, but, also, in suggesting the referents used to quantitatively measure a construct has guided the efforts in developing and validating the MIST. In the development of the MIST scoring manual, the scoring
of the sentence completions incorporates the referents for guilt which have been suggested by psychoanalytic theory.

Two studies were designed to investigate hypotheses stemming from psychoanalytic and behavior theory discussions of guilt. By using the MIST as the operational definition of guilt, evidence related to the construct validity of the MIST was obtained.

The first study investigated three hypotheses concerning the effects of guilt and fear of external punishment on the inhibition of unacceptable behavior as measured by performance in a perceptual defense task. The results indicated that sex guilt scores are not significantly related to perceptual defense scores as a main effect. The second hypothesis which concerned the inhibition of unacceptable behavior as a function of two experimental conditions designed to increase or decrease the subjects' fear of external punishment, was confirmed. A third hypothesis which stated that subjects who score low on a measure of sex guilt will be more influenced by the Anxiety-Induction and Anxiety-Reduction experimental conditions than subjects who score high on sex guilt was also supported.

The second study related the MIST measure of guilt to operant verbal conditioning. The results supported the hypothesis that subjects who score high on a measure of hostile guilt will condition less readily to hostile content than subjects who are low on a measure of guilt. A
second hypothesis involved the relationship of guilt to the conditioning of "superego" content. The results support the prediction that subjects who score high on a measure of guilt will condition more readily to "superego" content than subjects who score low on a measure of guilt.

Evidence for the discriminant validity of the MIST was provided by examining the relationship of guilt to intelligence and social desirability. The MIST measure of guilt was not significantly related to intelligence as measured by the OSPE, although a trend towards an inverse relationship was found for the male subjects. The MIST was not significantly correlated with the Edwards' Social Desirability Scale. While some of the correlations of the MIST with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale were statistically significant, theoretical reasons preclude considering this relationship as a defect in the MIST.

While psychoanalytic theory directly influenced the development of the measure and the generation of the hypotheses for the study, Rotter's Social Learning Theory provided a valuable clarification of the theoretical conceptualizations employed. In particular, Rotter's emphasis on the situational variable augmented the clarity of the theoretical conceptualizations and the interpretation of the results.

In summary, the initial attempts to provide evidence of the discriminant and construct validity of the MIST measure of guilt have been largely successful.
MOSHER INCOMPLETE SENTENCES TEST

Complete these sentences to express your real feelings. Try to do every one. Be sure to make a complete sentence.

1. People ________________________________
2. When I tell a lie __________________________
3. The idea of murder is __________________________
4. When I have sexual dreams __________________________
5. My father ________________________________
6. I tried to make amends __________________________
7. When someone swears at me __________________________
8. Masturbation ________________________________
9. I punish myself ________________________________
10. After childhood fight, I felt __________________________
11. If in the future I committed adultery __________________________
12. I could not do it because __________________________
13. Most women ________________________________
14. "Dirty" jokes in mixed company __________________________
15. After an argument ________________________________
16. Back home ________________________________
17. I should have been punished for __________________________
18. When I was a child, sex __________________________
19. To kill in war ________________________________
20. Sex relations before marriage __________________________
21. Sin and failure ________________________________
22. Other people

23. Petting

24. Arguments leave me feeling

25. Unusual sex practices

26. I detest myself for

27. If I had sex relations, I would feel

28. If I robbed a bank

29. I

30. As a child, sex play

31. When caught in the act

32. When anger builds inside me

33. Men

34. A guilty conscience

35. If I felt like murdering someone

36. One should not

37. I hate

38. A mother

39. After an outburst of anger

40. When I have sexual desires

41. When I was younger, fighting

42. I regret

43. Women who curse

44. The idea of incest is

45. Capital punishment

46. If I hated my parents
47. Obscene literature______________________________

48. If I committed a homosexual act____________________

49. Prostitution____________________________________

50. If I killed someone in self-defense, I____________________

____________________________________________________
The Scoring Manual for Guilt

The MIST is to be scored by assigning numerical weights of 0 to 5 to the various completions. To facilitate scoring, examples based on 51 males and 60 females are provided. Since we cannot hope to list all possible completions, general scoring principles are also provided. The principles should help determine the proper weight to be assigned when there is no example which is relevant to the unusual completion. In addition to the numerical weights, the stems or completions will be categorized on the basis of their content. We may distinguish three sub-categories of the total score, which is the sum of the weights on the various stems. Stems and/or completions may be categorized as "hostile," "sexual," or general "morality-conscience."

Scoring principles. Guilt may be defined as a generalized expectancy for self-mediated punishment for violating, anticipating the violation of, or failure to attain internalized standards of proper behavior. The referents for guilt include painful feelings of self-criticism, self-blame, and self-reproach which arise from violating or anticipating the violation of internalized standards of "proper" conduct. Guilt may involve a lessening of self-esteem for failing to live in accordance with ideals or from failure to attain certain "ought to" goals. The proper behavior, ideals, and goals vary from sub-culture to sub-culture. It is assumed that the scorer is familiar with the socially accepted moral code or standards of proper behavior of Western society, and of college students in particular. Further referents for the presence of guilt include attempts at restitution or undoing; inhibition and suppression of hostile and sexual impulses; self-punishment and ascetic denial; the employment of defense mechanisms; scientifically unsupported beliefs that condemned acts are physically or mentally damaging; confession of sinfulness and anticipation of punishment; depression; and marked interest in or involvement with religion and morality.

Indicators of guilt accompanied by very strong affect receive a scoring weight of 5. Completions to be given this scoring weight include the following general types of completions: (a) statements of extreme disgust or revulsion generally considered to be out of proportion to the stimulus, (b) statements that people who commit condemned acts are abnormal or insane, (c) reports of physical illness to feelings of anger or thoughts of sex, (d) reports of extreme feelings of being or doing evil, (3) reports that the individual will never forgive himself for committing condemned
acts. This scoring weight is used relatively infrequently and for some stems no scoring examples are provided.

Indicators of guilt accompanied by moderate to strong affect receive a scoring weight of 4. The general types of completion to be assigned this scoring weight include the following: (a) admissions or anticipations of feelings of guilt, shame, remorse, or sinfulness, (b) statements that certain acts are harmful or detrimental, (c) statements indicating fear of unacceptable thoughts (d) statements that persons who commit condemned acts should seek moral or mental help, (e) statements indicating that certain acts lead to depression, (f) admission of "general" wrong doing, and (g) statements indicating a need for punishment or ascetic denial, (h) reports involving the individual's attempts at restitution or undoing.

Indicators of mild to moderate guilt receive a scoring weight of 3. Often there is guilty content with little emotional involvement. Condemnation of improper behavior or moral platitudes which are in keeping with society's moral code but which lacks evidence of personal involvement are used to infer mild guilt, since the probability of the inhibition of unacceptable acts increases with their presence. The general types of completions which are assigned scoring weights of 3 include the following: (a) statements that the condemned behavior is "wrong" or "bad" with little evidence of affective concern, (b) statements that society condemns certain behaviors, (c) moral platitudes, (d) statements that the person attempts to control or should control impulses, (e) admission of a "specific" wrong doing, (f) statements that if a condemned act is committed, then punishment will follow, (g) statements that when faced with hostility or sexual impulses one should think of something else or leave the field, (h) statements that when one does wrong he should confess, (i) reports indicating an inability to recall past sexual or hostile events, (j) reports indicating slight depression, (k) and statements which belittle condemned acts as silly, stupid or ridiculous.

Most neutral completions receive a scoring weight of 2. All omissions are assigned a weight of 2. Omissions should be discouraged and there are usually very few when the scale is administered in small groups. Omissions may be prorated if they are frequent. Definitions, blatant denial or avoidance of the stem content, cultural cliches incomplete thoughts or phrases, and completions which otherwise defy classification are assigned scoring weights of 2.
Sentence completion which seem to be mildly to moderately non-guilty receive a scoring weight of 1. The general types of statements assigned the weight include the following: (a) statements that condemned acts are natural or normal, (b) statements that socially condemned acts are a common occurrence or have been committed by the individual, (c) statements indicating that the individual seldom engages in propiatory acts, (d) statements indicating that the person openly admits or wishes to express socially condemned feelings, (e) statements indicating the person expresses aggression verbally on non-living objects, (f) hostility toward the blank or examiner, (g) statements indicating some acceptance of hostile or sexual needs, (k) statements that provide a justification for committing socially condemned acts.

Completions which indicate an absence of guilt receive a scoring weight of 0. The general types of completions which are scores 0 include the following: (a) statements that socially condemned acts are normal and desirable, or natural with some affective involvement, (b) statements concerning hypothetical situations in which plans to avoid detection are made, (c) statements which deny feelings of guilt, (d) statements indicating that hostile and sexual needs are satisfied or satisfaction is actively sought, (e) statements that hostile or sexual acts are pleasurable.

Scoring categories. In addition to a total score for the guilt measure, the sentence completions are scores for three content areas. The stems may be divided into four groups, hostile, sexual, morality-conscience, and filler stems. The hostile stems are numbers 3, 7, 10, 15, 19, 24, 28, 32, 35, 37, 39, 41, 45, 46, and 50. The sexual stems are numbers 4, 8, 11, 14, 18, 20, 23, 25, 27, 30, 40, 44, 48, and 49. The morality-conscience stems are numbers 2, 6, 9, 12, 17, 21, 26, 31, 34, 36, 42, 43, and 47. The filler stems are numbers 1, 5, 13, 16, 22, 29, 33, and 38. The filler stems were taken from the Rotter Incomplete Sentences Blank, as were stems numbered 37 and 42. These stems can be scored for maladjustment using the Manual of Rotter and Rafferty (1950). The fillers are ordinarily not scored for guilt. Occasionally, one of the filler stems will evoke hostile, sexual, or morality-conscience content; when this happens, it is scored according to the scoring principles and assigned to a content category as well as included in the total score.

The hostile stem, plus any hostile content on the filler stems comprise the guilt over hostility subscore.
The scoring weights for the sexual stems, plus any sexual content on the filler stems are summed to determine the guilt over sex subscore. The morality-conscience subscore is the sum of the scoring weights assigned to the stems placed within that category. The latter category is more heterogeneous, and it includes stems concerning conscience, guilt, self-punishment, and moral straitenses.

Scoring Examples for Males

WHEN I TELL A LIE...

(5)

(4) I feel guilty; my conscience bothers me; I am ashamed; it is written all over my face; I usually feel guilty; I feel badly afterwards; it hurts; my conscience bothers me a great deal; I know I have done something wrong;

(3) I realize I shouldn't have; I feel uneasy about it; I blush and always get caught; I am nervous about it; it is an exception or rather an odd occurrence; it shows by the redness of my face; I always have the truth afterward anyway; I usually regret it; I don't like it; I don't; I usually feel bad; I think the person I am telling it to knows it;

(2) (omissions); I tell a lie;

(1) I feel very little guilt; I usually have a good reason; I usually feel justified; it is only because I think that is the best thing to do at the time; it is because to tell the truth would make it worse;

(0) I do not have a guilty conscience; I mix it with truth and serve it like a Martini; I wonder whether or not i"ll get away with it; I make it a good one;

THE IDEA OF MURDER IS

(5) it takes an insane person to murder; sickening; nauseating;

(4) rather frightening; terrible; wrong in my mind; revolting; against the basic rules of mankind; repugnant; appalling; evil and should not be committed in the U.S.; to become unbalanced enough to kill a person; disgusting; very cruel;
(3) stupid; wrong; not agreeable to me; something I have never had; not a human instinct; out of the question; crazy; awful silly; not appealing; utterly ridiculous; hardly ever justifiable; not an enjoyable thing; not a solution to anything;

(2) (omissions); I have absolutely no idea; to kill a person; to kill; hatred, passion or greed;

(1) prevalent in modern society; to exterminate a person you hate very much; funny; of no matter to me; repulsive but understandable; not new to me, thinking mostly of a war situation; of little concern to me;

(0) an idea that intrigues me; gain sort of a personal glory;

WHEN I HAVE SEXUAL DREAMS...

(5)

(4) I wake up and feel very guilty and ashamed; I get disgusted with myself; they depress me;

(3) I feel tired; I don't, I'm usually too tired to dream; I cannot remember them in the morning; I don't remember what they were exactly about; hardly ever; I don't; I wake up with a feeling of loneliness; I forget them the following morning; I forget them; I am sleeping and they come with other dreams;

(2) (omissions); I wake up sleepy, like every other morning; I am asleep; I don't asleep; I usually wake up; it usually wakes me up;

(1) They are wet; I can usually tell in the morning; they don't upset me; I wake up feeling better; I realize these are normal; I wake up feeling better; I do not worry about their meaning; I am very content; I try to sleep longer; I often sleep well; I realize they are a natural occurrence; I do not let it bother me; I wake up aroused; they seem real;

(0) I enjoy them; I wake up happy; they're great ones; they make me feel good; I long for women; oh boy!
I TRIED TO MAKE AMENDS...

(5)

(4) for wrong doings; because I was wrong; for things I have done wrong; to those I unconsciously hurt; for my improper action;

(3) to the people I offend; but didn't succeed the first time; for being a clod; for doing so badly autumn quarter; but failed; if I provoke someone; when doing harm to someone; for my lackadaisical effort in High School by trying in college; but found it better to do the right thing; for my mistakes; when my best buddy and I fought; as soon after the argument as I could; but to no avail (?)

(2) (omissions); at the time best suited; for the accident; by doing something nice; by being polite;

(1) only when I really desired to; but it is usually a waste of time; it never works; and I succeeded; and as usual it was very easy; with some people that I've mistreated but they are not always accepted;

(0) hardly ever; only in special cases;

WHEN SOMEONE SWEARS AT ME

(5)

(4) I am not offended;

(3) I think nothing of it; I pay no attention; I don't think about it because it is common; I lose respect for that person; I usually take it and leave; I disregard them; I usually do not swear back; I think he is very uncouth; it usually doesn't bother me much; I have no feeling about it; I considered their vocabulary limited; I usually try to forget it; I don't pay any attention; I walk away; I usually ignore him; it has little influence; I could care less;

(2) (omissions).

(1) I get angry or else hurt; I take little offense till he swings; I become angry inside; it moves me little; his swearing bothers me; it usually bothers me even if I don't show it; I swear back, sometimes out loud; I usually swear at him under my breath; I think less of him.
(0) I swear back; I get angry; I look at the person to see just who the heck he is; I get very angry; I feel angry; I don't like it and I say so; I must swear right back; I get mad; I usually swear back;

MASTURBATION...

(5) Is sickening; is a nauseating act of frustration.

(4) is wrong and a sin; is morbid; is stupid; is evil; is bad for mental health; is a foul practice.

(3) seemed wrong to me a few years ago; is an unfortunate habit; should not become habitual; is for kids; is not good for the young men; keeps one awake; is a bad way to satisfy sexual desires; isn't so good; are for the younger fellows; should not be practiced; is a habit that should be controlled; is not necessary for normal health; is something most people won't admit.

(2) who...me?

(1) is only harmful if worried about; is natural among men; seems to be common when young; is common among both sexes, but mainly men; is widely practiced; can be used as a relief for sexual tensions; is very common; is natural; occurs with many people; is a normal practice; is all right; occurs in our society; can be a form of emotional release; is not a sin; will always be a release.

(0) helps one feel eased and relaxed; is a normal outlet for sexual desires; is a part of relieving sex desires; is something which should not leave guilt feelings.

I PUNISH MYSELF...

(5)

(4) for the evil I do; with guilty feelings; quite often; for many minor things; if I feel I have done something wrong; for being persuaded to do the wrong thing by people; in many peculiar ways; through my conscience.

(3) by feeling sorry for myself; for leaving my brother; for not studying; for little mistakes rather than big ones; by working too hard; for making foolish mistakes when I make mistakes; by denying myself a privilege;
for only grievous faults; for mistakes; for failing; 
when I don't do as well as I think I can do; for big 
mistakes; when I do something wrong; for shortcomings; 
when I think I can do better; by admitting my fault to 
the offended party; when I feel I need punishing; after 
a stupid move; for failing at things; by not correcting 
my faults; with lots of work; only for stupidity.

(2) (omissions);

(1) very seldom; for very few things; not too often; very 
infrequently; when I shouldn't; very rarely; unneces-
sarily for failure; little; rarely.

(0) never; hardly ever.

AFTER A CHILDHOOD FIGHT, I FELT...

(5)

(4) ashamed; down beaten and wanting escape; miserable; 
greatly disturbed; remorseful; guilty and ashamed;

(3) hurt and alarmed; nervous; depressed; I never had a 
serious fight; weak; a loss of friendship; all tensed 
up, and bad if I lost; bad;--had none--; dirty; hurt.

(2) quite flushed; quivery; (omissions).

(1) relieved; bitter; big; gratified if I won; tough; good 
if I won; great but nervous; good if I won, bad other-
wise; fairly good; pretty good; that I had accomplished 
something.

(0) great; mad and irritable; very proud of myself; mad; 
proud and powerful; a great anger; like I was a hero; 
angry.

IF IN THE FUTURE I COMMITTED ADULTERY...

(5) I would never forgive myself; I wouldn't be able to live 
with myself;

(4) I would not blame anyone but myself; I would be extremely 
ashamed; I would be concerned as to what caused me to do 
it;--absurd; I would not give up, but face the fact, 
repent and go on; it would be sinful; I would be very 
much ashamed; I would try to seek forgiveness; I would 
feel guilty to break the commandments; I would imme-
diately see a Priest; I would have committed a sin;
I would be ashamed;

(3) I would see a Priest; I would probably be remorseful; I would be sorry; try to make amends; I would probably feel bad about it; I would think something was the matter with my marriage; I could not forget it; I would be ashamed but not say anything about it; I would probably marry the girl; which I wouldn't;

(2) (omissions);

(1) I wouldn't tell anyone; I'd stand my ground; my wife would not approve; I should pay for my fun; my wife would divorce me;

(0) I would enjoy it; I doubt if it would bother me very much; I hope I enjoy it; I don't want to be cut; I would not be ashamed; it would be because I wanted it; I will not feel as if I have sinned;

I COULD NOT DO IT BECAUSE...

(5) the law of God does not permit it...this is not the law of man.

(4) Of a conscience; I knew it was wrong; my conscience bother me; of my beliefs; I have a code of ethics; it was wrong; I shouldn't;

(3) I was not capable; it was against my better judgment; I am not capable of doing it; my bringing up was not that way; it might hurt someone; it would bother my parents; I knew better; it wasn't right; I might be caught; it wasn't honorable; of the seriousness involved; I did not want to; I got an attack of conscience or cold feet; I didn't feel it was right to; the consequences were too great.

(2) I could not afford it; I didn't think first; I was not sure; I didn't have the nerve; I didn't have the will power; I didn't try; I didn't practice enough; of my past experience; I thought about it first; I felt different; I froze; I didn't try hard enough; I did not have the ability.

(0) I didn't think of it; I can see no good reason why I should; I do not have the chance.
"DIRTY" JOKES IN MIXED COMPANY...

(5) is an indication of perverted minds; only lead to evil;

(4) are strictly out; --it takes "dirty" company; sometimes
bother me; are uncouth and ridiculous; are a sign of a
dirty mind; embarrasses me;

(3) are in very poor taste; are wrong; is not a good thing
to practice; are often out of place; should be avoided;
are coarse to say the least; are bad; does not meet my
approval; are difficult to cope with; are not proper;
should not be told;

(2) (omissions);

(1) depends on the mixed company; are to be listened to;
have little effect; is common in our town; if adult
enough is all right; are all right if done properly;
can be funny depending on the company; is O.K. if
couples are known real well, otherwise bad taste;

(0) are usually funny; makes them more interesting; are
lots of fun;

AFTER AN ARGUMENT...

(5)

(4) I become very nervous; I am sorry for my actions; I
feel very bad; I wonder how I could have avoided it;
I feel guilty; I'm remorseful; I am a nervous wreck;
I am disgusted that I allowed myself to become in-
volved; I wonder if I were really right in arguing;

(3) I feel very tense; I try to clam myself by working at
something; I forget about it; I cool off quickly; I
feel frustrated; I try to correct the difference; I
am sorry and see no reason to stay mad; I usually see
what my opponent was getting at; I keep to myself; the
reason is usually found to be silly; I usually find
that I have forgotten the point; I usually am sorry
that I argued; with my wife I feel low; I usually give
in; I don't feel angry, I want to make up;

(2) (Omissions); I shake all over; I am usually very warm;

(1) I usually feel good, if I won; I usually feel better
because my mind is relieved; I sometimes feel good;
something should be settled; I feel proud in victory,
and understanding in defeat; I am satisfied usually; I usually feel better.

(0) I feel much better, especially if I win; I think of a better argument to use next time; I am usually angry; I am livid with rage;

I SHOULD HAVE BEEN PUNISHED FOR...

(5) forty days and forty nights;

(4) several of my wrongdoings; many things I have done wrong; doing wrong; a lot of things; my failures, they were so stupid; my sins; the crime I had done;

(3) doing many childhood pranks; many things; my outburst; not working harder; stealing; not studying in high school; smoking when I was young; being continually late for dinner; several things; various acts; doing what I did; hurting others feelings; some thing I did as a young boy;

(2) (omissions); give me a week on this one; it;

(1) lots of things--but I'll never tell; few things I haven't been punished for; some of the things I got away with;

(0) I can't thing of anything; nothing;

WHEN I WAS A CHILD, SEX...

(5) was a dirty and filthy word;

(4) was not a word spoken; was never spoken of; was never mentioned at home; never entered my mind; was dirty; reared its ugly head;

(3) was not comprehended; was somewhat distorted; was hard to understand; was not thought about much; did not mean much to me; was only a matter of boys and girls, men and women; unimportant and meaningless; was far from my first love; was a confused subject for me; wasn't too important; was a mystery to me; went unnoticed; meant nothing, who noticed girls then?;

(2) (omissions);

(1) was something to kid about; caused a curiosity in me; did not interest me as it does now;
(0) excited me; was introduced at an early age; was something I was eager to learn about; was alluring;

TO KILL IN WAR...

(5)

(4) is still killing and wrong; is as bad as to kill in peace; causes some people to feel guilty; isn't so good either; is wrong; is not all right; seems unnecessary;

(3) is not a great sin; isn't as bad as murder; is a necessary wrong; is a shame but sometimes a necessity; is forgivable; is not right but we must protect our homes; is something each man must decide for himself;

(2) (omissions); is the only way to kill legally;

(1) Is necessary; must be done if you are to survive; is all right if duty calls; is justified; is all right if you are doing it for a cause you and many others believe in; is within the law; is a job to be done; is not my concern; is what is expected of one; is the orders of your superiors; is excusable; is justifiable due to the circumstances;

(0) is not morally wrong; is completely justifiable; is good and meritable; is a duty or obligation and it must be done; is usual and a pleasure; kill or be killed;

SEX RELATIONS BEFORE MARRIAGE

(5)

(4) are foolish and a mistake; are dangerous; ruin many a happy couple; are taboo; are evil;

(3) are not approved by society; should not be recommended; is not right; should be limited; are wrong; seem wrong to me; should, in my opinion, not be practiced; would be defeating one of the purposes of marriage.

(2) is often debated as to whether it is right or wrong; is the way things go sometimes; are sometimes good and sometimes bad.

(1) are practiced too much to be wrong; are up to the two individuals concerned; occurs quite frequently; are common; are all right; in our day and age are a
reality; are up to the couple; are becoming more common depending upon the situation, might be allowable; can be condoned; aren't so bad; should be casual; depends on the people involved; are a practice; happen all the time.

(0) help people to adjust; are O.K. if both parties are in agreement; seem like a pressing need right now; are permissible; are all right for me; are good in my opinion.

SIN AND FAILURE...

(5)

(4) seem to go together; are hard to avoid; make me very depressed; are the two worst things to happen to a person; are often closely connected; are disgusting; are one in the same; are usually the roots of a wasted life; are always wrong to me;

(3) is very common; are to be avoided; are depressing; are something to strive against; create a complex; are discouraging; are sometimes linked, but not failure and sin; are human, we must not give up but go on from there; are things that must be overcome; are two situations we try to avoid; happen to everyone;

(2) (omissions); are things that must be dealt with throughout life;

(1) do not depress me for long; do not go hand in hand; are different; are not wrong if one seeks to do better; is a sign of an incompetent person; are part of everyday life; make a poor comparison;

(0) is the cause of many murders; is due to lack of ambition; are for drunkards; have not bothered me yet;

PETTING

(5)

(4) usually go too far; is a sin in my church; should be controlled and not allowed to get out of hand; I am sorry to say, is becoming an accepted practice.
is all right as long as it is for love and not just something to do and both parties realize what's going on; is fun but wrong; is up to the couple and their moral beliefs; I don't think can be helped after a certain time; is against the moral ethics of most older people; common but not accepted by society; is fine if true respect is held by both; is all right for engaged couples; is all right if kept within its limits; is something that should be controlled; is all right as long as it doesn't go too far;

(2) (omissions); of dogs is a natural thing; seems to disappear after years of marriage; ask me again later.

(1) Has been and is being done by many; is a widespread practice now-a-days; is all right in private. is normal reaction to a certain degree; is not unusual in high school students; is good when you go with the girl long enough; is for teenagers; is accepted; is a form of education; is good; is a part of growing up; is okay; is very common; is sometimes lots of fun; does exist; is a common practice among teenagers.

(0) is fun; I like; arouses a sensational feeling; is fun, believe me; is an expression of affection which is satisfying; is a way of showing your fondness for another; is quite enjoyable.

ARGUMENTS LEAVE ME FEELING...

(5)

(4) relieved and guilty; confused inside if they are violent; as if they never should have been started; ashamed and keyed up.

(3) tired; that it was a waste of time; down in the dumps; foolish; depressed; upset; nervous; slightly ridiculous in some cases; lousy; blue; choked up inside; like I wish I hadn't had the argument; sorry; exhausted; ill at ease and ready to renew a friendship; apologetic, defensive; disgusted.

(2) frustration; indifferent;

(1) closer to the individual; sometimes good and sometimes bad; smarter; good if I win, frustrated if I lose; in a condition ready to continue; relieved; satisfied usually; satisfied; relaxed; excited; tired...strained
vocal chords; disgusted and angry; spiteful; better if I knew our argument had to come; fine as long as the other party doesn't hold a grudge; ok.

(0) mad; angry; proud, they certainly are worthwhile.

UNUSUAL SEX PRACTICES...

(5) are sickening; are awful and unthinkable; indicates a mentally sick person;

(4) are strictly taboo; are unhealthy morally and physically; usually indicate a mental disorder; needs medical attention; point to a mental disturbance; are against the moral ethic; are often harmful; are bad for emotional health; are against God; are wrong;

(3) don't interest me; are considered wrong in our society; seldom enter my mind; are not justified; are not common; are not very desirable; should not be condoned; should be terminated; are immature; I have not; should not be talked about; is not thought of very highly; makes me wonder; are to be observed clinically; are not ideal; present problems to society;

(2) (omissions); makes a person feel shy toward the opposite sex;

(1) are not uncommon; are not unknown; are engaged in more frequently than people realize; are common among a number of people; do take place; are not so unusual; as long as they're heterosexual, I suppose they would be acceptable;

(0) might be interesting; are normal for some people; are purely up to the individual;

I DETEST MYSELF FOR...

(5) all the evil I have done;

(4) thoughts I sometimes have; being an introvert through most of my life; some of my past mistakes; feeling inferior to people; some things I have done in the past; my sins and failure to take full advantage; whatever I did and have not detested myself for; doing wrong; not being more nearly perfect;
(3) not making the most of my talents; " goofing off" when I have a job to do; being so unsociable; not working harder; being lax in my studies; making simple mistakes when the current answers are quite obvious; smoking; physical reasons; lack of patience; being untruthful; eating too much at times; not saving money;

(2) (omissions);

(1) very little;

(0) nothing; no reason at all; even answering this question because I don't detest myself; no reason--I don't detest myself; not at all;

IF I HAD SEX RELATIONS, I WOULD FEEL...

(5) abnormal.

(4) guilty at home; guilt afterwards; guilty; a lot better, or maybe guilty, or panicky, I don't know; ashamed; guilt towards myself; guilty if she wasn't my wife; I had done wrong; as if I had sinned; I should be married; wrong if I were not married.

(3) relieved and sorry; I was in love; good and bad; unhappy; I don't know, it would depend; I did not really love the woman I had them with;

(2) (omissions); like anyone else under the same conditions; no different than I do now; ask me again later.

(1) better; temporarily satisfied; a lot less bored; satisfied; more relaxed and at ease; good; sleepy; natural; complacent; just the same as I did before; less tense at times; relieved.

(0) a lot better; warm and very good; that I had not done wrong; elated; great; in no way guilty; very satisfied.
IF I ROBBED A BANK...

(5) I'd shoot myself for being so stupid;
(4) I would be an idiot; I should get caught; I would have to be out of my mind;
(3) I would get caught; I wouldn't; I would have to be really desperate; I would give up I suppose; I would probably give it back; I would probably be a failure; I wouldn't be any richer; I'd go to jail; I would feel very self-conscious;
(2) (omissions); I don't know what I'd do;
(1) I would not spend the money right away; I would not like to be caught; I would try to hide; I would hide the money; I hope I would not be caught;
(0) I would have a good get-a-way; I'd plan it very carefully; I would see if I could get by with it; I would choose a small unguarded bank in a small town; I would fly to Alaska; I probably would get away with it; I would skip the country; I would live like a King;

AS A CHILD, SEX PLAY...

(5) is not good for mental and emotional well being; is dangerous; repugnant; can be harmful as to the outcome of their mental capacity when adults;
(4) is immature and ridiculous; is misunderstanding and should be corrected; should be discouraged;
(3) was never practiced; was never brought up; is not appealing; wasn't so good; meant nothing to me; should be unheard of; never entered my life; was not imaginable; escaped my knowledge; to me was unheard of (I didn't think too much about it); was a hush hush subject with us; never entered my mind;
(2) (omissions); is not understood;
(1) is probably normal for some; means very little; is quite widespread; was indulged in; is mostly curiosity; is strange and harmless; had no significance;
(0) is natural and innocent; is only normal; is desirable; is not harmful but does create sexual pleasure; was common without guilt feelings; is a natural curiosity; an important part in everyday living;
WHEN CAUGHT IN THE ACT...

(5)

(4) I become embarrassed; I became fearful; like most people, I feel ashamed; I always surrender and pay the conse-
quences; I felt as if I was doing something wrong; I was ashamed; I become extremely nervous; it's best to con-
fess; one usually feels remorse; I confessed to every-
thing;

(3) admit it; truth is the best policy; I was punished;
punishment was promised; it is best to admit whatever it is; apologize; I have never run or even tried to;

(2) (omissions); I never was;

(1) run; stand your ground; I get nervous and don't know what to say but then I regain my nerve; I try to make out the best I can; many people alibi; I try to con-
tinue the same as before;

(0) make excuses; I try to cover up somehow; I would try to lie out of it; it is natural to try to cover the act up; bluff your way out;

WHEN ANGER BUILDS INSIDE ME...

(5) I get sick.

(4) I try to calm down and not show my feelings; I have a tendency to be very quiet and not express my feelings very openly; I become nervous; I do my best to suppress it;

(3) I sit and count to ten; I get shaky, I cannot think clearly; I take a long walk; I try to control it; I usually talk to myself; I do something constructive to relieve it; I try to think of something else; I keep my mouth shut; I fill my mind with other thought; I try to listen to music; I hold it in; I seclude myself;

(2) (omissions)

(1) I have to blow off some steam; I usually will speak the way I feel; I release it before it continues to build; I let it come out; I give vent to my rage with physical exercise; I must tell someone; I look for some means to release it.
I get mad; I usually explore; I blow my top; I am a hard person to get along with; I lose physical con-

A GUILTY CONSCIENCE...

(5) can cause severe punishment to one's self; is a constant mental torment;

(4) can really shake a person; can be miserable; is a good thing, it is our mental thermostat; is justified; is truly a burden, one of the greatest, I think, one can experience; is worse than a sickness to me; is probably one of the worst feelings a person could have; is a terrible feeling; is very painful; is the worst punishment; bothers me and I usually try to relieve this feeling by correcting the wrong; is too great for my age;

(3) makes me nervous; leads to self consciousness; makes the heart grow weary; is hard to live with; is something to be thankful for; is a terrible strain; is hard to lose; bothers me; is a sign of a guilty person; is a sign of wrong doing; will sometimes show in one's actions; can be man's downfall; is a good thing to have;

(2) [omissions]; often leads to mental illness; reflects itself in irrational thinking; is a sign that one thinks he has done wrong;

(1) is your worst enemy; is nasty; is a bad thing to have; leads to embarassing predicaments; can cause the mind to think negatively; is due to many things; is something I don't think I'd like to have; does not bother me too much; does not let one do his best;

(0) is something I don't have; is experienced by every normal person?;
IF I FELT LIKE MURDERING SOMEONE

(5) I should have my head examined; I'd think I was crazy;

(4) I would go to someone and try to get guidance; I would
go to a doctor; I'd begin to think something was wrong;
I would ask for medical aid (advice); I would try every
means to refrain; I would be ashamed of myself; I would
go to church; I'd die;

(3) I wouldn't--; I walk away; I hurriedly dismiss the thought;
I would leave the vicinity; I'd forget it; I'd count to
ten; I would restrain myself; I would suppress my
desire; I would try to cool down; I'd take a walk;

(2) (omissions);

(1) it would be for a good reason; I probably wouldn't have
the nerve; I would consider it only as a sudden impulse
of anger; I wouldn't unless under battle conditions; I
tell him; I take it out on a wall;

(0) I probably would carry it out; it would be one who
oppresses me; I would use a pistol; it would not be
unusual; I would be careful to get away with it; I
would try to commit the perfect crime;

ONE SHOULD NOT...

(5)

(4) sin; do anything that would prey upon his conscience;
do anyone else any wrong; do something which he has a
feeling will bring remorse in him; knowingly sin; put
much stock in material things; do it if one does not
approve of it; indulge in dangerous habits; do anything
that he would not like done to him;

(3) tell others what to do; become lazy; become angry at
every little thing said against him; break the law;
steal; try to pretend to be something that he actually
isn't; harm others; drink or smoke; hurt anyone's feel-
ing intentionally in front of a crowd; idly waste time;
say one thing and do another; laugh at others mistakes;

(2) (omissions); go into debt if he can help it; let his
body go to waste; count his chickens before they hatch;
be a communist; talk too much;
(1) sign things like this; humble himself; worry too much;
(0) underestimate his enemies; inhibit oneself;

AFTER AN OUTBURST OF ANGER

(5) I become very nervous; I feel guilty; I feel remorseful; I realize I have done wrong; I am sorry and say so; I feel a little guilty about it; I feel sorry; I am usually embarrassed; I am usually sorry for getting angry; I feel ashamed; I curse myself for not having control; I often regret it.

(3) I usually don't know what to do next; I feel good, relieved, and sometimes wrong; I feel dejected; is foolish; I am jittery and all keyed up; I feel tired and wish to make up; I try to apologize; I am first to quiet down; I keep to myself; I try to switch my thoughts and cool down; one looks stupid; I feel ridiculous and sorry that I showed my emotions; I am usually friendly.

(2) (omissions); I feel exhausted; one is usually emotionally drained; it depends on what caused the outburst; I quiet down in a hurry; I usually get calm; I feel strange in my stomach; I try to think deeply; I usually tremble.

(1) I relax; I usually feel quite a bit better; I feel quite calm; I generally hit a wall (rather than someone else); I feel pretty good;

(0) I feel better; I am flushed and made; people generally feel better;

WHEN I HAVE SEXUAL DESIRES...

(5) I feel dirty!

(4) I go to church; I attempt to repress them; I keep them to myself;

(3) I try to control them; they usually leave; I control them; I usually try to curb them; I attempt to deviate my thinking; I forget them; I think about something else; I sometimes become temperamental; I become disagreeable; I try to occupy myself with other thoughts;

(2) (omissions); I am flushed and warm;
(1) I get a date; quite often; I am glad I'm married; I sometimes think of past experiences; I would like to find some willing female; I take them in stride as part of nature; I like to express them; I become easily aroused; I think about it or them; I realize that this is normal;

(0) I take my wife to bed; I enjoy it; I react like all healthy human beings; I generally satisfy them; I seek an outlet; I usually satisfy them; I pursue them; I wish I had an easy girl friend; I try and release it;

WHEN I WAS YOUNGER, FIGHTING...

(5)

(4) was out of the question; was a wrong act; was ridiculous--it still is; was idiotic; frightened me; for something was distasteful to me; made me nervous;

(3) was not interesting to me; never appealed to me; was something I never liked; was like some sort of survival, if you didn't want to fight, you had to; never occurred; was never one of my chief hobbies; was not part of my life;

(2) (omissions); was a method of solving disagreements;

(1) seemed all right; was common; was a part of my childhood; was natural; was kind of fun; was a normal practice; was an everyday event with my brothers and I;

(0) was always a thrill; was enjoyable; was a sport; seemed like fun; was fun and frequent; sometimes seemed a challenge; was the mark of a hero; was part of my daily routine; was a means of proving myself;
Scoring Examples for Females

WHEN I TELL A LIE...

(5) I have a very guilty conscience and usually apologize.

(4) my conscience bother me; I get red and scared; I am actually left feeling bad; I feel terrible; I feel guilty unless it's to save another's feelings; I am ashamed later on; I have a guilty conscience; I always regret it; I feel I have done wrong; I feel very guilty; I feel ashamed; I feel guilty for weeks if it is something important; I feel guilty; I feel ashed of myself; I feel that I have sinned; I regret it; I feel guilty afterwards; my conscience bothers me; I have a guilty conscience; I immediately feel bad because of it; I turn red and feel guilty inside; I have a guilty conscience and eventually admit it.

(3) I'm always afraid the truth will come out in the end; I feel guilty but I lie again; I feel bad; I worry about it; I always get caught; I know it will catch up to me eventually; I tell myself I won't do it again; I blush; I want to take it back; my face turns red; a funny expression comes over my face; I feel ill at ease; it worries me because it usually leads to more lies; I feel as though no one believes me; my face shows it, I know; it bothers me; it usually catches up to me; I wish I hadn't; it bothers me for quite some time; it usually bothers me and I rationalize that I had to do it.

(2) I don't ever forget it.

(1) It's usually just a "white" lie; I wonder if it is believed; I don't feel too guilty sometimes; I had a good reason; it is a social lie, such as saying someone is not in, meaning he is not in to that particular party; unless it is very extensive, I don't feel guilty.

(0)
THE IDEA OF MURDER IS...

(5) horrible to even think about; unthinkable to a normal person;

(4) absolutely "taboo" in my mind; frightening; very wrong; horrible and criminals should be punished; crude and horrible; very frightening to me; horrible to think about; horrifying; terrifying to me; horrifying to me; a violation of the Ten Commandments; horrid; horrible; terrible;

(3) childish; furtherest from my mind; the remotest from my mind; stupid; like a nightmare; ridiculous; inconceivable to me; to an unstable person a method of getting rid of an undesirable person; something I never think about; ridiculous and inhuman; unthinkable; absurd; crazy; shocking; an idea that has never entered my mind;

(2) (omissions); premeditated taking of one's life; usually based on our emotional feelings; one person taking another's life; seen often in movies; associated with uneducated people;

(1) a good plot for a novel; understandable to me at times; revenge; to destroy someone you hate; terrible, but I like to examine the reasons behind it; due to revenge;

(0) common at time to most of us;

WHEN I HAVE SEXUAL DREAMS...

(5)

(4) I wake up feeling guilty; I know something must be wrong because girls don't usually have sexual dreams; they leave me cold; I feel disturbed when I wake up; I get frightened; I wake up feeling dirty.

(3) I don't remember them if I do; I have dreamed about a coming date or one that I would like to have with a fellow. Where we would go (dance, movies, party) who we would see, etc.; I never remember them; I don't know what I'd do because I've never had any; I awake with a strange feeling; I have an odd feeling; I don't; it is usually a once-in-a-lifetime dream because I don't dream; I never have dreams; I don't think of them as having any special significance; I forget them
later; which stay dreams; I ignore them; I don't; they aren't very vivid; they are something I have no responsibility over because they are the work of the sub-conscious and my will has no control on this; (I don't remember having them); I am tired when I get up; I try to forget them; I just overlook them; --never have had.

(2) I have sexual dreams; I wake up then and can't go back to sleep; I want to be kind.

(1) I feel as if in reality; I think and wonder about them; I cannot control them; I dream them more than once; I wonder if they will come true; it usually about the same person; I feel that I must be growing up to young womanhood and marriage; I don't wonder; I don't think I do but if I do they are about one person; I feel lonely and depressed; I try to dismiss them as natural.

(0) interesting; I have more desire.

I TRIED TO MAKE AMENDS...

(5)

(4) for my behavior; and was compensated for it--knowing that was the least I could do; when I realize I have done something wrong; when I am wrong; for all mistakes; for all the wrong I do; because I hate to hurt people;

(3) with my father; for some of the things I've done; and have succeeded; for having said something wrong about a subject or person; for my faults but found it difficult; when I feel I have been wrong; with other people when an argument takes place; and I felt better; for my mistakes; when I hurt someone's feelings; for my mistakes; for hurting someone else; and we became friends;

(2) (omissions); by talking; by substitution; for my looks; by arranging a schedule;

(1) but it was very difficult; but sometimes it's difficult; but he wouldn't listen; with friends by buying them; but was unable to do so; with any enemies I may have;

(0) due to revenge;
WHEN SOMEONE SWEARS AT ME...

(5)

(4) it is because I have offended them; I am ashamed for them; I'm sorry I made them so mad;

(3) I feel very bad; It really does not bother me; I feel hurt; I feel sorry for them; it hurts my feeling; I ignore the fact that they did so; I don't comment; I wonder if they feel better swearing; I feel very low; I think it's poor taste; I feel a loss of dignity; he can't find other words to express himself so I laugh it off; it usually doesn't bother me; I feel like swearing back--but I just walk away; I think they show bad etiquette; I feel bad; I think that they do not know what they are doing; I feel sorry for that person; I just accept it as college talk; I rarely mind; I walk away; I forget it; I shut my ears; I smile; I feel horrible.

(2) seldom; I feel they are only tryint to prove they are a big person.

(1) I may become angry; I take no notice and that makes them mad; I feel like returning the remark; I could slap them; I feel like swearing back; I get mad and walk away; I often swear back under my breath; I don't like it; I usually think they are wrong.

(0) I swear back; I swear right back; I become angry; I really get angry; I get mad and swear back; I see red.

MASTURBATION...

(5) is abnormal; is sickening.

(4) is wrong; seems wrong; is wrong and will ruin you; is pitiful; seems distant and bad; is wrong.

(3) should be stopped; is against good principles; is wrong if done intentionally; is something I don't know much about; is childish; is something I don't really understand; has never happened to me; is due to the child's family background; should be corrected and understood; should be controlled if possible; is a sign of immaturity and need for understanding; never enters my mind; is not my problem; is a topic which shouldn't be discussed; is something that I do not think a person with normal relationships need; is not
good is a word which turns my face kind of red; is something I don't understand much about; is childish and unnecessary;

(2) I am not sure of the meaning; is done more by males than females; is a word I don't know.

(1) is supposedly common in the teens; is a common thing in childhood; is supposedly to be normal in some age groups; is supposed to be a very normal thing; is up to the individual; is not abnormal; are usually done when a child is young;

(0) is a way of sexual satisfaction; is all right; is practiced by 99% of the people in the world;

I PUNISH MYSELF...

(5)

(4) with worry when I do something wrong; when having done something I promise myself I wouldn't do; when I do something wrong; when I know I've done wrong; for my mistakes and failure; for sinning; when I know I have sinned; when I do wrong and don't get caught; when I know I've done something wrong; by always worrying and never having piece of mind; when I feel I have done wrong; and pray for forgiveness; when I feel I have done something wrong; when I feel I've done wrong; because I was wrong; when I feel guilty about something.

(3) by denying myself pleasures; for eating as much as I do; by worrying about my failures instead of concentrating on the future; when my grades are poor; by dieting; for my family separation; for saying the wrong thing; by using better judgment in the future; mentally; for hurting other people; when I do stupid things; when I say nasty things about others; by crying; when my performance is not good; when I realize I did something drastically wrong; by staying angry at someone else too long; by staying home; only when I become grouchy; by eating too much; for ridiculous mistakes; by worrying too much; when I do what I promised myself not to do; when I lose my temper, but not very often; by worrying over little things; for losing my temper; for acting foolishly and rashly.

(2)
(1) , but not often; seldomly; only at times when neces-
sary; seldom;

(0) for nothing; --never have; no; for nothing.

AFTER A CHILDHOOD FIGHT, I FELT...

(5)

(4) sad until it was righted; horrible; very badly; ashamed
of myself; ashamed; as if I had done wrong; like no one
could like me.

(3) sad; bad--I usually lost; like the world was coming to
an end; friendless and terribly unhappy; like crying;
sorry; very hurt; upset; that I wouldn't fight when I
grew up; verbal; it should have been avoided for noth-
ing was accomplished; insecure; didn't fight; like
making friends again; inferior; hurt and afraid to go
home; dejected; very ridiculous and we usually were
friends; I wanted to tell my mom; I'd lose a friend;
like running to mother; like running away; bad; I
didn't fight; that it was partly my fault.

(2) like crying; nothing.

(1) much better, but made friends afterwards; good if I
won; mad, usually; angry with the other person; ok;
good because I usually won; left out if I lost, or
good if I won; good; independent; relieved; good if I
won.

(0) elated; great; like fighting again; big and important
either relieved or angry; angry; that I had triumphed.

IF IN THE FUTURE I COMMITTED ADULTERY...

(5) I'd beg God for forgiveness; I would never forgive
myself; I would feel terrible inside always; I would
be unbearable to myself; I don't think I could live
with myself; I would be ashamed of myself and grow to
hate myself and him.

(4) I would pray for guidance; I would pray to be forgiven;
I would be miserable; I would seek help and advice from
a priest and be very sorry for this act; I couldn't
face anyone; I'd probably have guilt feelings; it would
be a sin; I would pray for repentance; I'd feel very
guilty; I would be ashamed; I hope I would be punished
very deeply; I would ask for forgiveness; I would feel guilty; I'd be too ashamed to do so again; I will be very ashamed of my actions; I will first look to God for forgiveness; I would surely be punished; I would ask God for forgiveness; I'll regret it;

(3) I would be unworthy of my husband; I could never face my friends; my attitudes will have altered; I would go to a priest; I would be sorry afterwards; I'd feel my marriage should end, it's not fair to my mate; I doubt if I would be proud of myself; I would resolve to not commit the mistake again! --all my training is against; I don't plan to; I would be very surprised; I would never be able to forget it; I would try not to let it happen again; I expect to be punished.

(2) I don't know what I would do; I cannot say how I will feel.

(1) I would hope there to be no consequences; I would have had a reason; I will try to live a normal life; I don't know what I'd want done.

(0) I would make the best of the situation; it would be only because of love; I would have a good reason.

I COULD NOT DO IT BECAUSE:

(5)

(4) I knew it was wrong; I felt I was wrong; it wasn't right; it was a sin; something kept telling me no; I would have a wrong feeling; I knew my conscience would bother me; I would have felt guilty; I felt it was wrong; of my conscience; I knew right from wrong; it had not been the practice in our church; it was wrong.

(3) I value others' opinions of me; I didn't know if it was right; my values and goals do not go along with this; I was not reared that way; I knew it wasn't right; I did not believe in it; I just couldn't; I wasn't allowed; I would be caught; I was afraid; it didn't seem best to me; I was afraid I would not be as good as it as others; it was against my better judgment; I felt that something is wrong; my ideals would not let me; I didn't feel it was right; it was against my principles; it just isn't right; I knew it was the wrong thing to do.

(2)
I didn't want to; --do what?; I donot know the directions; I was not qualified; I am lazy; I was a chicken; I wasn't physically or mentally capable; I didn't have time; I didn't try; I was scared; I didn't feel it necessary.

"DIRTY" JOKES IN MIXED COMPANY...

makes me feel uncomfortable; shouldn't be done or said; are something that make me very uncomfortable; embarass me; are not good or at any other time; are extremely undesirable; disgust me; should cause me to leave the room; annoy me; embarass me greatly; cheapen a person; I don't approve of.

are in bad taste; are usually in bad taste; are not becoming; is not very acceptable; are not too good to tell; are taboo if they get to ; are very bad taste; are ignorance; is in very poor taste; are "taboo"; don't interest me; is sometimes embarrassing; is not in good taste; are uncalled for; are improper; are out of place; are not a good idea; is not the best entertainment; are for the birds; is not too good; displease me; are distasteful; aren't funny; isn't quite up to par.

can cause trouble, but can be all right sometimes; aren't always wrong; are ok to a point; are sometimes fun and other times vulgar; are accepted in some situations; are sometimes all right, depending on the content; do not bother me; are ok to an extent; are acceptable up to a point. A slightly off-colored joke is ok among friends;

doesn't bother me; are funny; can be funny, if handled correctly.
AFTER AN ARGUMENT...

(4) I feel bad for having argued; I want to make amends and am sorry; I feel tense and very nervous; I feel very bad; I feel horrible; I feel miserable most of the time; I feel the need to apologize; I feel that it was caused by me; I feel repentant; I often worry and get upset if I feel I was wrong; I could shoot myself for getting into it; I want to cry for being so inconsiderate; I always want to apologize; my conscience bothers me; my conscience asks is I were really right; I feel guilty.

(3) I am sorry it happened; I feel nervous; I feel sorry; I wish that I hadn't argued; I feel emotionally "tired"; I like to make up; I want to forgive and forget; I feel let-down; I feel apologetic; I wish it could have been avoided; I like to talk it over; I wish I had never become involved in it; I sometimes wonder if I "lost my head" unreasonably; I almost always forgive and forget; I try to see both sides; I feel empty inside; I question myself about my viewpoints; I am generally confused; I am usually sorry; I feel bad or hurt; I like to make up; I am sorry; I must set things right; it's best to part friends; I'm usually bad or hurt; I always wish it never started; I feel let down; I feel depressed; I cry and feel sorry for myself; I wonder if the result were worth the sacrifice; I don't feel too good; I'm upset.

(2) (Omissions)

(1) I feel satisfied I have been proven wrong or made my point clear; I feel good if I win, depressed if I don't; I have to get out of the house; I forget it; I usually change the subject; I'm in a bad mood; I feel more at ease;

(0) I try to analyze the other people; I get mad; I'm mad.

I SHOULD HAVE BEEN PUNISHED FOR...

(5)

(4) having done that wrong deed; last night and I probably will be; many things I have done; many things I kept secret; anything I've done wrong; my sins; the wrongs I did knowingly; many things I've done; my thoughts; (I don't believe need others punishments).
(3) not behaving; the mean streak I have in me; talking back; some of my childhood actions; keeping my room in such a mess; many things I've done by my parents; yelling at my mother; taking her new dress; something someone else had done; not being honest with myself; staying out too late Saturday; being the way many little sisters are; being rude to my mother; being so fickle; being disrespectful to my parents; the times I talked back; keeping such late hours this summer; playing "hookey"; swearing at home; many things I have done wrong in high school; not studying enough; lying when I was younger; coming in late; disobeying my parents; talking back to my parents; acting like a spoiled child; lying; fights with my brother; speaking loudly at my parents; not working in high school; saying what I did; hurting my brother; a lot of childhood mistakes; doing what I shouldn't have done.

(2)

(1) what; nothing that I can think of;

(0) nothing;

WHEN I WAS A CHILD, SEX...

(5)

(4) was guilt ridden;

(3) did not interest me; was an unknown subject; was never mentioned; meant little to me; was unimportant; never entered my mind; was never spoken about; was not a common topic; was never thought of; was something "above my head"; was kept secretive; seemed very unimportant; was very confusing to me; never bothered me; was not taught to me; didn't interest me--naive; was a forbidden subject; was not mentioned around me;

(2) (omissions);

(1) was a curiosity; was familiar to me because mother nature is always at work on a farm; wasn't concealed; was not kept a deep dark secret;

(0)
TO KILL IN WAR...

(5)

(4) is hard and hard not to condemn; is petty and unnecessary; causes many conflicts of mind; is a duty, but still sinful; is still murder; is a violation of the Ten Commandments; is as sinful as to murder; is a terrible thing; is against God's law; is brutal and ridiculous; is a disastrous thing and very unnecessary.

(3) doesn't enter my mind; is necessary though awful; is not always good; is stupid; is something I could not do; is good or bad depending on one's beliefs; unnecessary; is a necessary, regrettable evil; is as useless as war; is necessary but evil; would be hard to do; is an act that conflicts with our mores; is not always justified; is necessary although often not desirable; is a necessary evil.

(2)

(1) is one act we are not able to abandon; is almost a necessity; is natura; is something that must be done; is acceptable; is necessary; is justifiable; is to defend your rights; is sometimes one's duty; is one of those things that has to be done; is normal; if not pre-meditated murder isn't wrong; is only duty; is almost a necessity; is excusable; is something that must be done; is not exactly murder but a service to one's country; is fair.

(0) is necessary for people to settle arguments; is no sin; is justifiable and expected; is the right attitude if one is to win and there is to be peace.

SEX RELATIONS BEFORE MARRIAGE...

(5)

(4) are wrong and immoral; are disgusting; are sinful and wrong; is disgusting and unnecessary; are a sin; can ruin a person for life; ruins marriage; no--don't believe in; are against my morals; are considered dirty; is one of the greatest sins I know; are immoral; are something I strongly disapprove of; are against God's laws.
(3) is wrong; are forbidden; are taboo in my mind; should be permitted; is not a good practice; are in poor taste; are not a good practice; are not right; are practiced by many but I prefer to wait; are disastrous but everyone makes mistakes; are taboo; take out the feeling for a sound relationship; are not good for anyone; should not occur; most of the time harmful; are not advisable; aren't good; should not be; are not right; should be prohibited; shouldn't be done; make marriage sex not so wonderful; should not happen I don't believe in; may lead to future unhappiness; are against my beliefs; ...you'll never get married if you have relations first.

(2)

(1) sometimes can't be helped; are wrong to some--right to others; is a commonly discussed topic.

(0) depend entirely on the couple; are up to the individual; all right when precautions are taken; are all right in some cases.

SIN AND FAILURE...

(5)

(4) can be helped by trusting in people and trying to do right; have not depressed my life for I am strong in my faith and hope in God; go hand in hand--a sense of guilt for sin obstructs success; is the worst thing that can happen to a person during his life; make me feel terrible; are quite characteristic of unhappy and God-less people; bother my conscience terrible when strong; depress me more than any other acts;

(3) are hard to overcome, but one must try; are two evils; depress me; can be a lesson; are things I don't want to happen to me; are very discouraging; are incentives for improvement; are hard to live with; make a person lose faith in themselves; seem to go together; can cause unhappiness; are embarrassing so I try to improve; sometimes go hand in hand; are the person's own fault! are very discouraging to me; are not to be laughed upon; are two things which I hope I never come in close contact with; are things I dislike; often cause each other; bother me; can ruin a person; become a great disappointment; are terrible; will get you no where; are things I try to overcome; can often destroy; are two things you can never run away from;
(2) (omissions); can change a personality; are problems of living;

(1) are constant companions with all mortals; are not necessarily related; are human daily occurrences; are a part of growing up; are something everyone comes in contact with; are not alike; yield no good; have nothing in common; are something everyone comes in contact with; do not go hand in hand;

(0) is permitted and accepted by our society; are not present if one tries to be a success; never enter my head;

PETTING...

(5) is revolting; is vulgar.

(4) is wrong; is against my principles; leads on further, and has bad results if it is not controlled; is just asking for trouble; is disturbing to me, and very bad on my conscience; is a common thing among young people today but it is also still evil and sinful; causes anxiety in young people...should they or shouldn't they; among teen-agers can be dangerous so I don't do it; is something that I would never do; should be reserved for marriage; is a moral issue; is wrong before marriage; is dangerous.

(3) should be avoided; is not desirable; is a natural desire to be controlled; is wrong to a teenager; is something I never experience; is a habit which should be avoided but always isn't; because of love is often rather for lust; is unnecessary unless it is someone awful special; is against my ideas; leads to trouble; can be overdone; leads to more intimate relations; I don't think is right unless you really like the boy; is against my better judgment, but hard to resist for some; is something most boys try but girls usually don't let them; is not a good situation because it leads to many more involved situations; is not a good practice, until after marriage; is a step in the wrong direction; is not for certain people; can lead to trouble; should wait till marriage; is juvenile; can be carried too far; is something I've never done; is against my up-bringing.

(2) (omissions);
is up to the individual...according to the situation; is a thing of this century which is now being accepted; is a way of sexual satisfaction; is a personal matter; depends on who I'm with; is all right...in some cases; leads to sexual arousal; is practiced by most young people; is justified with love; is all right for engaged people above the waist; is good or bad depending on who or where.

is a normal way of releasing one's sexual drives; is natural; is a way of expressing love.

ARGUMENTS LEAVE ME FEELING...

sick to the stomach;

ashamed; horrible; unhappy and sad; very sad and sorrowful; like an ugly person; depressed and sorry for being inconsiderate; relieved if I said my piece but usually just bad in general till I make up; very badly; inferior and extremely depressed; terrible.

worried whether they are made; uncertain; alone; foolish; lonely and unwanted; upset; hurt, often terribly childish; distressed and a little frightened; depressed; nervous; mad for not being able to hinder them; empty; sorry; pretty bad; "blue"; mixed up sometimes; upset; stupid because I usually lose; in a sad mood; down in the dumps; like I should never have opened my mouth; mixed up.

nothing; shaky; disgusted; undecided; hollow;

cold; more at ease; interested in whose right; excited; good if I won, bad if I lose; agitated; tense and angry.

mad at the person I argue with; either relieved or angry; mad.

UNUSUAL SEX PRACTICES...

are disgusting; are revolting; are unlawful and terrible.

are usually repulsive; are disgraceful; are abnormal; need medical care; are not legal and shouldn't be done; are dangerous to one's health and mental condition; show a maladjusted childhood; cannot be excused; are not normal; are very immoral; are practiced by perverts; seem ugly; are taboo.
(3) are forbidden; mean as little to me as usual ones; are not talked about; by a person should be corrected for a happier life; do not concern me; seem wrong to me; should not be permitted but do happen; make one wonder what some people are really like; should not occur; are taboo in our society; are not my practices; are wrong usually; are criticized by society; should be halted but understood; I know nothing about; are not very common; are a sign of immaturity and insecurity; are something I know little about; are generally caused by unhappy homes; can give a person the wrong attitude in life; are hard to understand for normal people; hinder girls reputations and cheapen them; comes to the attention of one who handles such cases; should be avoided; are unwise, and lead only to trouble.

(2)

(1) are sometimes considered natural in other societies; exist in some places; don't phase me; are due to emotions; I have read about; are different.

(1) are only unusual in America; are abnormal only out of marriage; would probably depend on the individual.

I DETEST MYSELF FOR...

(5) being myself;

(4) feeling inferior; being catty among other things; wanting money so much; thinking and doing things I shouldn't; degrading people; my shortcomings; my disloyalty; the many mistakes I have made; being so self-centered; losing my temper; dating a fellow I know is not good for me; not always listening to those who know better; having lied as much as I have in my life;

(3) not being prettier; hurting other people; being afraid of new places; not taking geometry in High School; not studying enough in high school; worrying; not always doing my best; not doing thing I should have when I was young; not being a "go-getter"; talking about other people; saying things I shouldn't; being sarcastic; talking too much and often saying the wrong thing; eating excessively; not trying harder in certain fields; being undecided and not as strong as I would like; lying sometimes; being so two-faced; always worry about what the public thinks of me; not studying to my full capacity; not speaking up at times when I wish I had; being short-tempered with my brother; procrastinating;
making quick decisions about some people; being afraid to give a speech; arguing with my mother;

(2) (omissions);

(1) being a worrier (not really detest); nothing; nothing at the present;

(0) nothing at all;

IF I HAD SEX RELATIONS, I WOULD FEEL...

(5)

(4) guilty for having done it; guilt and wrong; guilty if I wasn't married; guilty or not guilty depending on my general relationship with the person, etc.; that I had failed myself; very guilty; extremely guilty and miserable; miserable; guilty and unfaithful; terrible; guilty; guilty unless I was married to the second party; very dirty; guilty, sinful, and bad; a sense of guilty cheap and dirty only if before marriage; very guilty and unfit for the man I would want to marry; deeply ashamed; guilty and low; very, very guilty; ashamed and guilty; horrible (before marriage); extremely guilty.

(3) bad if I weren't married; guilty--but possibly good; I had broken a pledge to myself; cheap and embarrassed; ashamed; cheap and unfit for marriage;

(2) who knows;

(1) satisfied; all right, I think; good, maybe; it is a very normal thing; only like I really wanted to marry the person; relieved of desire.

(0) beautiful all over; only real love; a natural joy; very good;

IF I ROBBED A BANK...

(5) I must be out of my mind; I could never live with myself until I confessed; I would probably be mentally ill;

(4) I would feel guilty; I'll tell someone who will advise me to confess; I would break one of the Ten Commandments; I would not enjoy the profit because I would feel so guilty; I would return the money when in my right senses; I should be punished; I would be another
person; I'd be sick; it would be wrong; I'd confess in the end, my conscience would nag me; I'd feel terrible; I would confess immediately; I would be miserable with myself; I'd find it hard to live with myself;

(3) I'd wonder about myself; I believe I would give myself up; I'd have to be terribly desperate; I would be tempted to return it; I'd give myself; I'd be punished; I'd get caught; I would take the money back; I would probably give myself up and take the consequences; I would have a good reason; I would turn myself in to a police station; I wouldn't know what to do with myself; I would spend several years in prison; I would be stupid; I wouldn't; it would only be under force;

(2) (omissions); I don't know what I'd do;

(1) I'd run; I would be rich; I would have more never than I do now; I would run away; how? in the 20th century;

(0) I would go to Europe; I'd invest it; I would live in luxury; I would hide the money; I would leave the country; I would take the money and spend it on things I needed; I'd spend the money--fast!

AS A CHILD, SEX PLAY...

(5)

(4) was a forbidden practice not know about; can hurt the participants; should be taken seriously; is unbelievable; seemed very horrible to think about; is wrong and indecent;

(3) was unknown to me; didn't impress me; an unimportant part of my life; was not considered by me; was something I knew nothing of; is something I didn't indulge in; should be stopped by the parent; never entered my mind; is uncalled for; was never known to occur in my surroundings; was something I can't remember; I was not thought of; didn't exist for me; did not interest me for I had no brothers or sisters; an act to be controlled; is not right; is considered dirty; was the farthest thing from my mind;

(2) (omissions); is subconscious; is due to environment; is an important part in determining what kind of a person you will be;
(1) is up to the individual; was common; is natura; is something that often happens; is mostly based on curiosity; is most cases is normal; is not abnormal for a person; didn't concern me;

(0) 's an important part; seems to be a normal activity; was done innocently; is experimental and not wrong;

WHEN CAUGHT IN THE ACT...

(5)

(4) I confessed my guilt; I feel very humiliated; the shame is too much to bear; of telling an untruth, I feel guilty; I admit my guilt and take my punishment; I experience great shame; I feel very embarrassed and ashamed; I felt deeply ashamed; there is a feeling of guilt; I feel extremely embarrassed; I feel guilty; I become embarrassed and apologetic;

(3) my face turns red; a funny feeling comes over me; I admit it; face the music; parents should explain why not; one feels trapped; stay and try to make up for it; I blush; I am embarrassed; I admit I was wrong; the best thing is to confess; I face the consequences; you should be reprimanded; I make a fool of myself; he readily admitted everything; I usually turn red and confess;

(2) (omissions); what act?; people are more impulsive;

(1) I often try to lie before admitting the truth; I rationalize; I have lied once and a while but usually end up spilling the truth; I tried to cover up with poor success; I get nervous and don't know what to say but then I regain my nerve; I would not be caught in the act; I make some weak excuses; I give the reasons for such acts; I try to explain; I tried to make it seem right;

(0) I try to defend myself if possible; I laugh and hide my feelings; I am hesitant to admit guilt; I try to get out of it the best I can; I make excuses;
WHEN ANGER BUILDS INSIDE ME...

(5)

(4) I try not to let it out on anyone; I try to control myself; I try to calm myself; I try to control myself from letting it show;

(3) I try to solve it without emotional feelings becoming involved; I avoid talking to people; I like to be alone; I try to think of something else; I try to relax and forget about my worries; I prefer to be by myself; I learn what is causing the anger and turn to something else; I sometimes lose my temper, but try to suppress it; I count to ten so as to control my anger feelings; I try to reason with myself; I find an outlet in music; my nerves become bad; I like to be left alone to get over it;

(2) (omissions); I grow speechless; I cry; I want to cry;

(1) I try to find an outlet for it; it has to be released; I want to scream; the picture becomes distorted; I sulk; I must let it out in some manner; I get very moody; I want to scream and let go of it; I must discuss my problem with someone; I sulk and refuse to speak; it builds; I try to express it;

(0) I usually explode; I usually lose my temper; I swear; watch out; the urge to explode blurs my thinking; I often lose control of my emotions; I get mad at people around me; I forget everything except what I'm mad about; I hold it in for a while and then really let it go; I let it out by acting angry; I let people know how I feel; I throw a heavy object; my temper shows;

IF I FELT LIKE MURDERING SOMEONE...

(5) I'd be insane; I'd be nuts; I'd have my head examined; I must be crazy; I'd murder myself;

(4) I'd be insane; I would go to a priest; I would go to someone and try to get guidance; my conscience brings me back to normal; I would feel guilty; I'd be afraid of myself; I'd see a psychologist; it would frighten me; I would try to get rid of the feeling by prayer; I would consult a doctor; I'd commit suicide afterwards; (I can't imagine wanting to);
(3) I would do something to forget the incident; I'd lock myself in a room; I would reason with myself; I would go to bed; I would certainly contain myself; the desire was quickly suppressed; I wouldn't; I'd try to calm my anger; I would try to forget it; I would vanish the idea; I would try to control my emotions; I would change my mind;

(2) (omissions);

(1) I wouldn't have the courage to do it; I would think of the consequences; I wouldn't due to social indignation; I would pound the nearest pillow; I throw something;

(0) figure out how; I'd try a safe way;

A QUILTY CONSCIENCE...

(5)

(4) bothers me very much; serves me a great purpose; makes me feel bad afterwards; makes me feel that everyone is looking at me; is distressing; is something I hate to get; can make one feel unsafe; is sometimes very disturbing; is one that should be taken care of promptly; often keeps me awake at night; is worse than punishment; can ruin a person for life; is the worst thing to live with; is something which makes me feel terrible; makes one miserable; can make life miserable; is bothering me now; is a terrible thing but can be corrected by trying to be honest with yourself and others; bothers me until I do something about; is good because it teaches right from wrong; bothers me; makes me do strange, embarrassing things; is something I always have when doing something wrong; is merely God's reprimand; is the most uncomfortable feeling in the world; causes me much unhappiness and loss of peace of mind; is the worse thing I could have; can make you very miserable.

(3) is hard to live with; is worse than anything; is almost impossible to live with; should be aired; is a heavy weight; is bad to live with; is a terrible thing to live with; should be relieved so other activities may be well done; can be relieved in the confessional; is a good reason to change one's ways; shows that a person has control of his emotions; usually brings out the truth; can be gotten rid of by telling someone about it.
(2) usually breeds guilt; can drive a person to insanity; can drive one crazy; can cause mental problems.

(1) is worse than doing the act as far as its effect on you; is a bad thing; is quite a nuisance; is a person's greatest enemy (quote); obstructs creative accomplishments; is the quickest way to one's destruction; is a terrible thing; can be more harmful than telling a lie; can ruin the outlook on everything for a person; is a sign of insecurity;

(0) is very, very bad; is man's worst failing; is a natural state that happens to everyone; can make a person lose sight of good.

ONE SHOULD NOT

(5) do something he does not feel is right; think only of his self; sin; presume oneself sinless; ever give up hope or faith in oneself; think of one's self too much; make excuses for their actions; knowingly or willingly fall into sin; do that which he knows is wrong; do anything they wouldn't want God to see them do; let themselves get too angry; do things they know are not right.

(3) do things against her better judgment; run hasty into a blind date; cheat; lie to other people; lie; talk about other people; harm others; repeat a mistake; be mean to people they dislike; lie to one's self; make others feel bad; try to pick out the faults of others; do things that will hurt other people or objects; find fault in other people; ever make fun of people because of race or physical problems; judge another by one set of standards and himself by another; murder; try to inflict his or her values on someone else; do anything to intentionally harm another; rob a bank; date best friend's fiancee; be unkind or disrespectful to parents; habitually break laws; pry into others business; marry for money--but for love; commit crimes; act without thinking; disregard the wishes of their parents; lose his temper, cheat on exams or quizzes; be boisterous; be over-confident; try to imitate others; have any hard feelings toward people.

(2) eat too much; expect everything to go his way.

(1) degrade himself;

(0)
AFTER AN OUTBURST OF ANGER...

(5)

(4) I feel remorseful; I am always sorry; I feel worse instead of better; I feel bad; I feel terrible; I feel dejected or ashamed; I regret it; I feel ashamed; I try to make amends. I usually feel ashamed;

(3) I feel good but sorry; people are usually apologetic; I usually feel low, depressed and then I cry; I feel relieved but sorry; I resent the fact and calm down; I wish that I had not done it; I try to think over the reasons; I feel ill; I feel better, but guilty; I am sorry; I feel like a fool; I feel rather foolish; I feel stupid; I'm embarrassed; I am sorry I didn't try to talk it out without losing my temper; I wish I had thought more carefully first; I regret saying mean things; it only takes a while to get back to normal; I cool off quickly;

(2) I shut up; I sometimes cry; I usually cry; leads to an agreement; I am tired; I usually laugh; I feel very let down; I have to get out and walk; I cry; I usually retreat to solitude.

(1) I often feel better; I feel drained but relieved; I sometimes feel better--if it was justified; I sulk.

(0) I feel relieved; I feel good; I feel much better; I feel better; I cry and scream and swear; I feel much relieved and calmer than ever; my tensions are relieved.

WHEN I HAVE SEXUAL DESIRES...

(5) I feel dirty!

(4) I know it's only human but I feel terrible; I feel guilty; I feel ashamed; I fight them; a horrible feeling sets in; I wouldn't know what to do because I never have any; I struggle to overcome them; I reason with myself that it's wrong; I think of what I really want out of this life for myself, and what is right, and that isn't the thing I want; I immediately dismiss them and say a prayer;
(3) I control my emotions; I stay home; I try to go to sleep and forget them; I say to myself later in life; I try to get my mind on other things; I read books that are educational; I try to quiet them; I forget them because I am so busy with other things; I think of the consequences; I control my actions well; I try to concentrate on something else; they do not overcome me; I suppress them; I repress them; I try to control them; I try to get them out of my mind;

(2) (omissions);

(1) I feel normal; I wonder if everyone else feels the same way; I think of my boy friend; I grow lonesome; I keep myself busy or date; I feel they're normal; it is a natural born instinct; I am married and happily so; they are always combined with my love for a man; I call my boy friend;

(0) I need satisfaction; I sometimes let myself go too far; I usually express them; I want to be with a boy I like;

WHEN I WAS YOUNGER, FIGHTING...

(5)

(4) was shameful; and arguing were two of my worse faults; was repulsive to me; was intriguing, now it is shameful.

(3) was bad because I always lost; did not occur too often; was forbidden by my mother; did not impress me; was unthought of; frightened me; was never a thing I did; wasn't my idea of fun; was something left for the boys; was not one of my pastimes; was something I was afraid of doing; was only for boys; was something I never did; was not my way of getting even; and talking got me into trouble;

(2) (omissions) was common among the boys;

(1) was a fast way to settle an argument; was quite common in my life; was a challenge and social necessity; was a common sport; was only in fun; with my sister was common; meant survival of the fittest; seemed necessary at times; was just a trivial matter; played a good part
in my life; was a habit; was an everyday occurrence; was usual; came easily;

(0) was the way to win a point; was a normal expression of anger; was fun; seemed fun to me; was exciting; was a game to me; seemed exciting;
APPENDIX B

Perceptual Defense Instructions

This task is one in which I want to see how quickly you can decipher a word. Each word is in a booklet like this (show subject the practice booklet), and each booklet consists of carbon copies of that word. The least clear copy is first and the clearest copy is last. You are to go through the pages and try to decipher the word. I'm only interested in how quickly you can decipher the word, that is the page on which you can decipher the word. Therefore feel free to guess at any time. It is to your advantage to guess on every page. Do you understand? (If the subject has any question, answer it by rereading the relevant portion of the instructions.) Try this one (practice booklet). (Encourage guessing on the practice booklet.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taboo Words</th>
<th>Neutral Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. whore</td>
<td>ranch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. urine</td>
<td>scent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. bitch</td>
<td>towel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. penis</td>
<td>cable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. raped</td>
<td>spray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

**Verbal Conditioning Instructions**

Sit at this table so you can easily read the words on the card in front of you. I am going to put other cards before you one by one. Each of these will be like the one before you now with six words on it, three words in the upper part of the card and three in the lower part. For each card, I would like you to make up a sentence using one of the three upper words as the first word in the sentence and one of the lower words as the verb in the sentence. You may use anyone of the three upper words and anyone of the three lower words in your sentence.

I will place a new card before you each time you make up a sentence using the words of the preceding card. Now, it doesn't matter whether the sentence is long or short, or even if it's simple or complex. It is important that you respond with the first sentence that occurs to you. Do you understand? (If the subject has any question, answer it by re-reading the relevant portion of the instructions.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hostile Verbs</th>
<th>Superego Verbs</th>
<th>Neutral Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. poisoned</td>
<td>preached</td>
<td>tripped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. cursed</td>
<td>failed</td>
<td>jerked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assassinated</td>
<td>apologized</td>
<td>stumbled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. hated</td>
<td>refrained</td>
<td>marched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. slugged</td>
<td>redeemed</td>
<td>swam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. revenged</td>
<td>suppressed</td>
<td>trotted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. slapped</td>
<td>tempted</td>
<td>slid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. beat</td>
<td>forgave</td>
<td>staggered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. butchered</td>
<td>sinned</td>
<td>jumped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. slaughtered</td>
<td>wronged</td>
<td>waved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. knifed</td>
<td>disgraced</td>
<td>dodged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. attacked</td>
<td>prayed</td>
<td>trudged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. killed</td>
<td>inhibited</td>
<td>paraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. strangled</td>
<td>disobeyed</td>
<td>waddled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. beheaded</td>
<td>repressed</td>
<td>shuffled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. tortured</td>
<td>abstained</td>
<td>scampered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. quarreled</td>
<td>repented</td>
<td>threw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. shot</td>
<td>regretted</td>
<td>raced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. murdered</td>
<td>renounced</td>
<td>skated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. stabbed</td>
<td>confessed</td>
<td>strolled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post-Conditioning Interview for Awareness

1. What do you think the experiment was all about?
2. How did you go about deciding which words to use?
3. As you went along, did you notice any change in the words you selected to use in your sentences?
4. Was there anything about what I did that you particularly noticed?
5. What do you think the purpose of that was? (If "mmm-hmm" or "good" is not mentioned, ask,) What about my saying "good" and "mmm-hmm"?
6. Did it have any effect on you?
7. Did you notice any pattern to my saying of "good" or "mmm-hmm"?

Rating Categories for Awareness

No Awareness.

1. To be placed in this category, the subject must neither spontaneously (prior to question 5) notice the verbal reinforcers nor correctly relate the reinforcers to the correct response class.

Partial Awareness.

2. To be placed in this category, the subject must make an accurate hypothesis concerning the response class which was reinforced after the reinforcers are called to the subject's attention in question 5.

3. To be placed in this category, the subject must spontaneously (prior to question 5) notice the reinforcers, but his hypothesis concerning the response class it followed or when the reinforcers occurred must be incorrect.

Awareness

4. To be placed in this category, the subject must spontaneously (prior to question 5) notice the reinforcers and correctly related the reinforcers to the correct response class.

5. To be placed in this category, the subject must correctly relate the reinforcers to the correct response class prior to question 4.
Study I

Key

1 = Subjects
2 = Total Guilt
3 = Hostile Guilt
4 = Sex Guilt
5 = Morality-Conscience Guilt
6 = Experimental Condition
7 = Perceptual Defense Score
8 = Total Time
9 = Time Difference
10 = Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability
11 = Edwards Social Desirability
12 = Ohio State Psychological Examination
## APPENDIX D

### Raw Data

#### Study I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>76&quot;</td>
<td>40&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>163&quot;</td>
<td>51&quot;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>285&quot;</td>
<td>85&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>65&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>421&quot;</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120&quot;</td>
<td>32&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>129&quot;</td>
<td>49&quot;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>325&quot;</td>
<td>51&quot;</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>128&quot;</td>
<td>28&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>147&quot;</td>
<td>47&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>109&quot;</td>
<td>33&quot;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>34&quot;</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>455&quot;</td>
<td>25&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73&quot;</td>
<td>27&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>177&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56&quot;</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>132&quot;</td>
<td>26&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>215&quot;</td>
<td>121&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>371&quot;</td>
<td>171&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>300&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>405&quot;</td>
<td>47&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>96&quot;</td>
<td>52&quot;</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>185&quot;</td>
<td>35&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>298&quot;</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>185&quot;</td>
<td>83&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32&quot;</td>
<td>-6&quot;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>260&quot;</td>
<td>116&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>193&quot;</td>
<td>41&quot;</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>352&quot;</td>
<td>152&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>326 w</td>
<td>-4 w</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>80 w</td>
<td>6 w</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86 w</td>
<td>26 w</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>190 w</td>
<td>94 w</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>131 w</td>
<td>37 w</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study II

Key

1 - Subjects (Hostile Condition)
2 - Total Guilt
3 - Hostile Guilt
4 - Sex Guilt
5 - Morality-Conscience Guilt
6 - Block I
7 - Block II
8 - Block III
9 - Block IV
10 - Block V
11 - Block VI
12 - Block VI - Block I
13 - Total Hostile Verbs
14 - Total Superego Verbs
15 - Difference Scores (Total Hostile - Total Superego)
16 - "I" Hostile
17 - "I" Superego
18 - Awareness
19 - Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability
20 - Ohio State Psychological Examination
<p>|   | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 26| 39 | 28 | 29 | 32 | 5  | 7  | 7  | 3  | 5  | 5  | 0  | 32 | 28 | 6  | 6  | 7  | 1  | -  | -7 | 77 |
| 27| 84 | 24 | 28 | 32 | 5  | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 7  | 71 | 21 | 50 | 3  | 2  | 5  | 24 | 17 |
| 28| 90 | 28 | 35 | 27 | 1  | 2  | 5  | 3  | 5  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 2  | 18 | 46 | -28 | 0  | 4  | 1  | 18 | 89 |
| 29| 79 | 24 | 30 | 26 | 3  | 4  | 6  | 5  | 9  | 12 | 9  | 39 | 42 | -5 | 1  | 10 | 1  | 11 | 66 |    |
| 30| 71 | 23 | 23 | 19 | 7  | 7  | 11 | 6  | 9  | 9  | 2  | 49 | 29 | 20 | 15 | 11 | 3  | -  | -40|    |
| 31| 69 | 25 | 18 | 26 | 4  | 8  | 5  | 7  | 7  | 7  | 2  | 33 | 43 | -10 | 4  | 11 | 3  | -  | -58|    |
| 32| 69 | 21 | 23 | 26 | 2  | 4  | 5  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 1  | 17 | 58 | -41 | 1  | 28 | 1  | -  | -92|    |
| 33| 86 | 20 | 33 | 33 | 7  | 5  | 6  | 4  | 8  | 6  | -1 | 35 | 48 | 12  | 5  | 2  | 1  | 11 | 18|    |
| 34| 81 | 27 | 32 | 32 | 7  | 7  | 7  | 11 | 10 | 7  | 0  | 47 | 25 | 22  | 14 | 10 | 1  | -  | -68|    |
| 35| 87 | 26 | 31 | 30 | 5  | 7  | 7  | 8  | 3  | 7  | 2  | 37 | 41 | -4  | 5  | 12 | 1  | 12 | 52|    |
| 36| 88 | 27 | 30 | 31 | 0  | 8  | 12 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 77 | 20 | 57  | 9  | 6  | 5  | 11 | 90|    |
| 37| 83 | 28 | 28 | 29 | 1  | 0  | 2  | 3  | 6  | 5  | 3  | 15 | 46 | -31 | 0  | 0  | 1  | 9  | 64|    |
| 38| 84 | 32 | 27 | 25 | 2  | 3  | 6  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 4  | 22 | 47 | -25 | 4  | 12 | 2  | 12 | 66|    |
| 39| 81 | 31 | 31 | 19 | 0  | 3  | 3  | 2  | 5  | 4  | 4  | 17 | 24 | -7  | 4  | 7  | 1  | 16 | 73|    |
| 40| 65 | 28 | 13 | 22 | 2  | 4  | 3  | 4  | 9  | 8  | 6  | 29 | 45 | -14 | 8  | 14 | 3  | 24 | 94|    |
| 41| 75 | 15 | 29 | 31 | 6  | 6  | 7  | 9  | 7  | 1  | 36 | 35 | 3  | 5  | 11 | 3  | 16 | 4  |    |
| 42| 81 | 20 | 33 | 28 | 6  | 3  | 6  | 4  | 5  | 8  | 2  | 32 | 37 | -5  | 10 | 8  | 2  | 15 | 72|    |
| 43| 97 | 34 | 33 | 30 | 5  | 2  | 2  | 1  | 3  | 0  | -5 | 13 | 30 | -17 | 0  | 5  | 4  | 21 | 78|    |
| 44| 90 | 33 | 29 | 28 | 5  | 2  | 2  | 1  | 5  | 2  | -3 | 16 | 38 | -22 | 2  | 15 | 1  | 21 | 55|    |
| 45| 101| 34 | 34 | 35 | 7  | 9  | 6  | 10 | 5  | 6  | -1 | 42 | 36 | 6  | 1  | 9  | 1  | 15 | 65|    |
| 46| 94 | 31 | 35 | 29 | 5  | 6  | 8  | 8  | 7  | 7  | 2  | 40 | 42 | -2  | 7  | 11 | 2  | 14 | 50|    |
| 47| 89 | 32 | 30 | 27 | 4  | 9  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 6  | 2  | 37 | 48 | -11 | 15 | 19 | 5  | -  | 48|    |
| 48| 76 | 22 | 25 | 29 | 3  | 7  | 9  | 6  | 8  | 7  | 4  | 38 | 25 | 16  | 15 | 8  | 1  | 15 | 52|    |
| 49| 91 | 28 | 35 | 30 | 6  | 4  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 3  | -3 | 22 | 57 | -35 | 0  | 8  | 2  | 7  | 74|    |
| 50| 63 | 24 | 12 | 29 | 4  | 7  | 10 | 9  | 6  | 8  | 4  | 44 | 28 | 18  | 15 | 10 | 4  | 17 | 59|    |
| 51| 97 | 34 | 32 | 31 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 3  | 8  | 3  | -3 | 35 | 65 | -50 | 4  | 17 | 3  | 16 | 43|    |
| 52| 78 | 29 | 24 | 25 | 4  | 5  | 5  | 4  | 5  | 2  | -2 | 22 | 44 | -22 | 6  | 10 | 4  | 20 | 88|    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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