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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Society, in fact all "Culture" and civilization as we know it, is based on the conformity of individuals to a shared set of rules, laws, customs and taboos. Variation among these, with differing emphasis, and differing demands for compliance, is what distinguishes one society from another. Taken in this broad sense, conformity implies a state of harmony and is, in fact, so defined by Webster as a, "state or quality of being in agreement, harmony; congruity" (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, p. 174).

The question then presents itself, whence the dissatisfaction of those commentators on the contemporary American scene who decry our "conformist society," our "other-directed, lonely crowds," our "mass men," and our "status seekers"? (Rilaman, 1954). Apparently our society has gone overboard in civilizing its members; we seem to be suffering from too much socialization. Conformity, understood in this negative sense, has become an end in itself rather than a rational balance between individual interests and societal demands.

The problem of the relation of individual and society is an ancient one whose many solutions lie outside the scope
of this work. Let us merely emphasize that there is agreement from Plato to Freud on the existence of conflict between individual and society and on the tremendous importance for both as to how this conflict is resolved.

A "rational" solution of this conflict, which permeates American democratic values, may be traced from the philosophers of the English Enlightenment, through the Founding Fathers, and on to those contemporary writers who so deplore our drift toward "conformity." Simply stated, the rational solution asks that individuals recognize the necessity of delegating portions of their individual freedom to the state in return for the protection it provides, and, in some sense, do this consciously or willingly, even if with reservations. Having made this rational choice, they are still free to decide, in cases of disputed truth, whether to go along with the majority of society or whether to stand in individual opposition. In some cases, a minority of individuals may even attempt to alter the rules or laws accepted by the majority, and a rational philosophy requires that they be given the right to do so. Conformity, in this idealized society, is never an end in itself, but merely the means to effecting a workable balance between individual and social demands.

In one form or another this rational or democratic value system underlies the criticism of "irrational" conformity, or conformity for its own sake, so frequently encountered nowadays.
Conformity used from here on in the sense of "irrational" conformity occurs when an individual resolves conflicts with the group or majority by a consistent acquiescing to their position. This compliance becomes a goal in itself, and is engaged in regardless of where the truth lies in the particular conflict. It is pursued whether there are "real" external pressures to conform to the majority or whether the pressures arise from the conformer's own anxiety about opposing the group. We might distinguish conformity from the compliance of individuals in a totalitarian state who "conform" to its dictates because of fear of retribution. These subjugated individuals comply, but do not believe it, and do not like it, and would say so if they were free to. Conformity, on the other hand, arises principally from the individual's internal fear of being different and is engaged in situations where there is no possible external retribution for opposing the group. In this peculiar sense, it becomes democracy's own form of self-imposed totalitarianism. The motives described above are analogous to those that psychoanalytic theory distinguishes as "objective anxiety," or fear with a basis in reality, and "neurotic anxiety," or fear arising from internal conflicts which are inappropriately cued by reality.

Let us now turn our attention from social philosophy to individual psychology in an attempt to shed further light on this phenomenon. We mentioned earlier that conformity
seems to arise from civilization carried too far, or from "over-socialization." More accurately we might call it a particular form of socialization which, like that of the neurotic, has failed. The following discussion is based on psycholanalytic theory, particularly Freud's *Civilization and Its Discontents*, with modifications introduced from psychological learning theory.

As Freud points out, socialization is a process whereby the individual's impulses, primarily sexual and aggressive, are suppressed, forced to undergo delays, and channeled into socially acceptable outlets. This process begins at birth, with the parents serving as the original and most important agents in carrying out society's task of acculturating its members. Aggressive impulses and their treatment become especially important because much of the process of socialization is, in itself, frustrating, giving rise, in turn, to increased aggressive reactions. Indeed, it may be questioned whether "aggressive impulses" exist prior to the frustrations of socialization, as Freudian theory postulates. These aggressive impulses must in turn be dealt with, suppressed, repressed and channeled in a number of ways. Society, and particularly those prime frustrating agents the parents, will not permit their direct expression.

There are many ways that different individuals learn for handling their aggressive impulses, all based, we might
conjecture, on the important interactions with their parents. The useful psychoanalytic concept of defense mechanism, sublimation included, is applicable here, particularly if we modify "defense mechanism," to "character defense." By character defense we wish to imply a more pervasive, learned pattern for dealing with a variety of related conflicts and situations. The concept of character defense is also free of those vestiges of libido mechanics with which defense mechanisms are still imbued, particularly by post-Freudian psychoanalysts such as Fenichel (1945). Character defenses refer to ways of reacting to situations which are perceived as threatening, or which cue off that early learned, non-specific response, anxiety.

Now, we might assume, following Freud, that all children as a central part of their socialization, are made anxious about their aggressive impulses (by parental punishment, withdrawal of love, and so on), and learn various characteristic ways to reduce this anxiety. These ways are what is meant by character defenses and some are more effective than others. The most effective are those which provide a socially acceptable expression of the aggression, such as sublimation; the least effective are those which fail to achieve an adequate reduction of anxiety and/or fail to provide an acceptable social outlet. Those phenomena called the psychoneuroses are examples of this latter form of mal-adaptation.
It is the central hypothesis of the present study that conformity may be viewed as a character defense consisting primarily of the avoidance defenses of repression, denial reaction formation, and turning against the self. This would imply that what we call conformity is but one aspect of a pervasive character structure whose purpose is to minimize the anxiety aroused by hostile and aggressive impulses through the use of repression and related defenses. Conformity in the form of individual acquiescence to the majority takes place because to oppose the majority, even in cases where the individual is intellectually convinced of the correctness of his position, is too threatening. That is to say, individual opposition requires a constructive channeling of aggressive impulses of which the conformer, because of certain early learned character defenses, is not capable.

In subsequent chapters, a working or operational method for distinguishing individuals on a dimension of conformity will be described after reviewing the literature on this topic. In accord with the foregoing theory which treats conformity as a character defense, several hypotheses concerning the differential ability of conforming and independent individuals to express hostility will be tested. In general, we will predict that individuals high on the conformity dimension will be less able to express hostility in an open or appropriate manner, and will show greater indices
of that particular type of covert hostility associated with the defenses of repression, denial reaction formation, and turning against the self. Two principal measures of hostility expression and defense will be utilized, one, a projective test (the TAT), and the other a situational test involving hostility arousal and subsequent opportunity for expression. The rationale and scoring principles for these tests will be developed in the chapters to come.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The work of Asch (1952, 1956) has served as the stimulus and starting point for the majority of studies in the area of conformity. In addition, Asch developed the basic model, the "Asch-situation," which has served as the operational definition of conformity, either in its original form in one of a number of modifications in almost all subsequent work.

Conformity as the "Asch-situation" defines it consists of submission by the individual subject to a unanimous majority of "peers" who oppose his correct judgment. This judgment typically concerns some clearly perceivable matter of fact, such as matching lines for length. The ambiguity of the material to be judged is one of the variables that differs from one modification of the "Asch-situation" to another. An important experimental control used by Asch (1956), but not in all of the subsequent modifications of the "Asch-situation," requires that subjects be able to correctly judge the stimuli under conditions where group pressure is not a factor.

Conformity in all the "Asch-situations" consists of the modification and distortion of individual judgment in
the face of group pressure. In Asch's work, the "peers" who comprised the unanimous majority were pre-instructed accomplices of the experimenter who gave their judgments prior to that of the naive subject. Asch found that this unanimous majority had a marked effect on the judgments of the minority subjects, with approximately one-third of the minority judgments being modified in the direction of the majority. In addition, he found marked individual differences in resistance to group pressure effects, ranging from complete independence to complete compliance. A striking feature in Asch's work is the consistency of these individual differences over time and in different situations.

From these important initial studies, the work on conformity has proceeded in two related directions: one, investigation of the situational determinants of conformity and, two, study of the personality characteristics associated with conformity. Investigation of situational determinants has demonstrated that a majority of three is as effective in producing conformity as a majority of eleven (Asch, 1956); that anonymity decreases conformity (Asch, 1956; Mouten et al., 1956); that essentially the same effects are obtained with differing stimulus materials (Asch, 1956; Crutchfield, 1955; Tuddenham, 1957); that an experimenter supporting the majority produces an increase in conformity (Crutchfield, 1955); that task difficulty is related to amount of conformity (Coleman et al., 1958); and
that a majority of high status produces more conformity than one of low status (Lefkowitz et al., 1955).

Few of these studies have been derived from any consistent theoretical orientation and most of the results fail to go beyond what would be predicted from a common-sense point of view. Despite a variety of methodological differences, conformity continues to appear in about the same proportion (one-third) and with the same individual consistency first reported by Asch.

Early investigations of the personality determinants of conformity tend to be largely descriptive. Helson et al. (1956) and Mouton et al. (1956) found a significant relationship between conformity in a simulated group situation and submissiveness as measured by the Allport A-S Reaction Study. Barron (1953) administered the MMPI and Gough's Adjective Check List (1955) to the upper and lower 25 per cent of Asch's original subjects. He found no differences on any of the clinical scales of the MMPI, but the self-ratings on the Adjective Check List indicated that conformers tend to describe themselves as more, "personally stable," "helpful," "kind," and "obliging," while non-conformers describe themselves as "artistic," "emotional," and "original." All of these differences were significant.

Crutchfield (1955) reported the most elaborate investigation to date dealing with conformity and a number of personality variables. He used a modification of the
"Asch-situation" consisting of a complex system of lights and switches which enabled him to run five subjects simultaneously. Each subject was led to believe that he was observing the responses of the other four on his panel of lights, while in actuality all the patterns were identical and controlled by the experimenter. Conformity in this situation was found to correlate -0.33 with Barron's Ego Strength scale; +0.39 with the California F-scale; +0.35 with staff ratings of authoritarianism in a psychodrama; -0.63 with staff ratings of intellectual competence; and -0.51 with scores on the Concept Mastery Test. The special nature of the sample leaves the generality of the correlations with intelligence an open question. In addition, the conformers tended to come from more stable families; to hold more "idealized" images of their parents; and to be more "restrictive" toward their own children. Staff ratings, utilizing a Q-sort, led to a description of the non-conformers as effective leaders, persuasive, efficient, active, vigorous, expressive, and self-reliant. The conformers were described as submissive, compliant, overly accepting of authority, overcontrolling their impulses, inhibited, confused, disorganized, unadaptive under stress, lacking insight into their own motives, overly responsive to the evaluation of others and suggestible.

While it is difficult to draw definite conclusions, it seems clear that many of Barron's and Crutchfield's
findings support the theory of conformity as a repressive character defense, outlined in Chapter I. This is true both of Barron's self-report data, which because of its exaggerated "goodness" and naiveté suggests repressed hostility emerging via reaction-formation; and of Crutchfield's staff rating data, particularly that which describes conformers as lacking insight into their own motives, over-controlling their impulses, inhibited, and suggestible. The child rearing evidence, while scant, seems consistent with our theory of repressive character defense. If we assume that the "restrictiveness" the conformers employ with their own children parallels a restrictive handling they received earlier from their parents (interpreting "restrictiveness" as punishment for the expression of aggression), then we may interpret their consequent "idealized" parental image as part of a reaction-formation to the hostility aroused by their own "restrictive" upbringing.

We might also comment at this point, in view of the correlations Crutchfield reports between conformity and authoritarianism, on the similarities and differences between the personality structure we have hypothesized for conformers and the "Authoritarian Personality" described by Adorno et al. (1950). Both conformers and authoritarians are conflicted regarding the expression of hostility, and both must employ certain ego defenses to ward off the anxiety and guilt aroused by their hostile impulses. While
the repressed hostility of authoritarians tends to be handled with projection and displacement onto "out-groups" where it is given vent in the form of racial and ethnic prejudice, the hostility of the conformer is denied this outlet, and tends to be directed inward where it is experienced as feelings of inadequacy, anxiety, or, in extreme cases, depression. The only "outlet" for conformers then becomes the secondary gain obtained by making others suffer through masochism. To take an analogy from the clinic, the authoritarian is a proto-paranoid; the conformer a proto-hysteric or depressive.

Two studies by Kagan and Mussen (Kagan and Mussen, 1956; Mussen and Kagan, 1958) begin to bring a theoretical rationale to bear on the problem of personality determinants of conformity. In the first of these, utilizing the original "Asch-situation," they found a significantly greater number of dependency themes in the TAT stories of conformers than in those of non-conformers. This result was not replicated by Hardy (1957), who found that groups scoring high and low on a TAT measure of n Affiliation did not differ significantly in degree of conformity, n Affiliation being scored from the TAT in a manner almost identical with Kagan and Mussen's "dependency." The situation used by Hardy to define conformity consisted of standard "arguments" employed by stooges in an attempt to influence the subject's pre-assessed attitudes toward divorce. Thus the discrepant findings
between the Hardy, and Kagan and Mussen studies may be due to methodological differences in delineating conformity.

This particular problem of differences in the operations used to define conformity runs through all of the studies in this area. To date, there has been no study which attempts to compare the different methods used in different conformity studies. For example, it is possible that "dependency needs" or affiliation, per se, play a role in determining conformity only when the conformity situation involves "neutral" stimulus material, such as matching lines for length (Kagan and Mussen) and not when more complex attitudinal stimuli are envoled, as in the Hardy study. Or it might be that variations on an ambiguity dimension were the important stimulus differences involved. Or again, it may be that the original "Asch-situation," utilized by Kagan and Mussen, contained greater pressure to conform and that this was the particular variable that was relevant to "dependency needs." Further empirical evidence as to the effects of differences in the operations used to define conformity is needed to clarify such discrepancies as the foregoing. Until this evidence is forthcoming, we shall have to rely on logical comparisons and assume, for example, that pressure to conform is strongest in situations with "live stooges," weaker when tape records of "peers" are used (Olmsted and Blake, 1955), and weakest with paper-and-pencil measures (Barron, 1953). Other important dimensions
would be the neutrality-meaningfulness of the stimuli; clarity-ambiguity with which it can be judged; and pressure to conform (see discussion of situational factors earlier in this chapter). It seems logical to equate, methodologically, such studies as those of Asch (1956) and Crutchfield (1955), since they appear comparable on the above dimensions. It is less logical to equate either of these with the studies of Wiener et al. (1957) and Wiener (1959), in which conformity pressure is operationally defined by erroneous group "norms" supplied by the experimenter in a design choosing task. Since many of these studies (Wiener et al.; Wiener; and Hoffman, 1953) obtain results consistent with studies using the original "Asch-situation," we may temporarily equate them. However, when discrepant or negative findings arise in studies using different methods of defining conformity, we cannot be sure, in view of the lack of evidence comparing the different methods, about the exact source of the discrepancy.

In the second study by Mussen and Kagan (1958), a somewhat more complex line of psychoanalytic theory is brought into play. They again used the original "Asch-situation" and the TAT and found that conformers tend to perceive parental figures as "harsh, punitive, restrictive and rejecting." They explain their results with reference to Anna Freud's (1946) concept of "identification with the aggressor." They speculate that the parents of conformers are punitive with their children, arousing their hostility,
but they do not permit the open expression of this hostility. Hence, conforming to the parents, with a consequent repression of hostility, becomes a learned mode of responding because of its anxiety-reducing properties. This general ego-defensive pattern is then overgeneralized from parents to other authorities, and also to the "authority of the group."

A theoretical explanation along similar psychoanalytic lines is advanced by Hoffman (1953) in an excellent study that antedates the work of Mussen and Kagan. Hoffman views "compulsive conformity" as an ego-defensive process centering around the repression of hostility. The childhood antecedents, i.e., punishment for the expression of hostility, are essentially the same as those discussed by Mussen and Kagan. These antecedents are postulated as leading to "overidealization of parents" (a reaction-formation against repressed hostility), intropunitive aggression, and subserviency in the face of authority. The "compulsive conformist" builds up an ego structure characterized by the inability to handle hostile impulses in an open or adaptive manner. Guilt and anxiety associated with these impulses bring into play a set of related ego defenses, centering around repression, and including denial, reaction formation, and turning against the self (Anna Freud, 1946). Though Hoffman does not make this explicit, it must be assumed that any situation in which the conformer finds himself
contradicted by the "authority of the group" is one which arouses these conflicts and brings these defenses into play.

Hoffman selected extreme groups of conformers and non-conformers on the basis of a modified "Asch-situation," utilizing bogus group averages to stimulate majority pressure in a distance judging experiment. He then administered selected TAT cards and a special set of incomplete sentence stems to these extreme groups. In accordance with his theoretical predictions, he found that the extreme conformers showed significantly more of the following categories, scored from TAT and ISB content: parental dominance, intro-punitive aggression, overidealization of parents, ego-weakness, over-concern for parents, strict moralism, submission to authority, success strivings, threatened by responsibilities, and conventional belief in God. The conformers showed significant less ego-strength, critical evaluation of parents, liberal moralism, critical evaluation of authority, and resistance to authority. Repressed hostility was found to significantly differentiate the conformers from the non-conformers when a subtle scoring system was used with the TAT.

Hoffman places major emphasis on the importance of the child-rearing antecedents, and his content categories reflect this, many of them being scored in terms of hostility conflict with parents or parental figures. However, there is reason to suspect that the ego defenses, described above, are more pervasive, more in the nature of character
defenses as defined in Chapter I, and are not restricted to situations in which the individual is in conflict with parents or parental figures. That is to say, the ego defenses of repression, denial, reaction-formation, and turning against the self represent a characteristic mode of response in all situations that arouse potential hostility.

It is this line of theorizing that we have taken as our point of departure for the present study. More specifically, we shall construct a TAT scoring system to explore Hoffman's finding that conformers differ from independent's on a dimension of "repressed" or covert hostility as well as with regard to the more overt TAT and ISB content which is primarily involved in his other categories.

This brings up an important point regarding an alternative explanation for conformity which we have as yet not discussed in the present work. It might be argued that much of the data obtained in the conformity studies reported above can be explained on the basis of motives which we might subsume under the label, "need for social approval." This line of reasoning would explain conformity as essentially motivated by a desire to gain the approval of other people, both peers and authorities (which already raises the problem of the impossibility of doing this in an "Asch-situation" in which "peer" judgments conflict with the experimenter's demands for accuracy). The negative side of this motivational picture would consist of fears of being
rejected by the group for opposing its judgments. This line of reasoning would hold that individuals exhibiting conformity in "Asch-situations" do so because they have stronger needs for social approval. Under this general rubric could be placed the finding of Kagan and Mussen (1956) that conformers produce a greater number of dependency themes on the TAT, dependency themes being defined as those concerned with loss of love and support. Also potentially explainable by this line of thought would be some of the findings reported by Barron (1953), Crutchfield (1955), Hoffman (1953), and others. Findings that conformers describe themselves as "kind" and "obliging" (Barron) or that they hold more "idealized" images of their parents (Crutchfield), or even the projective test findings that they show "overconcern for parents, strict moralism, submission to authority, etc." (Hoffman), may be explained on the basis of their greater "need for social approval," which motivates them to behave in an extremely conventional manner in the belief that this will please other people and lead to a gratification of their approval needs.

This line of reasoning is most clearly brought forth in a series of recent studies by Crowne and his associates (Crowne and Marlowe, 1960; Marlowe and Crowne, 1961; and Crowne, 1961). Using the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale (M-C SD) (Crowne and Marlowe, 1960) as the operational definition of "need for social approval," a number of
Interesting individual differences have been predicted. Among these are verbal conditioning (Crowne and Strickland, 1960); opinion conformity (Marlowe and Crowne, 1961); and, in two studies, conformity in an "Asch-situation," (Strickland and Crowne, 1960; Crowne, 1961). In the first conformity study, group pressure was simulated with the use of a tape recording, following the method of Olmstead and Blake (1955). In the second, actual accomplices were used. In both cases a significantly relation was demonstrated between "need for social approval," as measured by the M-C SD scale, and conformity. The rationale used to explain these findings, like that described above as an alternative explanation for conformity, postulates a need for social approval and acceptance, which motivates those subjects, high on the M-C SD, to engage in what they perceive to be culturally acceptable and appropriate behavior. Conformity is assumed to be one way of gaining social approval, either of the examiner or the fellow subjects in the "Asch-situation," or both. The reverse may also hold, that is, non-conformity is avoided because of the anxiety it would arouse over loss of approval. The results of the other studies are accounted for in a similar manner. Thus, with regard to verbal conditioning (Crowne and Strickland, 1960), the significantly greater amount of conditioning obtained with those subjects high on the M-C SD scale is explained in terms of their greater need to obtain approval from the examiner, which
they attempt to accomplish by complying with his subtle reinforcements. In the opinion conformity study (Marlowe and Crowne, 1961) subjects performed a boring task for 25 minutes, following which they were given a chance to rate their attitudes toward the experiment. As predicted, those subjects above the mean on the M-C SD scale, and hence with a high "need for social approval," expressed significantly more favorable attitudes toward the experiment than those below the mean.

In all of the above studies, behavior on the part of subjects that might be described as compliant, submissive, conforming, socially desirable, and even, in the opinion conformity study, repressive or suppressive, is explained in terms of a "need for social approval."

This general explanation of conformity in terms of "need for social approval" is not so much a contradiction to our initial formulation of conformity as a repressive character to our initial formulation of conformity as a repressive character defense as it is an explanation at a different level. The two alternative explanation differ in regard to the models they suggest, "need for social approval" suggesting that individuals behave in a much more opportunistic, manipulative fashion. They also differ with regard to the importance given to unconscious or repressed factors, in particular repressed hostility, in the shaping of this same form of behavior.
Though not actually specified, the conceptualization of individuals in terms of "need for social approval" certainly suggests a model of opportunistic, conscious manipulation of their own actions by those individuals bent on obtaining satisfaction of their approval needs. This model contrasts with the repressive-defensive character structure postulated earlier as underlying conformity. Now it is entirely possible that a great deal of what has been termed "need for social approval" is, in fact, an overt manifestation of the sort of repressive character defenses described previously. For one thing, an inspection of the M-C SD scale reveals that 19 items out of 33 deal directly with the denial of hostility, typically stated in such an extreme form as to imply defensive, irrational "denial," rather than conscious manipulation. (For example: Item 18. "I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loudmouthed, obnoxious people." Or: Item 29. "I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.") Another important point is that all of the previously cited results obtained with the M-C SD are as consistent with an explanation in terms of ego defenses and repressed hostility as they are with a "need for social approval." At least one of these, the opinion conformity study, seems more in accord with a repressed hostility explanation. However, none of the previously cited studies allows a comparative test of these two explanations, since in none of them are subjects, given
the opportunity to express hostility in situations free from potential social disapproval. This is true also for most of the previously cited conformity literature. In most cases it is impossible to determine whether the personality characteristics associated with conformity reflect a pervasive character structure centering around repressed hostility or whether they reflect tendencies to go along with the group, to be conventional in an opportunistic sense, to the end of gaining social approval.

One exception is Mussen and Kagan's finding that conformers view parental figures, on the TAT, as harsh, punitive, and rejecting. Another is Hoffman's finding that conformers show greater repressed hostility on the TAT. Repressed hostility was scored for stories in which parents are left miserable (e.g., "She never got over her son's death," ) and for such things as total number of people who die. It is difficult to reconcile these results with the "need for social approval" hypothesis, while they are in direct support of the character defense hypothesis.

In the present study, Hoffman's schema will be expanded, and TAT categories will be constructed to measure directly expressed, undefended hostility and indirectly expressed, covert hostility. The first hypothesis, derived from the theory of conformity as a character defense involving the repression, denial, reaction-formation and turning against the self of hostile impulses, will predict that:
The amount of conformity in an "Asch-situation" will be inversely related to the TAT fantasy measure of the direct, undefended expression of hostility; and directly related to the TAT fantasy measure of the covert, defensive expression of hostility.

While the inverse relationship, predicted between conformity and directly expressed hostility, is consistent with both "need for approval" and character defense explanations of conformity, the second prediction of a direct relation between conformity and covert hostility is not. This latter prediction is consistent with a character defense explanation and is, in fact, essential to it, but is contradictory to a conscious "need for approval" explanation.

To further test the relationship between conformity and character defense, a behavioral situation, described more fully in Chapter III, was devised to obtain an independent measure of the subject's ability to express hostility. The situation was so constructed that it would arouse the hostility of all subjects and, following this, give them a chance to express themselves in a "free" situation, to a "peer," without fear of reprisal or exposure. The value of the situational measure is twofold. First, it provides further validation for the main hypothesis of a relation between conformity and character defense, tested first with the TAT, by furnishing evidence from a different and independent source. Second, it provides a set of operations to
distinguish response suppression, which is essentially the "need for approval" explanation of conformity, from repression, which is essential to the character defense explanation.

Several considerations enter into the decision to use the lack of expressed hostility in the "free" situation as our operational definition of repression. First, the nature of the situation is such that one would expect the subject to go along with the accomplice's initial expression of anger, particularly if "need for social approval" and response suppression are the determining motives. The failure of the subject to comply and express hostility, thus, cannot be logically attributed to suppression or conscious withholding, and hence, is more likely due to repression. Second, the content of the responses categorized as repression are consistent with this concept in a clinical and theoretical sense (see Appendix B). Third, and finally, the usefulness of this operational definition will ultimately be demonstrated by its relationships with other independent measures, derived from a common theoretical network (in particular, the TAT measures of $E_X$ and $C_O\_Hos$). Our second hypothesis may then be stated:

Conformity, in an "Asch-situation," will be significantly related to the inability to express hostility in a free situation, following hostility arousal.
This situational test is the unique feature of the present study. By placing individuals in a situation where it is "socially desirable" to express their aroused hostility, we provide a crucial test of the theory of repressed hostility and defenses associated with it. The problems of operationally defining "repression" are great, and space does not permit an examination of them here. It is essentially a difference of "repression" vs. conscious withholding that was central to our distinction between character defense vs. "need for social approval," however, and within its limitations, the situational test of hostility expression serves as an operational definition of repression, capable of distinguishing between the two. Repression is here defined as the discrepancy between the way individuals feel and how they talk about the way they feel, with "social desirability" or response controlled. This is accomplished by inducing their "feeling" of hostility with an arousal condition, and then putting them in a situation where they are free, in fact are encouraged by the "peer's" initial expression, to talk about the way they feel. Failure to do so constitutes our operational definition of repression.

As a further extension and check on the measures used, the additional hypothesis may be stated:

There will be a significant relationship between the projective test (TAT) measure of repressed and
defended hostility and the inability to express hostility, following arousal, in the free situation. These three hypotheses constitute the core of the present study. In addition, our available measures will permit several additional comparisons that are of tangential relevance, particularly with regard to the M-C SD scale. First, for purposes of replicating the results of Strickland and Crowne (1960) and Crowne (1961), it is proposed that:

There will be a significant relationship between conformity in the "Asch-situation" and high scores on the M-C SD scale.

Following this, several comparisons may be made to determine the relative dependence of the M-C SD scale on "Need for social approval" as opposed to repressed and defended hostility. In line with the trend of theorizing of the present work, we are conceptualizing it as primarily a measure of repressed hostility and are predicting it will relate inversely to the TAT measure of directly expressed hostility and directly to the TAT measure of covert hostility. In addition, we will predict that high scorers on the M-C SD scale will show less ability to express hostility in the free situation following hostility arousal, than those subjects scoring low on the scale.

As a final comparison, and for purposes of shedding further light on the two contrasting explanations of conforming, compliant, and suppressive behavior, an additional
comparison with the TAT may be made. The TAT protocols, originally scored for hostility and defensiveness, can also be scored for n Affiliation, the scoring category most closely resembling "need for social approval." The relationship between n Affiliation and M-C SD, conformity, and behavior in the Arousal-Expression situation can then be examined. It is our expectation that none of these comparisons will be significant.
The Measure of Conformity

The conformity measure used in the present experiment is based on a modified "Asch-situation" originally used by Blake and Brehm (1954); Olmstead and Blake (1955); and further developed by Marlowe (1959) and Strickland and Crowne (1961). The central feature of the conformity situation, as in the original "Asch-situation," consists in the exposure of naive subjects to easily discriminable stimuli, in the present case a series of metronome "clicks." This is immediately followed by the judgments of three preinstructed accomplices of the experimenter who purposely give incorrect judgments on 13 critical trials. These unanimous incorrect judgments serve as the majority pressure, and conformity as defined as deflection of the naive subject's judgment, in the majority direction.

Unlike the original "Asch-situation," the accomplices in the present experiment were never physically present while the naive subjects made their judgment. Group pressure was simulated through the use of a tape recording, comprised of the stimuli to be judged and the "judgments" of
the accomplices. This procedure represents a marked departure from Asch's original situation.

Modified "Asch-situations" of this type have been used previously with considerable success (Blake and Brehm, 1954; Olmstead and Blake, 1955; Marlowe, 1959; and Strickland and Crowne, 1960) and contain certain improvements over the original "Asch-situation," as well as certain drawbacks. On the positive side, the expense and potential unreliability of actual confederates, re-enacting their roles with each new subject, may be dispensed with. This provides a method more efficient in time and effort, as well as more uniform for all subjects. On the negative side, the simulated group lacks the high degree of compelling reality possessed by the original "Asch-situation." In the light of these considerations, and particularly in view of the positive results previously obtained, the present simulated group pressure situation would seem to be an adequate one.

The stimuli to be judged in the present situation consisted of 18 series of "clicks" produced by a metronome at the rate of 180 per minute. Following each series, the three female accomplices stated how many "clicks" they heard. They responded in a fixed sequence and never disagreed with each other. On 13 of the 18 trials (the critical trials), the accomplices unanimously reported an incorrect number of "clicks." The "clicks" and accomplices'
responses were recorded on a tape. When the naive subject arrived for the tape session, she was given the following instructions:

This is an experiment in auditory perceptions. More specifically we are interested in seeing how accurately you can hear and report a series of audible clicks that will be played over this tape. Your answers will be recorded on this other tape and also by hand. (Subject is seated facing a complex 3-bank tape recorder, earphones are adjusted and she is given a microphone.) You will be the fourth subject to participate in this part of the experiment. This means you will hear a series of clicks, followed by the judgments of the three subjects who preceded you. Immediately following the third subject, you are to call out your answer into this microphone. Following this, there will be a seven second pause to record those subjects who come after you. Then, the next series of clicks, etc. Your job will be to report, as accurately as you can, the number of clicks you hear. Do you have any questions?

The number of "clicks" per trial, their order of appearance, and the "judgments" of the accomplices are shown in Table 1.

In order to determine the discriminability of the stimuli under conditions where group pressure was not a factor, four female judges listened to the taped "clicks" and made their judgments prior to those of the accomplices. They were all able to state the correct number of "clicks" with 100 per cent accuracy.

Each subject's conformity score was the total number of times she agreed with the majority on the 13 critical trials. The possible range of conformity scores is thus 0-13. The obtained range in the preliminary study was 0-13, with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Actual Number of Clicks</th>
<th>Response of Accomplices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Critical trial—accomplices incorrect.*
a mean of 2.87 and a standard deviation of 3.06 (N=39). In the final study the obtained range was 0-13, with a mean of 2.75 and a standard deviation of 3.29 (N=79).

The TAT Measure of Hostility and Defense

A number of studies have attempted to relate TAT fantasy measures of aggression to different behavioral indices of aggression, with varying degrees of success. Lindzey and TeJessy (1956) failed to find any relation between ten indices of aggression, culled from the TAT literature, and clinical ratings made by a "diagnostic council," or observer ratings of aggressiveness. They did find a high relation between the TAT aggression indices and self-ratings of aggressiveness, and interpret their results in terms of the differing "levels" of aggression, on a dimension of covert to overt, tapped by the TAT. They further point out that the particular "level" must be specified and the TAT scoring system worked out accordingly. The assumption that the TAT always reflects unconscious aggression is not tenable.

Scodel and Lipetz (1957) found that hospitalized psychotics with histories of suicidal and assaultive behavior did not show greater TAT hostility than those without such histories. Psychotics did show significantly less TAT hostility than hospitalized neurotics. They interpret their results in terms of the greater reticence or defensiveness
of the hospitalized psychotics, both with and without assaultive histories, with regard to expressing their hostility. They point out that the single common denominator among the men in their sample diagnosed psychotic is paranoid ideation, characterized by suspiciousness and "bland" test responses. They stress the need for an evaluation of "need-defense" systems rather than a simple prediction of overt hostility from TAT hostility, in an attempt to take into account the effects of test-taking defensiveness.

Gluck (1955), in a study employing neuropsychiatric patients, attempted to predict behavioral hostility from the TAT. Unlike the aforementioned studies, he attempted to assess both overt and covert aspects of hostility with the TAT, his scoring categories being quite similar to those used in the present study. He failed to find any relation between any of his TAT categories and behavioral hostility as measured by the S's reactions in a frustrating, stress situation. He interprets this as due to the limitations of the behavioral situation. S's were required to express their hostility to the same E who was playing the role of the frustrating authority figure and to do so at the same time as they were being frustrated. Thus while defensiveness was taken into account in the TAT scoring, it was not accounted for in the behavioral situation. A similar failing is present in Bialick's (1951) study. Bialick failed to find any relationship between nurses' ratings of
cooperativeness of a sample of psychiatric impatient and aggression, expressed by these patients, against authority figures on the TAT. As Gluck points out, neither of these studies provided a situation where the S's could express their hostility without fear of punishment.

Mussen and Naylor (1954) scored the TAT's of 29 lower-class boys, inmates at a juvenile study center, for aggressive "needs" and punishment "press" associated with the expression of aggression. These categories parallel Gluck's "overt" and "covert" hostility. A measure of behavioral aggression was obtained from the ratings of attendents at the center. Boys with greater aggressive needs, as assessed by the TAT, were somewhat more aggressive in their behavior, and those with greater punishment press were somewhat less. However, when these two categories were combined, much greater prediction was obtained. Boys with high aggressive needs--low punishment press showed much more overt aggression than boys with low aggressive needs--high punishment press.

This general approach is further supported by the work of Kagan (1956) and Lesser (1957). Kagan assessed aggressive needs and defenses with a series of TAT-like cards, graded for aggressive theme "pull." Failure to tell aggressive stories to pictures that strongly suggest aggression was taken as the measure of anxiety over the expression of aggression, while aggressive needs were assessed from
total number of aggressive stories. Predictions to overt aggression utilizing need as well as anxiety were confirmed. Teacher ratings were used as the measure of overt aggression.

Lesser measured aggressive "need" with the TAT, and derived his "defense" of anxiety measure from the rearing practices employed by the mother's of his male, school age subjects. He found a correlation of .43 between fantasy aggression and overt aggression (based on reputation for aggression among peers) for boys whose mothers encouraged the expression of aggression, and a correlation of -.41 between fantasy aggression and overt aggression for boys whose mothers discouraged the expression of aggression.

While methodological differences with regard to subjects, TAT cards, specific TAT hostility categories employed, and behavioral situations and their scoring, make comparisons of the foregoing studies difficult, certain generalizations do seem warranted. It would appear essential in scoring the TAT to separate out at least two main categories. These have been alternately defined as aggressive "Need," "overt hostility" or "expressed hostility" on the one hand, and punishment "press," "defense," "covert hostility" and "anxiety" over expression on the other. Studies in which these two are not separated will fail to predict behavioral hostility since opposite behavioral effects are to be expected for high need individuals as opposed to high defense individuals. A further important point is that the
concepts of defense and anxiety cannot be ignored in defining the measure of behavioral aggression. Thus the two studies which most strikingly relate TAT need-defense measures to overt or behavioral aggression (Mussen and Naylor, and Lesser), derived their behavioral aggression measures from situations in which the subjects were relatively free to express their aggression.

What all of the foregoing would seem to point up is that the TAT, or any fantasy measure for that matter, is not a royal road to the unconscious. Subjects react with the same characteristic expressions and defenses as they do in other situations whose stimuli arouse their hostility, sexual drives, achievement needs, and so forth. The TAT is useful because it provides a standardized method of comparing subjects and because the pictures possess enough ambiguity to allow for wide individual variation, which we are then free to attribute to personality differences. We must keep in mind that "overt" or "behavioral" aggression is really no more "overt" than what is produced to a TAT card. It is nothing more than a response to a particular type of situation whose cues arouse certain needs and their related defenses. An early statement of this general viewpoint is given by Rotter (1954). He stressed the importance of specifying the situational variables in making behavioral predictions, as well as the importance of taking both "need" variables and "expectancy" variables (in this case expectancy
for punishment following aggression) into account when making predictions from projective tests. It is this general conception of the TAT that underlies its use in the present study.

Ten cards were selected from the Murray series and administered to subjects individually, the examiner writing down the stories, with the standard TAT instructions. The cards and their order of presentation are as follows: 2, 6GF, 3BM, 6BM, 4, 8BM, 7 GF, 13MF, 8GF, and 18GF. Card 9GF, used in the preliminary study, was replaced by 8BM in the final study since a rough item analysis indicated its ineffectiveness.

The complete manual for scoring TAT hostility content is presented in Appendix A, with detailed examples for all the categories, and selected scoring examples for each card. A brief resumé will be presented here.

The scoring of the TAT breaks down into two major categories and two subsidiary categories. The two major categories are Expressed Hostility (Ex Hos) which parallels Gluck's "overt hostility," and Mussen and Naylor's "aggressive needs," and Covert Hostility (Co Hos) which parallels Gluck's "covert hostility," Mussen and Naylor's "Punishment press," and Kagan's "anxiety" related to expression of hostility. The subsidiary categories are Intropunitive Hostility (In Hos) and Expressed-Defended Hostility (E-D Hos).
Finally, a TAT Total Defended Hostility score was computed by combining Ex Hos, Co Hos and In Hos.

Expressed Hostility

The ability of the S to deal with hostile content in a direct and undefended manner is reflected in this category. Stories are scored here if aggressive or hostile action, thoughts, or motives are openly expressed in a non-defensive, unqualified manner. Obvious examples are stories dealing with fights, arguments, statements of anger or hatred, deliberate rejection, revenge and murder.

Stories in the Ex Hos category are scored along a three-point dimension: 1=mild, 2=moderate, and 3=severe. Ex Hos mild is scored for stories in which the hostility is not the central theme, or for milder fighting, arguing or intent-to-fight stories. Ex Hos moderate is scored for stories dealing with fighting, physical aggression, and intense verbal battles. Ex Hos severe is scored for stories dealing with murder, strangulation, very intense fights, and the like.

Covert Hostility

This category reflects what is typically assessed clinically as repressed hostility and its expression via defended or unconscious channels. The general principle involved is that the consequences of what is inferred to be hostile motivation are visited on the fantasy characters in
an indirect manner. The most obvious examples are deaths, accidents, and sicknesses.

Stories in this category are scored along a three-point dimension: 1=mild, 2=moderate, and 3=severe. Co Hos mild is scored when there is minimal reference to sicknesses or accidents, i.e., when they are not the central theme of the story. Co Hos moderate is scored when accidents and illnesses are of a more severe nature, or are the major components of the story. Co Hos severe is reserved for stories in which the "tragedies" are of major proportion, particularly deaths, heart attacks, and the like.

Intropunitive Hostility

This category represents the turning of aggression inward on the ego. In the present study its use was restricted entirely to card 3BM for stories dealing with depression, guilt and dejection and, on the remaining cards, solely to stories of suicide or suicidal intentions. In Hos was scored along a three-point dimension of mild, moderate and severe.

Expressed-Defended Hostility

This category was employed with stories which begin with a direct expression of hostility, such as is found in Ex Hos, but which were subsequently defended or qualified by denials, rationalizations, happy-endings, guilt, or
punishment. Stories are simply scored E-D Hos with the appropriate defense.

Summary

The majority of the stories receive one score, although in a few isolated instances, when two distinct themes are present, two scores may be given. By far the most frequently scored categories are 0, for stories which do not deal with hostility, Ex Hos, and Co Hos.

The total TAT protocol of each subject yields three major scores, Ex Hos, Co Hos, and Total Defended Hostility. In addition, some of the protocols received scores on In Hos and E-D Hos. On the basis of the preliminary study, it was decided to exclude the E-D Hos category from the final data analysis. This was done because of difficulty in establishing interscorer reliability, and because of its relatively infrequent occurrence. Because of some minor changes in the scoring procedure which were introduced between the preliminary and the final studies, the following summary will be presented in terms of the final study only, N=79.

1. **Ex Hos**: representing the amount of openly expressed hostility, with a potential range of 0-30. The obtained range was 0-10, with a mean of 4.53 and a standard deviation of 2.73.

2. **Co Hos**: representing the amount of repressed and defended hostility, with a potential range of 0-30. The
obtained range was 0-12, with a mean of 3.48 and a standard deviation of 2.81.

3. **In Hos**: representing the total amount of hostility turned inward, with a potential range of 0-30. The obtained range was 0-3 with a mean of .54 and a standard deviation of .98.

4. **TAT Total Defended Hostility**: This composite score, representing the best single estimate of each subject's need-defense system, was computed by subtracting Ex Hos from Co Hos + In Hos and adding the constant 10 to keep all scores positive. Thus, the higher the TAT total score, the more covert and defended hostility and the less openly expressed hostility. The potential range is -20 to 70 with an obtained range of 1 to 21. The mean was 9.49 with a standard deviation of 4.57.

**Interscorer Reliability**

In order to determine the interscorer reliability of the TAT categories described above, 20 TAT protocols (200 stories) were randomly selected from the final sample of 79, already scored by the author, and given to a second judge.* The judge scored these 20 protocols independently, using the scoring manual (Appendix A) as his guide. Interscorer reliability coefficients were computed for the Ex Hos, Co Hos, and TAT Total Defended Hostility categories. In Hos

*Our thanks are extended to Dr. Donald L. Mosher who served as the reliability judge.
occurred too infrequently to permit computation of a correlation coefficient. A percentage of agreement, computed for the In Hos category, yielded 50 per cent agreement between the two judges. In view of this relatively low reliability, and also because of its infrequent occurrence, it was decided not to use IN Hos as an independent category in the final analysis of results. In Hos does enter in as a component of the TAT Total Defended Hostility score, and, as such, is checked for reliability in a manner commensurate with its use in the final data analysis.

The scoring of the 20 protocols yielded two sets of scores (one for each judge) in each of the three main TAT categories. Each set was then independently ranked, and Spearman rank order correlation coefficients (rho) were computed to determine the interscorer reliability. These are presented in Table 2. Rho was utilized in preference to the more commonly used Pearson r, because it conformed more closely to the manner in which the data was handled in the final analysis of results.

The coefficients reported in Table 2 are at an acceptable level, and it was decided on the basis of this reliability check to carry out all further analysis, involving these TAT categories, using the author's original scoring.
TABLE 2

INTERSCORER RELIABILITY OF THREE TAT HOSTILITY CATEGORIES (TWO JUDGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Description</th>
<th>Correlation (rho)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex Ho (n=20)</td>
<td>rho = .92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co Ho (n=20)</td>
<td>rho = .84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Defended Hos (n=20)</td>
<td>rho = .86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hostility Arousal-Expression Situation

The Hostility Arousal-Expression situation was specially designed to test the hypotheses of the present study concerning the ego defensive nature of conformity. A situation was desired that would arouse the hostility of all subjects and, following this, give them a chance to express this hostility in a situation where they felt free to do so. This was attempted in the following manner.

When a subject appeared for this part of the experiment she and an accomplice of the experimenter, who was posing as a subject, were taken into a room, seated side by side across the table from E and read the following instructions in a somewhat gruff manner:

I'm Dr. ___ and I'm a psychologist conducting this experiment in measures of human performance. Now I want you to listen carefully to these instructions because I'll only read them once and I expect you to get it. The materials will consist of these 20 pegs and 20 hole peg-boards. I want you to take the pegs, one at a time, and place them in the holes, without touching the sides of the holes as you do so. You are then to remove them one at a time and return them to the box, in alignment. Continue to fill and empty the board until I tell you to stop.
You may use either hand but only one hand at a time. The colors of the pegs are not relevant to the present experiment. You may work at your own preferred speed. Ready, begin. (Experimenter starts stop watch.)

Each subject was provided with a box of 20 multicolored pegs and a small peg board. The task of getting the pegs in the holes without touching the sides proved to be a rather difficult one. The subsequent harassment of the experimenter, and the efforts of subjects to comply, made it even more difficult.

When the naive subject had gone through the peg-board three times, the experimenter stopped both subjects (the naive subject and the accomplice), informed the naive subject of the number of mistakes she had made and told them both they would have to begin again, resetting the stop watch as he did so. During the next five to six minutes both subjects were harassed and criticized about minor imperfections in their performance. Next, the accomplice was stopped, informed of the number of "mistakes" she had made, and both subjects were told they must begin all over. At approximately 12 minutes from the start, both subjects were stopped and the following statement was made to them:

You'd think by this time one of you would have figured out that the "X's" (each peg had a small X on one end) have something to do with it. It should be obvious that the experiment is concerned with uniformity, and most subjects figure it out by this time. The "X's" all have to go the same way, either all up or all down. You'll both have to begin at the start, and try to get it right this time.
After a total time of 15 minutes had elapsed, both subjects were told to stop, and go down the hall for the final portion of the experiment. They were told to wait in front of room__, and that the experimenter would be there in about 5 minutes. They left the experimental room and the experimenter slammed the door behind them.

The period of approximately 2 minutes in the hall and in front of the second room constituted the "free" expression situation. If the naive subject did not spontaneously comment on the experiment, the accomplice said, in an angry voice:

Boy, he makes me mad, having us do that stupid thing, and then telling us we're wrong. Doesn't that get you?

The response of the subject to this statement was the main indicator of hostility expression in the "free" situation. If the subject did not respond, or if her response was equivocal, the accomplice made a further angry remark, ending in a question to the naive subject as to her feeling. The experimenter then came down the hall, and ushered the subject and the accomplice into separate rooms. At this time the accomplice recorded verbatim the remarks of the subject, made during the free period. A brief interview was then conducted with the subject, consisting of the following questions:

1. What did you think of the experiment?

2. How did you feel when I kept telling you your were doing it wrong?
3. Did it make you angry?

The interview was conducted by the experimenter, who dropped the critical, punitive manner adopted during the hostility arousal portion of the experiment. After the interview, the subject was informed of the nature of the experiment and, in a few cases, brief reassurance was given.

The hostility Arousal-Expression situation had a rather marked effect on the majority of subjects, with extreme reactions ranging from barely controllable anger, to rather intense anxiety. None of the subjects expressed doubts about the authenticity of the accomplice.

On the basis of the 25 subjects run in the final form of the situation, in the preliminary study, a manual was developed to provide a more accurate and reliable scoring procedure for the final study. This scoring manual, complete with examples of responses in each of the several categories, will be found in Appendix B. A summary of the categories will be presented here.

The Accomplice-Subject Dialogue

Responses of the subject, made to the accomplice in the "free" situation immediately following hostility arousal, constituted the most important measure of hostility
expression-repression. The subjects' responses are divided into five categories as follows:

**Strong Expression of Hostility**

In this category are placed those responses which leave little or no doubt as to the subject's anger toward E. Instances in which the subject refers to E in colloquial terms ("bitch," or "bastard") or makes clear statements of their anger toward him (He makes me so mad," or "I was getting ready to hit him") are placed in this category. The intensity of the subject's anger is not as important a criterion as is its direct and undefended expression. This means that statements of anger or dislike directed toward E or the task are not rationalized or denied or minimized.

**Mild Expression of Hostility**

Responses in this category show some evidence of the subject's ability to express hostility, but lack the clarity, undefensiveness, or strength of the responses scored **Strong Expression of Hostility**. Here are placed responses which vacillate between blaming E and turning the blame inwards, with blaming E predominating. Also, those responses in which some hostility is expressed, but the subject then minimizes it by talking about her own failure with the pegs, or changing the subject in a forced manner. In general,
responses in which the subject's expression of anger is present, but is not the central theme of her remarks, are placed in this category.

**Insight**

Responses are placed in this category if they indicate insight into the hostility arousing properties of the situation and/or the experimenter's actions. References to the experimenter's trying to get them made, being "nasty" to see how it effects their performance with the pegs, and so forth, all qualify. The most important general consideration is that subjects do not repress the hostile contents of the situation, although they may use a variety of intellectual defenses to control their anger. Thus, mention that the experimenter was "supposed to make them mad," or was, "trying to make us angry to test our reactions," even though they are not angry, qualify as **Insight**.

**Strong Repression of Hostility**

Responses in this category indicate that the subjects are utilizing repressive and avoidance defenses to keep their aroused hostility at bay. The most common of these are a focusing on the task itself, especially with emphasis on their own poor performances. Here would come all those remarks regarding the number of "mistakes" they made, how they "did it wrong," and a
general acceptance, at face value, of the experimenter's criticisms given during the arousal portion of the situation. In line with this masochistic trend would go all those responses which emphasize how "nervous" they felt, or how "stupid" they were for not "doing it right." In addition, blunt avoidance of the accomplice's expressed anger, by changing the subject, or returning to a discussion of the task itself are important indices of Strong Repression of Hostility.

Mild Repression of Hostility

Like Mild Expression, the Mild Repression of Hostility category is reserved for those responses which do not permit a clear-cut placement in the Strong category. Here would go those responses in which some minimum anger is expressed but is then denied or overlaid with self-blame, and so on. In general, the repressive elements, such as talking about the task, avoiding the accomplice's statements of anger, changing the subject, and so on, must predominate. Those responses in which some insight into the hostility arousing properties of the situation are present, but are outweighed by repressive elements are also scored in this category.
The Interview with the Examiner

The responses of subjects in the Experimenter Interview were utilized primarily to determine the consistency of their response in this and the Accomplice-Subject dialogue. The five categories, described above, were reduced to three. Strong and Mild Expression were collapsed to Expression of Hostility; Strong and Mild Repression were collapsed to Repression of Hostility; the third category, Insight, remained the same. Definitions and scoring principles are given in the scoring manual (Appendix B), and are essentially the same as those described above.

Scoring and Reliability in the Final Study

From the final study, 79 protocols were available, consisting of the accomplice's verbatim transcript of the Accomplice-Subject Dialogue, and the subject's answers to the three questions in the Experimenter Interview.

Accomplice-Subject Dialogue

The protocols were coded, so that the subject's name was not visible during scoring, and the two parts of the protocol were scored separately. They were first scored by the author, using the scoring categories described above. They were then given to a second judge who scored them independently, using the scoring manual (Appendix B) as his guide.
The ratings of the Accomplice-Subject Dialogue by the two judges were then compared for purposes of selecting out subjects, scored with high interjudge reliability, for use in the final analysis. This process yielded three categories with very high percentage of agreement:

**Strong Expression of Hostility** (n=26, 92% agreement)
**Insight** (n=13, 85% agreement)
**Strong Repression of Hostility** (n=19, 100% agreement)

Of the 26 subjects in the Strong Expression of Hostility category, 24 were rated Strong Expression by both judges and two were rated Strong Expression by one judge and Mild Expression by the other, for a total of 92 per cent complete agreement. Of the 13 subjects in the Insight category, 11 were rated Insight by both judges, and two were rated Insight by one judge and Strong Expression by the other, for a total of 85 per cent complete agreement. Of the 19 subjects in the Strong Repression category, all 19 were rated Strong Repression by both judges, for a total of 100 per cent complete agreement. As can be seen, the four cases of "disagreement" in the first two categories are of degree and not direction.

The remaining 21 cases in which divergent, or Mild, judgments were given were replaced in a Doubtful category and were not used in the final testing of hypotheses involving the Hostility Arousal-Expression situation. In summary, the reliability judging procedure yielded three highly reliable groups.
of 26 (Strong Expression), 13 (Insight), and 19 (Strong Repression), for a total N of 58, with 21 subjects left in a Doubtful category.

**Experimenter Interview**

The protocols of these 58 reliably scored subjects were then analyzed in terms of the Experimenter Interview portion of their response. A comparison of the two judges yielded 95 per cent agreement on this part of the protocol. Complete agreement existed on 55 of the subjects, and on the remaining three, the disagreement was one of degree and not direction. A comparison of the two portions of the protocol (Accomplice-Subject Dialogue with Experimenter Interview) revealed that 49 of the 58 subjects were consistent in their behavior in both parts of the situation. Of the remaining nine, six were scored Strong Expression in the Accomplice-Subject Dialogue and Repression in the Experimenter Interview. One was scored Insight in the Accomplice-Subject Dialogue and Repression in the Experimenter Interview. These seven subjects formed a group of Inconsistent hostility expressors. This group shall be used later in conjunction with the M-C SD scale since their pattern of behavior in the Hostility Arousal-Expression situation forms a convenient operational definition of manipulative "need for approval." The remaining two inconsistent subjects were scored Strong Repression in the Accomplice-Subject Dialogue and Expression in the
Experimenters Interview. They were not included as a separate group in the final data analysis.

Scoring in the Preliminary Study

The main reason for doing a pilot experiment, preliminary to the final study, was to develop an adequate methodology for measuring hostility expression-repression in a "free" situation. Thus while the conformity and TAT measures and results are comparable from preliminary to final study, the comparison of results based on the preliminary form of the Hostility Arousal-Expression situation must be treated with much more caution.

After discarding several earlier versions of the situation, we settled on the final version described above. Only 25 of the total 39 preliminary study subjects were run in this form of the situation. These 25 protocols were utilized in constructing the scoring manual (Appendix B) which then enabled us to carry out an interscorer reliability check in the final study. No interjudge reliability was established with these preliminary results. Rather, they were categorized by the author, on a blind basis, into two groups: Hostility Expression and Hostility Repression. Subjects in the Hostility Expression group included all those who would be scored Strong Expression, Mild Expression and Insight in the final study. Subjects in the Hostility Repression group included all those to be scored Strong
Repression and Mild Repression in the final study. Because of the reduced number of subjects, an exclusion of doubtful cases was not possible, a further factor which leads us to treat the preliminary study categorization as a rough approximation. Of the 25 subjects in the preliminary study, 14 were scored Hostility Expression and 11 were scored Hostility Repression.

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C SD)

The M-C SD scale is described by its authors as a measure of the need to present oneself in a socially desirable light (Crowne and Marlowe, 1960). This is inferred when the subject attributes culturally approved statements to himself, while denying culturally unacceptable traits. Items for the scale were selected from a pool representing statements which are culturally sanctioned and approved, but are improbable of occurrence. This procedure was followed to provide a scale free from the psychopathology content felt to contaminate earlier social desirability scales (Edwards, 1957). High scores on the M-C SD scale represent the endorsement of items which reflect a strong need to present oneself in a favorable light, and to deny the presence of motives and actions which might lead to social disapproval. As was pointed out in Chapter II, the originators of the scale consider it to be a measure of the "need for social approval."
The scale consists of 33 items, which the subject answers either true or false. The potential range is 0-33. In the preliminary study, the obtained range was 6-26, with a mean of 17.05 and a standard deviation of 5.25 (N=39). In the final study the obtained range was 5-23, with a mean of 16.27 and a standard deviation of 5.51 (N=79). The complete M-C SD scale is presented in Appendix C.

The TAT Measure of n Affiliation

The TAT n Affiliation measure, originated by Shipley and Veroff (1958), was employed in the preliminary study for purposes of checking alternative hypotheses at two points. Conformity, the first of these, has been conceptualized as arising from motives in the n Affiliation family. Both Hardy (1958) and Samelson (1958), theorizing along this line and using different modifications of the "Asch-situation," failed to find any direct relation between n Affiliation and conformity. Hardy did find a relationship when he broke n Affiliation into high, medium and low groups and used conformity pressure with a complete majority and with social support (one accomplice siding with the naive subject). The medium n Affiliation group was the only one to conform in both situations, a finding which he attributes, post hoc, to their "ambivalent motivation toward social acceptance."

The second, and related, alternative arises from the Crowne et al. conceptualization of conformity as an expression of the "need for social approval." As we point out in
Chapter II, this line of reasoning forms an alternative to the conceptualization, advanced in the present study, which treats conformity (and the M-C SD scale) as expressions of a character defense involving repressed hostility. The "need for approval" hypothesis would predict a relationship between M-C SD and TAT n Affiliation and between conformity and TAT n Affiliation.

Since this is the case, and since both Hardy's and Samelson's results are equivocal, it seems worth while to score the TAT protocols, at least in the preliminary study, for n Affiliation. Comparisons would then be made between n Affiliation-conformity and n Affiliation-M-C SD.

The definition of n Affiliation is that of Shipley and Veroff, and Heyns et al. (1958). The scoring system is a simplification of that outlined by these authors. N Affiliation is defined as:

Concern ... over establishing, maintaining or restoring a positive affective relationship with another person ... most adequately described by the word friendship (Heyns et al., p. 205).

Both positive concern (e.g., the seeking of friendships) and negative concern (e.g., rejection, separation anxiety, and loneliness) contribute to the make up of n Affiliation.

On the seven subcategories outlined by Heyns et al., only two were employed in the present scoring system. These are:

**Affiliative Imagery:** scored +1 for any story meeting the minimal definition of n Affiliation.
**Affiliation Thema**: Scored +1 for any story in which Affiliation dominates the central plot of the entire story.

Thus each story could receive a score of 0.1 or 2, yielding a potential range of 0-20 for each subject. The obtained range in the preliminary study was 0-8, with a mean of 2.44 and a standard deviation of 2.10. The complete manual for scoring in Affiliation may be found in Heyns et al. (1953).
Subjects

The subjects in both the preliminary and final studies were girls, enrolled in an Introductory Psychology course at the Ohio State University. All students in this course are required to volunteer for a certain number of experiments. Our subjects volunteered for a two hour experiment in "Personality and Perception." Thirty-nine girls participated in the preliminary study, 25 of these completing the entire series including the Hostility Arousal-Expression situation. Seventy-nine girls participated in the final study which was conducted the following quarter.

The Preliminary Study

The preliminary study may be broken into two groups of subjects. The first group consists of those 25 subjects who received the conformity measure and the TAT during their first hour, and the Hostility Arousal-Expression measure their second. The second group of 14 subjects were tried out in the earlier versions of the Hostility Arousal-Expression situation their first hour and were given the conformity measure and the TAT during their second. These earlier ver-
sions of the situation yielded no usable data. M-C SD scores were obtained from scales administered independently of the present experiment to the total Introductory Psychology course population at the beginning of the quarter. Thus, the preliminary study yielded scores for 39 subjects on conformity and the TAT, and for 38 subjects on the M-C SD scale (one being lost); and for 25 of these same 39 on the Hostility Arousal-Expression situation.

It should be pointed out that the two groups comprising the larger pool of 39 subjects, on which comparisons of conformity-TAT, conformity-M-C SD, and TAT-M-C SD were based, received these measures in different orders. Twenty-five of them received the conformity measure and the TAT the first hour, while the other 14 received the conformity measure and the TAT the second hour, having previously participated in early versions of the Hostility Arousal-Expression situation. The main effect of this difference in order of administration was to make the latter group more suspicious regarding the "rigged" nature of psychological experiments and hence more skeptical in the conformity situation. All 39 subjects in the preliminary study were asked the following three questions, immediately after the conformity situation, to determine their degree of "insight" into what was actually being measured.

1. What did you think was the purpose of this part of the experiment?
2. Who do you think the people you heard were?

3. Did they influence you in making your judgments?

Since "insight" into the situation did not seem to preclude conformity (several of the subjects who conformed five and six times had some form of "insight"), no subjects were excluded on this basis. There is, of course, a necessary relation between "insight" in the situation, particularly conceptualizing it in terms of independence of judgment, and non-conformity. All of the completely independent subjects had "insights" into the situation in so far as they were able to recognize its relationship to group pressure and independence of judgment. None of the completely independent subjects in the group of 25 had insight into the "rigged" nature of the situation, however. Only two subjects in the group of 14 did. On the basis of these findings, we decided to drop the three questions from the final study to eliminate the arousal of the subject's suspicions, which, we felt, might subsequently bias their response in the Hostility Arousal-Expression situation.

To summarize, the preliminary study enabled us to make comparisons of conformity--hostility expression, and TAT--hostility expression on 25 subjects who were run in a manner closely following that of the final study. Further, we were able to increase this N to 39 for comparisons of conformity with the TAT scores, and to 38 for comparisons of conformity--M-C SD, and TAT--M-C SD.
The Final Study

Seventy-nine girls participated as subjects in the final study. When a subject appeared for her initial hour she was taken from the waiting room to a room containing the tape recording apparatus and given the conformity test. No questions were asked or answered by the experimenter at this time. The subject was then taken to a different room for administration of the TAT and M-C SD scale. In this room the subjects were seated across a table from the experimenter who read the following instructions:

This is going to be a test of your imagination. I am going to show you these pictures, one at a time, and I just want you to make up a story about what you see there. You can talk about what is going on, what led up to it, and what the outcome will be. You might talk about the relationship of the different people. There are no right no wrong answers and you may make your stories as long or as short as you like.

The ten TAT cards were then administered. When this was finished the subject was given the M-C SD scale, which she filled out on her own, following the instructions at the top of the scale (see Appendix C). When this was completed, a time was arranged for the second hour of the experiment. The interval between first and second hours ranged from one to two weeks.

When a subject arrived for her second hour the experimenter met her in the same waiting room and asked if two "subjects" were present for "Experiment A-24." The subject and accomplice, who had been previously planted in the
waiting room, indicated that they were, and the experimenter ushered them both into the same room previously used for the TAT and M-C SD scale administration. The two "subjects" (real subject and accomplice) were seated together across a table from the experimenter who proceeded to check their names in his appointment book. This being done, the Hostility Arousal-Expression situation, already described in Chapter III, was enacted. The accomplices, four in number, were all undergraduate girls recruited from the same student population as the subjects. They were paid $1.00 an hour for their time and efforts.

Following the free expression period with the accomplice and the three question Experimenter-Interview, the purpose of the experiment was explained to the subjects and they were asked not to say anything about it until that time when all subjects would be run. In spite of the fact that they had just participated in the rather trying hostility arousal portion of the experiment, many of the subjects felt they had learned something of value through their participation, either about themselves, or the general nature of conformity, or both.
CHAPTER V

RESULTS

The two major hypotheses of the present study predicted relationships between conformity in a modified "Asch-situation," hostility expression on the TAT, and the expression of hostility in a "free" situation, following arousal. These hypotheses may be stated as follows:

1. Conformity will be inversely related to the direct expression of hostility on the TAT (Ex Hos), and directly related to covert hostility and its handling by repressive defenses (TAT Co Hos and Total Defended Hostility).

2. Conformity will be inversely related to the expression of hostility in the Hostility Arousal-Expression situation, and directly related to hostility repression in this situation.

In addition, a third hypothesis, comparing the two measures of hostility expression, may be stated as follows:

3. Hostility expression in the Hostility Arousal-Expression situation will be positively related to the TAT measure of directly expressed hostility; and hostility repression in the situation will be
... positively related to the TAT measures of covert and defended hostility.

To test the first hypothesis concerning the relationship between conformity and the TAT hostility measures, the subjects were divided into three groups on the basis of their conformity scores. These were: a group of Independent subjects, conforming zero times; a group of Middle Conformity subjects, conforming one to three times; and a group of High Conformity subjects, conforming four to thirteen times. Tables 3 and 4 list the mean scores on the various TAT hostility categories for these three groups.

**TABLE 3**

**PRELIMINARY STUDY**

**MEAN TAT HOSTILITY SCORES OF INDEPENDENT, MIDDLE AND HIGH CONFORMITY GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAT Category</th>
<th>Independents (n=12)</th>
<th>Middle Conformity (n=14)</th>
<th>High Conformity (n=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Hostility</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert + Intropunitive Hos.*</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Defended Hostility</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>13.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The covert + intropunitive hostility categories were scored as one in the preliminary study. They were separated, and the In Hos category was more narrowly defined, in the final study, to increase interscorer reliability.*
Inspection of Tables 3 and 4 reveals that in every case (with the exception of the Middle Conformity score on In Hos) the means are in the direction predicted by our hypothesis. To test the significance of the major differences appearing in Tables 3 and 4, the Independent and High Conformity groups were ranked on the three major TAT scores and Mann Whitney U tests were computed. The results of these U-Tests are reported in Tables 5 and 6. Inspection of Tables 5 and 6 indicates that the first hypothesis is supported in every instance.

Non-parametric statistics were used throughout the entire study. We followed this course because the distribution of our major variable, conformity, was highly skewed, and because the situation yielded categories rather than continuous scores.
TABLE 5
PRELIMINARY STUDY
DIFFERENCE IN INDEPENDENT AND HIGH CONFORMITY
SUBJECTS ON THREE TAT HOSTILITY SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAT Category</th>
<th>Independent (n = 12) Mean rank</th>
<th>High Conformity (n = 13) Mean rank</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Hostility</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert + Intropunitive Hostility</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Defended Hostility</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One-tailed test.

TABLE 6
FINAL STUDY
DIFFERENCE IN INDEPENDENT AND HIGH CONFORMITY
SUBJECTS ON THREE TAT HOSTILITY SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAT Category</th>
<th>Independent (n=12) Mean rank</th>
<th>High Conformity (n=13) Mean rank</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Hostility</td>
<td>25.59</td>
<td>19.41</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert Hostility</td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>25.54</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Defended Hostility</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>26.30</td>
<td>158.5</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One-tailed test.
An alternative way of testing this relationship is to compare the two conformity groups (Independents and High Conformity) on the basis of the relative size of their TAT Ex Hos to Co Hos scores. Dividing these groups, in the final study, yields the following two by two table:

**TABLE 7**

**EX HOS TO CO HOS RATIOS FOR INDEPENDENT AND HIGH CONFORMITY GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Independents</th>
<th>High Conformity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex Hos greater</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than Co Hos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co Hos greater</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than Ex Hos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total N=42 (two ties)</strong>, yielding a $X^2$ of 3.63, $p = .05$ (one tailed test).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This same comparison, now utilizing the entire sample from the final study split at the median on conformity (below median on conformity group conforming 0-1 times, $n=42$; above median on conformity group conforming 2-13 times, $n=37$) yields the following table:

**TABLE 8**

**EX HOS TO CO HOS RATIOS FOR TOTAL SAMPLE, SPLIT AT THE MEDIAN ON CONFORMITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below Md on Conformity</th>
<th>Above Md on Conformity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex Hos greater</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than Co Hos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co Hos greater</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than Ex Hos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total N=74 (five ties)</strong>, $X^2=1.58$, $p$ not significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results reported in Table 7 essentially confirm the U tests reported in Tables 5 and 6. The failure to find a significant difference in TAT hostility expression when the entire conformity sample is used (Table 8) indicates that it is the extreme groups (upper and lower 28%) which account for the previously cited results. Given the nature of the conformity measure, we may take this as additional confirmation of the first hypothesis, since the group that conforms not at all (Independents) forms a more meaningful operational definition of non-conformity than the larger group containing subjects who also conform one time. This is equally true of the High Conformity group as contrasted to those more widely distributed subjects above the Md on conformity.

The second major hypothesis predicted an inverse relationship between conformity and the expression of hostility in a "free" situation; and a direct relationship between conformity and hostility repression in the situation. Tables 9 and 10 list the mean conformity scores for subjects in the various categories of the Hostility Arousal-Expression situation.

Inspection of Tables 9 and 10 reveals that in all cases the conformity means are in the direction predicted by the hypothesis. To test the significance of these differences, U-tests were computed between the several
Hostility Arousal-Expression categories, ranked on Conformity. These are reported in Tables 11 and 12.

**TABLE 9**

**PRELIMINARY STUDY**

**MEAN CONFORMITY SCORES OF SUBJECTS SCORED HOSTILITY EXPRESSION AND HOSTILITY REPRESSION IN THE AROUSAL-EXPRESSION SITUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hostility Expression (n=14)</th>
<th>Hostility Repression (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 10**

**FINAL STUDY**

**MEAN CONFORMITY SCORES OF SUBJECTS SCORED STRONG EXPRESSION, INSIGHT, STRONG REPRESSION, AND DOUBTFUL IN THE AROUSAL-EXPRESSION SITUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong Expression (n=26)</th>
<th>Strong Repression (n=19)</th>
<th>Insight (n=13)</th>
<th>Doubtful* (n=21)</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=79)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: with regard to the scoring and reliability of the Hostility Arousal-Expression situation, we should mention that the mean conformity score of subjects in the Doubtful category closely approximates the mean of the Total sample, indicating a lack of any form of consistent bias in placing subjects in this category.


TABLE 11

PRELIMINARY STUDY

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HOSTILITY EXPRESSION AND HOSTILITY REPRESSION GROUPS, RANKED ON CONFORMITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hostility Expression (n=14)</th>
<th>Hostility Repression (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean rank</td>
<td>Mean rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>10.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{align*}
U & = 42.5 \\
z & = 1.89 \\
p^* & = .03
\end{align*}
\]

*One-tailed test.

TABLE 12

FINAL STUDY

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN STRONG EXPRESSION, STRONG REPRESSION, AND INSIGHT-STRONG REPRESSION GROUPS, RANKED ON CONFORMITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong Expression (n=26)</th>
<th>Strong Repression (n=13)</th>
<th>Insight Repression (n=19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean rank</td>
<td>Mean rank</td>
<td>Mean rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity (S.E.-S.R.)</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>27.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I.-S.R.)</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>19.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{align*}
U & = 168.5 \\
z & = 1.80 \\
p^* & = .04 \\
U & = 64.5 \\
z & = 2.26 \\
p^* & = .01
\end{align*}
\]

*One-tailed test.

The results reported in Tables 9 to 12 are in each instance consistent with, and strongly supportive of, the second major hypothesis.

The third hypothesis predicted relationships between the two measures of hostility expression and defense; namely the TAT and the Arousal-Expression situation. Tables 13
and 14 list the mean scores of the three main TAT categories for the several Arousal-Expression categories.

**TABLE 13**

**PRELIMINARY STUDY**

**MEAN TAT HOSTILITY SCORES OF THE HOSTILITY EXPRESSION AND HOSTILITY REPRESSION GROUPS OF THE AROUSAL-EXPRESSION SITUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAT Category</th>
<th>Hostility Expression (n=14)</th>
<th>Hostility Repression (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Hostility</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert + Intro-punitive Hostility</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Defended Hostility</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>11.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 14**

**FINAL STUDY**

**MEAN TAT HOSTILITY SCORES OF GROUPS CATEGORIZED STRONG EXPRESSION, INSIGHT, STRONG REPRESSION, AND DOUBTFUL IN THE AROUSAL-EXPRESSION SITUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAT Category</th>
<th>Strong Expression (n=26)</th>
<th>Insight (n=13)</th>
<th>Strong Repression (n=19)</th>
<th>Doubtful (n=21)</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=79)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Hostility</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert Hostility</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Defended Hostility</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>9.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inspection of Tables 13 and 14 reveals that in every case the means lie in the predicted direction. To ascertain the significance of these differences, U-tests were computed between the various Arousal-Expression categories, ranked on TAT hostility scores. These are reported in Tables 15 and 16.

**TABLE 15**

PRELIMINARY STUDY

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HOSTILITY EXPRESSION AND HOSTILITY REPRESSION GROUPS, RANKED ON THREE TAT HOSTILITY SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAT Category</th>
<th>Hostility Expression (n=14) mean rank</th>
<th>Hostility Repression (n=11) Mean rank</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Hostility</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>58.</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert+Intro-punitive Hos</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Defended Hostility</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One-tailed test.
TABLE 16

FINAL STUDY

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN STRONG EXPRESSION—STRONG REPRESSION, AND INSIGHT—STRONG REPRESSION GROUPS, RANKED ON THREE TAT HOSTILITY SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAT Category</th>
<th>Strong Expression (n=26)</th>
<th>Insight (n=13)</th>
<th>Strong Repression (n=19)</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex Hos</td>
<td>25.13</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>191.5</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S.E.-S.R.)</td>
<td>(I.-S.R.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co Hos</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>194.5</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S.E.-S.R.)</td>
<td>(I.-S.R.)</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>173.5</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One-tailed test.

Only one of the results reported in Tables 15 and 16 reaches the conventional .05 level of significance. However, this result is the most important single comparison: TAT Total Defended Hostility with Strong Expression—Strong Regression groups in the Arousal-Expression situation. This, along with the consistency of these results (not a single reversal) may be taken as good general support for the third hypothesis.
Secondary Hypotheses

In addition to the three major hypotheses, a number of secondary hypotheses primarily involving the M-C SD scale and TAT n Affiliation were formulated. Specifically, we took the position that the M-C SD scale might fruitfully be conceptualized as a measure of the same type of repressive character defense previously described in connection with conformity. On this basis it was predicted that:

1. The M-C SD scale would relate positively to conformity in the modified "Asch-situation."
2. The M-C SD scale would be inversely related to the TAT measure of directly expressed hostility and directly related to the TAT measures of covert and defended hostility.
3. The M-C SD scale would be directly related to the repression of hostility, following arousal, in the "free" situation.

To test the first hypothesis subjects were dichotomized at the median on the M-C SD scale and at the median on conformity. Conformity was also broken into upper and lower extreme groups. Chi-squared tests were computed from the resulting two by two tables. Table 17 lists the results of these tests for the preliminary and final studies.
TABLE 17

CHI-SQUARED TESTS RELATING CONFORMITY TO THE M-C SD SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conformity Split at Md.</th>
<th>Conformity Extreme Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Study</td>
<td>$X^2 = .001$ (n=38)</td>
<td>$X^2 = -.01^*$ (n=24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Study</td>
<td>$X^2 = 1.46$ (n=79)</td>
<td>$X^2 = 1.47$ (n=44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Minus sign indicates an inverse relationship.

The results reported in Table 17 fail to confirm the first of our secondary hypotheses since in no case are the chi-squared tests significant. The comparison in the preliminary study indicate a marked lack of any relationship, while those in the final study are in the predicted direction.

The second of our subsidiary hypotheses predicted an inverse relationship between M-C SD and TAT Ex Hos; and a direct relationship between M-C SD and TAT Co Hos and TAT Total Defended Hostility. To test this, subjects were dichotomized at the median on M-C SD and at the medians on the three TAT Hostility scores. Chi-squared tests were computed from the resulting two by two tables. Table 18 lists the results of these tests.

The results in Table 18 reveal a lack of relationship between the M-C SD scale and the TAT Ex Hos and Total Defended Hos categories. M-C SD fails to relate to the Co Hos (actually Co+In Hos) in the preliminary study. However,
the comparison of M-C SD with Co Hos in the final study is significant.

TABLE 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHI-SQUARED TESTS RELATING THE M-C SD SCALE TO TAT HOSTILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAT Ex Hos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Study (n=38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Study (n=79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p .05, one-tailed test.

While the over-all picture presented by these results is one suggesting a lack of relationship between TAT hostility and the M-C SD scale, this last finding is suggestive of a trend in support of our hypothesis.

The third hypothesis stated that the M-C SD scale would be directly related to repression of hostility, following arousal, in the "free" situation. This hypothesis provides a crucial test in which the "need for social approval" conceptualization is forced to predict the opposite from the repressive-defense explanation. Tables 19 and 20 list the mean M-C SD scores for the several categories scored in the Hostility Arousal-Expression situation.
TABLE 19
PRELIMINARY STUDY

MEAN M-C SD SCORES OF HOSTILITY EXPRESSION AND HOSTILITY REPRESSION GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hostility Expression (n=14)</th>
<th>Hostility Repression (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| M-C SD                    | 14.57                       | 21.09

TABLE 20
FINAL STUDY

MEAN M-C SD SCORES FOR GROUPS SCORED STRONG EXPRESSION, INSIGHT, STRONG REPRESSION, AND DOUBTFUL IN THE AROUSAL-EXPRESSION SITUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong-Expres-</th>
<th>Strong-Repres-</th>
<th>Insight</th>
<th>Doubtful</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>(n=13)</td>
<td>(n=19)</td>
<td>(n=21)</td>
<td>(n=79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| M-C SD         | 15.81          | 15.77   | 17.63    | 15.90        | 16.27

The means reported in Tables 19 and 20 are all in the direction predicted by the repression-defense hypothesis. A U-test comparing the two groups in the preliminary study yielded: $U = 16, z = 3.34, p = .001$. A point biserial correlation coefficient was computed on these two groups and yielded: $r_{pt. biser.} = +.63$. Thus the preliminary study very strongly supports the third hypothesis. Table 21 lists the U tests on the Strong Expression--Strong Repression, and Insight--Strong Repression groups, ranked on M-C SD scores, in the final study.
### TABLE 21

**FINAL STUDY**

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN STRONG EXPRESSION—STRONG REPRESSION, AND INSIGHT—STRONG REPRESSION GROUPS, RANKED ON M-C SD SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strong Expression (n=26)</th>
<th>Insight (n=13)</th>
<th>Strong Repression (n=19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-C SD</td>
<td>Mean rank 21.25</td>
<td>Mean rank 25.39</td>
<td>Mean rank 201.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Strong Expression—Strong Repression)</td>
<td>U 1.04</td>
<td>z 97.15</td>
<td>p* .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Insight—Strong Repression)</td>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>97.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One-tailed test.

As Table 21 shows, the strong relationship between M-C SD and Repression in the Hostility Arousal-Expression situation found in the preliminary study fail to reach significance in the final study, though it is still in the predicted direction.

The Hostility Arousal-Expression situation gave the subjects two separate opportunities to express their aroused hostility, one to the accomplice in the Accomplice-Subject Dialogue and the other to the Experimenter in the Experimenter Interview (both described more fully in Chapter III and Appendix b). Expression to the accomplice was the more important of the two, and the second, expression to the experimenter, was used primarily to pick out subjects who
were inconsistent in their expression in these two portions of the situation. By this process we were able to single out a small group of seven subjects who were inconsistent in the way they expressed their hostility. Of these seven, six were scored Strong Expression and one Insight in the Accomplice-Subject Dialogue, all seven being scored Repression in the Experimenter Interview. Table 22 presents the mean scores of these seven inconsistent subjects, along with the mean scores of the 20 subjects who were consistently scored Expression in both Accomplice-Subject Dialogue and Experimenter Interview, on the major measures of the study.

TABLE 22

FINAL STUDY

MEAN CONFORMITY, TAT HOSTILITY, AND M-C SD SCORES FOR INCONSISTENT AND CONSISTENT HOSTILITY EXPRESSION GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inconsistent Group (n=7)</th>
<th>Consistent Group (n=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAT: Ex Hos</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co Hos</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C SD</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>14.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An inspection of Table 22 reveals that the inconsistent subjects are not significantly different from the consistent hostility expression group with regard to
conformity and the TAT measures. In each of these instances, they behave in the fashion predicted for Strong Hostility Expressors in the Accomplice-Subject Dialogue, if not a little more so (i.e., their conformity and TAT Total means are lower than those of the consistent group). However, the mean M-C SD score of the inconsistent group is considerably larger than that of the consistent group. The results of a U-test comparing these groups is given in Table 23.

TABLE 23
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN INCONSISTENT AND CONSISTENT GROUPS IN THE HOSTILITY AROUSAL-EXPRESSION SITUATION, RANKED ON M-C SD SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group (n=7)</th>
<th>Group (n=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean rank</td>
<td>Mean rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inconsistent</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One-tailed test.

As Table 23 indicates, the mean difference on M-C SD scores for these two groups is significant, even with the small number of subjects in the Inconsistent group.

As a final step in the analysis of results, the TAT protocols from the preliminary study, originally scored for hostility were scored for n Affiliation. To investigate the possible relationship of n Affiliation with the major variables of the study four comparisons were carried out. N Affiliation scores were ranked for the following dichotomous groups: Independents and High Conformity, above and below
the median on the M-C SD scale, above and below the median
on TAT Total Defended Hostility, and Hostility Expression
and Hostility Repression groups from the Arousal-Expression
situation. Tables 24 to 27 list the means and results of
U-tests for these four comparisons.

TABLE 24
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INDEPENDENT AND HIGH CONFORMITY
GROUPS, RANKED ON TAT N AFFILIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Independents (n=12)</th>
<th>High Conformity (n=13)</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 25
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW M-C SD GROUPS,
RANKED ON TAT N AFFILIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low M-C SD (n=17)</th>
<th>High M-C SD (n=21)</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>20.82</td>
<td>18.43</td>
<td>156.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 26
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW TAT TOTAL DEFENDED HOSTILITY GROUPS, RANKED ON TAT N AFFILIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low TAT Total (n=18)</th>
<th>High TAT Total (n=21)</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Affiliation Mean</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>22.03</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>152.5</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 27
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HOSTILITY EXPRESSION AND HOSTILITY REPRESSION GROUPS, RANKED ON TAT N AFFILIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hostility Expression (n=14)</th>
<th>Hostility Repression (n=11)</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Affiliation Mean</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the preceding four tables clearly show, none of the comparison involving TAT n Affiliation are significant. No trends are indicated by the mean scores. In view of these results it was decided not to score n Affiliation in the final study. The failure to demonstrate any relationship between TAT n Affiliation and the other variables, particularly conformity and the M-C SD scale, suggestively supports, by default, our present conceptualization of these latter variables in terms of repressed hostility and character defense.
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

Psychoanalytic theory, with modifications introduced from psychological learning theory, has served as the major source of hypotheses in the present study. The essentially positive confirmation of these hypotheses points to the usefulness of this approach in conceptualizing coherently the existing conformity data, generating predictions relating conformity to repressive character defenses, and, finally, suggesting the methods used to confirm these predictions.

In a broad sense, the confirmation of the major hypotheses may be viewed as evidence for the "construct validity" of the defense aspects of psychoanalytic theory. On a more specific level, the results provide evidence in support of the repressive character defense explanation of "Asch-type" conformity, as well as validational support for the measures used to delineate conformity, hostility expression, repression and its related defenses.

The evidence in support of a repressive character defense explanation of the particular "Asch-type" situation used in this study is rather clear and unequivocal. Dividing subjects into three groups of completely independent,
middle, and high conformity, seems, logically, to yield the most meaningful comparisons. The mean scores of these three groups on the TAT measures of directly expressed hostility, covert or repressed hostility, and total defended hostility, in both preliminary and final studies, are all in the direction predicted by our hypotheses. Furthermore, the independent and high conformity groups are significantly different on these three TAT measures in both studies. These TAT results indicate that the individuals who are most subject to group pressure in the conformity situation are those who are least able to express hostility in an open or appropriate manner. Further, they are more likely to express their hostility via those covert channels which suggest repression and related repressive defenses.

The relationship between conformity and the subjects' expression or repression of hostility in the Arousal-Expression situation likewise provides rather clear-cut support for our theoretical conceptualization of conformity. Dichotomizing the Arousal-Expression situation into a hostility expression and a hostility repression group in the preliminary study yielded a significant difference (the more conformity, the more repression), when these two groups were ranked on the basis of their conformity scores. This finding was only tentatively accepted since no interscorer reliability was available and since the small number of subjects prohibited a more sensitive categorization of the
situation. In the final study this more sensitive breakdown was carried out and led to the development of three main categories: Strong Expression of hostility, Insight into the hostility arousing properties and motives inherent in the situation, and Strong Repression of hostility.

Finally, a Doubtful group was reserved for those subjects who could not be reliably placed in any of the first three categories. High interscorer reliability was demonstrated for the three main categories. As predicted, both the Strong Expression and the Insight groups showed significantly less conformity than the Strong Repression group.

Though not significantly different from each other, it is interesting to note that the Insight group had a lower mean conformity score than the Strong Expression group. We might speculate that this is a function of the psychological similarity between the conformity and Arousal-Expression situations, both being dependent on that particular type of conscious monitoring which is the opposite of repression. If this is the case, then the insight into their own motivation, and particularly their own hostility, shown by these Insight subjects in the Arousal-Expression situation, may enable them to exert greater rational control in the face of group pressure.

The significant positive relationship between conformity and repression in the Arousal-Expression situation serves as the most important confirmation of the theory of
conformity as a repressive character defense. This is so because the Arousal-Expression situation provides the clearest test for differentiating repression from the type of conscious withholding which is central to the prevalent alternative explanation, i.e., "need for social approval." The unique feature of the Arousal-Expression situation is the "free" opportunity (in the Accomplice-Subject Dialogue) it gives to subjects with aroused hostility, to express this hostility without fear of external punishment, or criticism. In a sense, nothing holds them back but their internal fears, which we are calling anxiety, guilt and the related repressive defenses.

This same behavior, which we are calling repression, might alternatively be conceptualized as a learned habit of relying on self-deprivation in situations of this sort, to the end of gaining reassurance. Following this line of reasoning one might hypothesize that our high conformers are not as strongly effected by the arousal portion of the situation. It is our feeling, however, that this alternative does not fit the total data as well as our previously stated character defense theory. Among other things, the content of the responses of Strong Repression subjects—the Accomplice-Subject Dialogue reflect, hostility which is being denied, rationalized regressed, and so on rather than the absence of hostility.
The usefulness of this particular attempt at operationally defining the concept of repression is borne out by the confirmation of the derived hypotheses. The meaningfulness of the Arousal-Expression situation is further borne out by the consistency of its relationships with the independently derived TAT measures of expressed, covert, and total defended hostility. Though the significance of these relationships is generally low, they all lie in the predicted direction, and the most important single comparison, TAT Total, ranked on the Strong Expression-Strong Repression groups, does reach an acceptable significance level.

The significant relationship between conformity and repression of hostility in the Arousal-Expression situation, nicely complements the previously demonstrated relationship between conformity and TAT repressed hostility. Taken together, these results provide validational evidence from two different and independent sources (i.e., a fantasy or projective measure, and behavior in an interpersonal situation), both confirming our theoretical conceptualization of conformity.

The findings with regard to the M-C SD scale are not quite as clear-cut as are those with the principal measures reported above. First, there is the failure to replicate the positive relationship between M-C SD and Asch conformity, demonstrated by Strickland and Crowne (1961), and Crowne (1961). The methodological differences between the present
study and that of Strickland and Crowne, which it most nearly resembles, consist of: (1) a male instead of a female experimenter, running female subjects, (2) somewhat less ambiguous stimuli in the conformity task, and (3) a sentence in the conformity instructions stressing "accuracy" which Strickland and Crowne did not use. All of these differences are slight, and further empirical investigation is needed to specify more precisely this failure to replicate.

Considering the M-C SD scale in and of itself, we hypothesized that it might be usefully conceptualized as a measurement of the same type of repressive character structure described as underlying conformity. This explanation seemed compatible with the previously obtained M-C SD results and, furthermore, seemed more in accord with the scale's item content than a "need for social approval" explanation.

The present study enabled us to make several critical comparisons of these two explanations. The only TAT variable which was significantly related to M-C SD was Covert Hostility, in the final study. This positive relationship, of all the TAT comparisons, is suggestive since it is difficult to reconcile with a conscious "need for approval" explanation (why would people with "a need for approval" create more stories dealing with sickness and death?). Furthermore, it is supportive of an explanation of M-C SD in terms of repressed hostility and the defense mechanisms
associated with it. Finally, TAT n Affiliation did not relate to the M-C SD scale as a "need for social approval" explanation would predict. The TAT results may then be considered as suggestive trends in support of a repressive-defense explanation for the M-C SD scale.

The Arousal-Expression situation provided a unique test of the two alternative explanations of the M-C SD scale. Presumably, if high scorers on the scale were motivated by a "need for social approval" they would not hesitate to go along with the accomplice on the expression of their aroused hostility. On the other hand, if high scores on the scale reflect repressed and defended hostility we would predict that these subjects would not express hostility in this situation. In the preliminary study this latter hypothesis was very strongly supported, the hostility repression group having a significantly higher mean M-C SD score than the hostility expression group. In the final study, the mean M-C SD scores are again in the direction predicted by the repression hypothesis, though they fail to reach significance. Analysis of the methods in the preliminary and final studies with respect to these two measures gives few clues as to why a relationship as strong as that found in the preliminary study should become so much weaker upon replication. One remote possibility might be the difference in subjects who volunteer in mid-quarter (preliminary study) as opposed to those who volunteer at the very
beginning of the quarter (final study), but this is questionable, since none of the other measures or relationships vary appreciably from one sample to the other. Further experimental evidence is required to substantiate the tentatively established relationship between M-C SD and repression in the Arousal-Expression situation.

The Arousal-Expression situation, as it was scored in the final study, permitted the delineation of a small number (seven) of subjects who exhibited an inconsistent pattern of hostility expression. These were subjects who expressed hostility when the situation gave them the freedom to do so, but inhibited its expression when it might possibly lead to disapproval or punishment. This behavioral pattern forms a convenient operational definition of the type of conscious manipulation suggested by the "need for social approval" model. A comparison of these "inconsistent" hostility expressors with the larger group of subjects who consistently express their hostility to both accomplice and experimenter reveals that the former group does, in fact, have a significantly higher mean M-C SD score than the latter. What this finding indicates is that a small number of individuals who score high on the M-C SD scale do exhibit a pattern of hostility expression which supports a "need for social approval" interpretation of the scale. These seven subjects express hostility when it is socially appropriate to do so in the Accomplice-Subject Dialogue, and suppress it
when they think it inappropriate in the Experimenter Interview. Their scores on the conformity and TAT measures do not point to repressed hostility or the character defenses associated with it. In fact, these scores largely parallel those of the consistent hostility expression group.

Taken together with the previous results relating M-C SD to TAT covert hostility, and to repression in the Arousal-Expression situation, this finding suggests that the M-C SD scale is probably not unidimensional in nature. At least two different meanings may be indicated by high scores on the scale. One of these would be repression of hostility and its associated character defenses, and the second would be response suppression, motivated by a "need for social approval."

With regard to the M-C SD conformity relationship, it should be pointed out that this small sub-group of "need for approval" high M-C SD subjects had a lower mean conformity score than the total sample (or then any other group in the study, with the exception of the Insight group). If conformity is related to M-C SD, as Strickland and Crowne, and Crowne have found, this suggests that it is the repressed hostility component of the M-C SD scale that accounts for the relationship, rather than the "need for approval" component. This, of course, is in line with our present conceptualization of conformity.
These two different types of high M-C SD scorers may account for the discrepancy between the preliminary and final study results, relating M-C SD to repression in the Arousal-Expression situation. Obviously, these seven subjects with high M-C SD scores are pulling down the relationship between M-C SD and repression, in the final study, since they are all scored Strong Expression on the basis of their responses in the Accomplice-Subject dialogue. While we have no way of checking it, the possibility exists that there were few or no "inconsistent" subjects in the preliminary study (due to a sampling artifact that could be caused by the relative infrequent occurrence of this pattern) and, hence, that repression in the Arousal-Expression situation was related to high M-C SD scorers who represented only the repression-defense dimension of the scale. A replication of this portion of the study would help to settle this issue.

Finally, certain limitations of the present line of research are worth considering. As in many studies of this type we have limited our sample rather markedly, which of course limits the generality of the findings. Our present sample included only college girls, enrolled in an introductory psychology course. Obviously, replication with a broader sample, and particularly one including males as well as females, is desirable.
Of the principle measures used, that of conformity is in greatest need of extension to determine the generality of the major findings. Of particular interest, would be extensions of the present line of research to studies in which live "stooges" are employed in an Asch situation, and in which the stimuli to be judged are varied along dimensions of ambiguity and neutrality-meaningfulness.
The general hypothesis of the present work has been that conformity, and particularly that type of conformity typified by an irrational acquiescing to misguided group pressure, may be most meaningfully explained in terms of the psychoanalytic concept of character defense. More specifically we have postulated that individuals who conform in an "Asch-type" group pressure situation, characteristically rely on the defenses of repression, denial, reaction-formation, and turning against the self, in many situations which arouse potential hostility and its attendant anxiety. This theoretical treatment of anxiety and character defense represents a modification of psychoanalytic theory in which defenses are conceptualized as learned modes of reaction, cued off by certain types of threat situations.

To investigate this theoretical conceptualization of conformity, a modified "Asch-situation" was developed, enabling us to differentiate subjects along a dimension of conformity. Two principle measures of hostility expression and defense were then developed. The first was a TAT fantasy measure with which we were able to assess each
subject's ability to express hostility in an open, appropriate manner, as well as their tendencies to rely on that type of covert hostility associated with the defenses of repression, denial, reaction-formation and turning against the self. The second measure was a situational test in which each subject's hostility was aroused by the experimenter, following which they were given an opportunity to express this aroused hostility in a situation where it was socially appropriate to do so. This was accomplished by having an accomplice pose as a "peer" who suffered through the arousal condition and subsequently expressed her anger when she and the subject were in a situation free from potential disapproval or exposure. The subject was then "free," in fact encouraged by the accomplice's initial expression, to express her aroused hostility and failure to do so was taken as the operational definition of repression. Interscorer reliability was established for both the TAT and Arousal-Expression situation categories.

Our principle hypotheses predicted:

1. An inverse relationship between conformity and the TAT measure of direct, undefended expression of hostility; and a direct relationship between conformity and the TAT measures of covert, defensive expression of hostility.

2. An inverse relationship between conformity and expression of hostility in the "free" situation, following arousal.
3. A direct relationship between the projective test (TAT) measures of repressed and defended hostility and the inability to express hostility in the free situation; and a direct relationship between the projective test measure of openly expressed hostility and hostility expression in the situation.

The mean scores of the three TAT categories, derived in connection with the first hypothesis, for three conformity groups of Independent, Middle and High conformers were all in the predicted direction. Non-parametric significance tests carried out between the Independent and High conformity groups, ranked on the three TAT measures, were all significant. The first hypothesis is clearly supported.

A comparison of the mean conformity scores for the categories scored in the Arousal-Expression situation are again in the predicted direction. Significance tests comparing the hostility expression—hostility repression and insight—hostility repression groups, ranked on conformity, were all significant. Hypothesis two is clearly supported.

Hypothesis three was tentatively confirmed. All mean scores were in the predicted direction, though significance levels were generally low. However, the most important single comparison (TAT Total Defended Hostility with the Strong Expression--Strong Repression groups from the Arousal-Expression situation did reach significance.
In summary, the results supporting the three principle hypotheses clearly point to the usefulness and validity of the conceptualization of conformity as one aspect of a repressive character structure.

In addition to the principle hypotheses described above our available measures enabled the testing of certain secondary hypotheses involving the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability scale (M-C SD scale). Our general position was that the M-C SD scale and the results obtained with it by previous investigators are reflections of the same repressive character structure postulated as underlying conformity.

While we failed to replicate the positive relationship of M-C SD to conformity found by previous investigators, some suggestive results were obtained. A significant positive relationship was found between M-C SD and the TAT measure of covert hostility. A tentative relationship was demonstrated between M-C SD and repression of hostility in the Arousal-Expression situation. Finally, a breakdown of the Arousal-Expression situation into consistent and inconsistent hostility expressers provided a convenient operational definition of response suppression. Response suppression, as part of a "need for social approval," has been offered previously, as the explanation for the results obtained with the M-C SD
scale, and also as an alternative explanation for conformity. The significantly higher M-C SD scores of this small group of inconsistent subjects, viewed in conjunction with the previously reported M-C SD relationships, suggests that high scores on the scale reflect both repressive character defenses and response suppression.
APPENDIX A

MANUAL FOR SCORING TAT HOSTILITY CONTENT

I. Expressed Hostility (Ex Hos)

The ability of the subject to express hostility in a direct and undefended manner is reflected in this category. Stories are scored here if aggressive or hostile action, thoughts or motives are expressed in an open, undefended, and unqualified manner.

Certain themes and subthemes such as fights, arguments, statements of anger and hatred, deliberate rejection, revenge, murder, etc. obviously qualify. Furthermore, these themes, once expressed, must be left alone, and cases in which hostility is expressed but is then minimized by a happy ending, or rationalized, or denied, or followed by guilt or punishment to the fantasy character responsible for the hostility are not scored Ex Hos.

Stories in which the subject vacillates between a hostile and non-hostile alternative (e.g., "Can't tell whether he killed her or found her there dead"), are scored on the basis of the way the story is finally resolved. If it is impossible to determine the resolution they are scored 0.
Once a story is placed in the Ex Hos category it should then be scored for the degree of hostility along a 3 point dimension: 1 = mild, 2 = moderate, 3 = severe. Stories that were difficult to place in the Ex Hos category because of lack of clarity should receive no more than a score of 1, regardless of the content of the theme. For the majority of stories an easy determination is possible, however, and they should then be rated for degree of hostility. Criteria and examples are as follows:

1 = mild: stories about arguments, disagreements, dislike, milder fighting themes and particularly intent-to-fight stories. Particularly stories in which the hostility is not the central theme.

Examples:

(6GF) He's just threatened her with something which shocks her. She doesn't think it would come from him. By the wicked smile on his face, maybe he said something off color.

(6BM)...someone had an argument and mother has been in middle of it. Maybe his mother, and he doesn't know which way to go. She feels he should take her side of it, wife over on the other side.

2 = moderate: particularly stories about fighting, physical aggression, more intense verbal battles, anger and intent to fight if they are the central theme of the whole story.

Examples:

(4) He's quite angry at someone, perhaps someone has tried to pick a fight with him, and his wife is trying to stop him from doing something violent. She's trying
reason with him. I don't think she'll do any good and he'll go ahead and do what he wants to. He doesn't look too impressed by her arguments.

(7GF) Mother is sitting on couch with her daughter trying to tell her what she has done wrong, why she shouldn't do it again. Daughter is rebellious, she's listening to mother but isn't paying any attention. Maybe she's especially mad because mother criticized her in front of her friends.

3 = severe: Particularly stories about murder. Also very intense fights, strangulation, and the like.

Examples:

(13MF) Seems as though he might have...killed her. She looks sort of limp. Realizes what he's done and is sorry. Probably loved her, but now...he just did it in a moment of anger.

(18GF) For a minute I was going to say that he had died and she was holding him, but looks like she strangled him and did a pretty good job of it. Because person looks dead or at least unconscious. Her hands aren't right for strangulation, maybe trying to see if person's okay, guess they are right for strangulation.

II. Covert Hostility (Co Hos)

This category reflects what is typically assessed clinically as repressed hostility and its expression via defended or unconscious channels. The general principle involved is that consequences, of what is inferred to be hostile motivation, are visited on the characters, but not as a direct result of anything the hero of the story does. The inference of hostile motivation is based on the introduction of unfortunate consequences, inappropriate to the stimulus.

The most obvious examples are deaths, accidents, sicknesses and the like. The inappropriateness may arise in two
ways, either by the introduction of some unfortunate "accident" which has no grounding in the scene depicted on the TAT card, or by the resolution of an ambiguous card in the "accident" direction, rather than in the direct hostility-expression, or some other direction. In both cases, the assumption is made that since the hostility is not present in the stimulus, it comes from the subject.

Stories in this category are scored along a 3 point dimension representing the degree of covert hostility: 1 = mild, 2 = moderate, 3 = severe. Criteria and examples are as follows: 1 = mild: borderline stories, and those in which there are minimal references to accidents and sicknesses befalling characters.

Examples:

(6BM) This young man looks like a worried father, just, just heard that his little girl has fallen off her horse, which he told her she wasn't allowed to ride....

(2)...It looks like it's out in the country, a farm area, and people are not very rich. Don't have farm machinery.... Don't seem very interested in what they are doing, don't get the relationship of the three people, don't look like they belong in the same family. One lady looks like she's older. Either pregnant or got a tumor.

2 = moderate: accidents and illness are the major components of this category. It is distinguished and "mild" if the accident or sickness is more severe or if it takes up the central position in the theme.
Examples:

(4) This man just looks like he's anxious to get away. Maybe something caused him to be startled or afraid. His eyes have fear in them.... Don't know, maybe some of his children had an accident, or came in and was telling him a playmate had an accident and wants father to help him.

(13MF) Looks like a man and woman that live moderately, not too many riches, but not poor. Woman is sick, got the man up in the middle of the night to go get a doctor, the outcome may not be very good. Worried whether she will live or not.

3 = severe: Those stories in which the "tragedies" are of major proportion, particularly deaths, heart attacks, etc.

Examples:

(8GF) A woman, about late 19th century, her husband is in the war. She just heard over radio that war is ended and she's real happy. Can see by look in her face she's happy and relieved that husband is coming back soon.... What she doesn't know was that husband was just killed, they couldn't contact her, he was wounded and just died, so she won't be happy very long.

(7GF) Older woman could be mother, but looks more like an aunt or maid or nanny. Girl is young, she's reading a story to the girl which indirectly concerns the child. Isn't a happy story because she doesn't have a smile. The story could pertain to her family, maybe something happened to her mother and father, and she's reading her a story about another little girl and her family as an easier way of telling her "your Mom and Dad were killed in a crash."

III. Intropunitive Hostility (In Hos)

In general, this category represents the turning of hostility and aggression inward on the self. This is inferred from such themes as depression, guilt feelings, dejection, and the like. In the present series of TAT cards it is
restricted entirely to card 3 BM and to stories about suicide or suicidal intention, on the other cards. In Hos should not be confused with guilt feelings which follow as a result of some expressed hostility in the story, which are scored in category IV.

Some of the typical themes involve self-blame, self-criticism, and suicide. In Hos is scored along a 3 point dimension of 1 = mild, 2 = moderate and 3 = severe. Criteria and examples are as follows:

1 = mild: Borderline themes and those involving the milder forms of self-blame, guilt, etc.

Examples:

(3BM) What is that? (object in corner) I don't know, she cry? or something, I don't know, she probably hurt herself on that or something, she must be an awfully excitable person cause I certainly wouldn't sit like that.

2 = moderate: Stories in which depression, dejection, crying, etc. make up the central theme, or are of a severe nature.

Examples:

(3BM) She feels very depressed about something. Perhaps everything has been going wrong lately and she's decided to have a good cry over it.

(3BM) Seems like an orphan child. Very sad or discouraged. Feels that no one wants him or loves him. That he would find someone to adopt him. This would change his whole outlook and he wouldn't be so sad.

3 = severe: This category is reserved exclusively for themes involving suicide, suicidal intention, etc.
IV Expressed-Defended Hostility (E-D Hos)

In this category are placed those stories in which hostile or aggressive action, thoughts, or motives are initially expressed and subsequently defended against. This includes all stories, initially the same as those in the Ex Hos category, including fights, arguments, anger, hatred, murder, etc., which are subsequently qualified by denials, rationalizations, happy-endings, guilt, or punishment. These five ways of defending against expressed hostility constitute the five sub-categories under E-D Hos. Once a determination is made that the story belongs in the E-D Hos category, the particular sub-category should be specified. Examples of each sub-category are as follows:

E-D Hos, denial:

(6 QF) This is a scene taken from an old movie. She has said she wants a divorce. He wants to know why, he is questioning her. This is about 1930. They probably talk about it and they look like they're really in love, so they won't get a divorce.

(18 QF) Looks like this woman is strangling this other woman. Maybe first woman has found out that younger one has been going out with her husband and second woman has confronted first woman with the fact. First woman gets so upset flies into a rage and attacks her. But the husband intervenes before she can do any harm. In the end, husband divorces the first woman and marries the second.

E-D Hos, rationalization:

(3 BM) This person has just shot somebody in self-defense, maybe a burgler, and now she has collapsed, having realized what she has done. Don't think she has much feeling, done something she didn't think she could do, now she is exhausted over with it.
**E-D Hos, happy ending:**

(18 GF) This woman is killing this other woman, strangling her, choking her, doing this because she has gone mad from being pushed around all her life, because she is ugly. Woman she is killing is her sister because she is real pretty and always rubbed it in that she is ugly. Sister said something to touch her off, she goes mad. Doesn't completely kill her, just chokes her unconscious, someone comes into room and they take this woman and put her in an institution and she gets well, comes home, and finds a husband, gets married and everything is fine. She lives happily ever after too.

**E-D Hos, guilt:**

(3 BM) Looks like a little boy whose friends don't want to play with him any more. Maybe he had a fight with them. Looks like he's crying, he feels bad because of it.

(3 BM) In this picture, I notice a gun on the floor, this person, a girl, has probably shot someone accidentally. And she's sorry for it now.

**E-D Hos, punishment:**

(13 MF) He's just killed the girl in a fit of jealous rage. He's in love with her, but she's in love with someone else and he's very jealous. Now he realizes what he's done and he's in despair because he's killed the only one he loves. He'll probably turn himself in to the police.

(13 MF) The man evidently had an affair with this woman. By look on his face, maybe he killed her because he felt guilty, maybe because his wife found out, or he didn't want her to find out. Well, sooner or later discover her body, question her friends and find out who did it, and he'll be punished accordingly.

(Note: There may tend to be overlap among the sub-categories in E-D Hos, as in stories with both guilt and punishment, or those in which happy endings serve as denials or rationalizations. In these cases, both sub-categories should be scored, e.g., E-D Hos with guilt and punishment. The main thing is the correct placement in the E-D Hos category.)

**Summary:** The majority of the stories will receive just one score. In a very few cases, however, a single story may
receive two scores, particularly if two separate or distinct themes are present.

In scoring story it should first be decided which of the 4 major categories (Ex Hos, Co Hos, In Hos, or E-D Hos) it falls into. If it fits in none of them, as many of the stories won't, it is scored 0. If it qualifies for one of the categories it should then be rated mild, moderate or severe, or placed in the appropriate subcategory, if in E-D Hos. Thus, a story in which moderate hostility is openly expressed would receive a score of "Ex Hos 2." One in which severe hostility is expressed covertly a score of "Co Hos, 3" and so forth. Far and away the most frequently used categories will be 0, Ex Hos and Co Hos. This should be borne in mind, and stories which seem to lie between Ex Hos and E-D Hos or between In Hos and Co Hos should always be placed in the Ex Hos or Co Hos categories.

Following are some of the most frequently scored categories for each card.

Card 2:

They're a poor farm family, and daughter is going to school. She would like to get a higher education. Mother is worried about it, father not particularly concerned. Should think they would have been discussing it. (score: 0.)

You just want a story? (long pause) Looks to me as though they're settlers in Middle West, starting a farm. Have to plow the land. Looks like daughter is going off to school. Oh My...I don't know, I haven't got any imagination. I can't think of anything. (score: 0.)
This is an old picture took place back when people started farming. Girl standing there, her boyfriend is plowing, and there is girl's mother. Young girl wants to talk to boy, but her mother won't let her. Mother is standing there supervising. Girl is mad, giving her mother a dirty look. Girl has two books of poetry in her hand, wanted to read them to this guy, but mother forbids this, she is very strict and stern. (score: Ex Hos 2.)

Card 6 GF:

I don't know, just a woman that's been startled by a man, just a stranger to her in a restaurant or a bar, I don't think she's the kind that liked it very much. (score: 0.)

Around 1920's woman could have been sitting in her room reading or writing a letter, heard a noise and turned around and saw this man. He's threatening her with something. That's all. (score: Ex Hos 1.)

Man and wife are sitting in living room having a serious discussion. Husband says something that startles his wife very much, she's quite disturbed, man seems to be quite happy about it though. Seems to be a revengeful happiness maybe. (score: Ex Hos 1.)

This is a husband and wife. Husband has been giving his wife a lecture on money expenses. Gotten into a big quarrel on that. He told her she will have to cut down on luxuries. She's mad and looking at him, disgusted with him for being so tight. He's telling her she will have to cut down on dresses, she's telling him she's going to leave him. (score: Ex Hos 2.)

This man's told her some bad news and she is very startled with the fact. This is just a picture of him telling her, but if it were to go on, he would console her in the end. (what news?) That, something had happened to their children. (score: Co Hos 2.)

This man is telling the woman he's going to kill her, she's scared just as he is about to kill her someone will walk in room and save her. He'll be sent to jail for attempted murder. (score: E-D Hos, punishment.)

Card 3 BM:

Well, it's a young girl, looks like at a lounge someplace where there is benches like that. Could be asleep or crying or, depressed. Maybe something she's done she shouldn't have. Don't see what the scissors have here, look like scissors. (score: In Hos 2.)
This is a girl, I think and she's crying. She just had an argument with her boyfriend. She was sitting on the floor talking to him on the phone and she just felt so bad she couldn't get back up on that bench. She feels if she waits everything will get better and they'll go back together. (score: E-D Hos, guilt and happy ending.)

The girl seems to be crying, so she must have been grieved or depressed, maybe a loved one has passed away. Something in the left hand corner but I can't tell what it is. Might have a lot to do with the picture. (score: Co Hos 3.)

This could be a boy maybe. Reminds me of a story I read once about two brothers who were so closely attached, but younger one was smarter and this is younger one just grieving because other one was sent away to school...Just given up. (score: In Hos, 2.)

Looks like a girl who's tired. Either tired or crying, I just guess she's tired. (score: 0.) (Just crying: score: 0)

Card 6 BM:

This reminds me of "Gene Krupa Story." Looks like he's leaving his mother to play the drums and be away from religious life. He loves her but he wants to do what he wants to. He will do what he wants to. She won't approve of what he does, but wants him to do what he wants. (score: 0.)

Looks as though this person has something on his mind, but is afraid to tell his mother. Trying to get up his courage. Or, she's looking out the window, maybe she saw something sad and he came in to tell her what it was. (?) I was thinking of an accident maybe. (score: Co Hos 2.)

This boy's father has just died, they've come back from the funeral she's reminiscing about their life together, he feels bad about it. (score: Co Hos 3.)

This is a mother and son. He's just told her he's going to go join the army, and she's rather shocked by it, made her feel sad, that he hurt her. (score: Ex Hos.) (Stores in which "He hurt her although he didn't want to" score: Co Hos 1.)

This is a man and his grandmother, and his parents died when he was young and grandmother raised him. He's now 23 and wants to get married and leave home, he realizes grandmother won't have anybody if he does, but he loves a girl and wants to get married, so there is a conflict. He gets married and
they either move in her house, she has a large and beautiful house or else she moves in with them. (score: Co Hos 3, and E-D Hos, happy ending.)

Card 4:

Think that this guy is probably an artist, I assume so. Woman looks like she is pleading with him. I don't think she likes his work. That's all. (score: 0.)

Well, this could be husband and wife and he's trying to go off someplace maybe to work, or maybe had an argument and she's trying to reason with him. He seems angry with her for some reason. Maybe she lied to him or did something he told her she shouldn't do. (score: Ex Hos 1.)

He looks like he's struggling to get away from her to do something, she's trying to hold him back. From his expression I'd say he's angry, probably going to get in a fight and she's trying to prevent it. She looks calm, whereas he's disturbed so she's probably trying to reason with him. But it doesn't do any good, because he isn't paying any attention to her. (score: Ex Hos 2.)

This is a husband and wife and it takes place in Cuba. A revolution is going on in the city. They're starting to bomb the city, and he feels he should go out and help his fellow citizens, but she doesn't want him to, afraid he'll get hurt. She says do you care more about the city then about me? Because you'll get skilled. A lady in the background, who is this woman's sister, she's rather, she's not a very nice lady, she doesn't care if he gets killed or not, has a devilish look in her eye. Wife is pleading with him not to go, he pulls away from her and goes out the door. (score: Ex Hos 3.)

Something bad has happened such as a mine cave in or explosion, he is rushing out to help with rescue work and she is trying to keep him back from going. (?) he will go to help with the rescue work. (score: Co Hos 3.)

This looks like a scene in the local tavern, in working... laborers territory. Someone has just made a wise remark to this man about something on his job maybe, and he's ready to fight with him. This girl holds him back. She's probably a waitress in this hang-out, and been dating him for awhile. Since he's a regular customer. Eventually the difficulty with the fight will work out and he'll marry the waitress. (E-D Hos, happy ending.) (Man angry or going to fight, woman talks him out of it or stops him: Ex Hos 1.)
Card 7 GF:

This is an older Mother, had her child late in life. Girl is about 7 years old now, an only child and greatest thing in her life is her dolls. Mother thinks its time she put dolls away and started playing with other children, took an interest in piano and girl-scouts. But only thing girl has known all her life is her dolls, she's not interested in other children. Mother is trying to reason with her. (score: 0.)

Looks like mother and child. Mother is reading to girl, she seems lost in day dreams. Could be about what she's hearing or an effort to get away, not to play. Maybe mother is reading her a fairy tale and she's dreaming about kings and queens and castles, or could be mother is reading her arithmetic and she's day dreaming about picnics or kids playing hop-scotch outside. (score: 0.)

This is a mother and daughter, daughter is holding mother's little baby. Daughter is jealous because all the attention is given to the new baby, mother is telling her that she hasn't stopped loving her, that she shares love with the two children. (score: Ex Hos 1.)

Card 13 MF:

I don't think (pause) I think she's a prostitute and he isn't married. And he just went back to her apartment and this is the next morning and she's still sleeping so he's going to leave her. (score: 0.)

This man has just slept with that woman, and he seems to be a little upset that he did it. He could have killed her though, because she doesn't look like she's just sleeping. Probably his wife and maybe she's been running around with someone else and he got mad and decided that he didn't want that. Probably a college student because they don't seem to have a very big room, and there're books on the table. (score: Ex Hos 3.)

I think this is a young married couple, man seems sad about something that has happened, possibly to the woman. Seems to be crying, and from way woman looks she might be sick or ill. Maybe he knows what's wrong with her but can't help her. (score: Co Hos 2.)

Well, this fella's walked into room and found this girl dead, or asleep, probably dead because of way he's covered his face. Probably someone he liked real well, maybe his wife. He doesn't want to look. (score: Co Hos 3.)
This is a man and his lover. This guy has just killed this woman. Been in a motel all night and when he woke up he was disgusted with himself and her, and in this mood and though it was all the girl's fault that he betrayed his wife. Now he can't believe he did it so he'll go pick up the phone and turn himself in and be sentenced to prison. But he will get out after 15 years for good behavior and wife will have waited on him. They'll live happily ever after. (score: E-D Hos, punishment and happy ending.)

Card 3 GF:

She's been cleaning house all day, or working somehow, and now she's day dreaming about a date she has tonight. She's looking forward to a good time. (score: 0.)

This was probably painted by her husband, a picture of contentment. Doesn't look real happy, but she doesn't show her emotions. This is how she looks to him everyday, because she doesn't have a fancy dress, just shirt and blouse. I don't think she's very pretty, about middle age, but her husband probably does, and they're very happy. (score: 0.)

This looks like loneliness, woman is sitting on a chair, maybe because her lover has gone, or husband died. She has no one. As a result she'll probably move, seek new companions. (score: Co Hos 3.)

Card 18 GF:

Looks like this woman is trying to kill the other woman, trying to strangle her perhaps. This older woman looks like she might be mentally ill. (Ex Hos 3.)

This woman looks like she's trying to strangle this other, older woman, maybe her mother-in-law. She seems to have hate for this other person, at same time she seems to be sorry she's doing it. (Ex Hos 3.)

This is a mother carrying a child and he was maybe hit by a car and she's carrying him upstairs; when doctor comes he'll heal him and he'll be better. Mother looks like she's very shocked. (score: Co Hos 2.)

Looks like man has just fallen down the stairs, he had a heart attack, and wife runs into the room, picks him up and holds him up against the bannister to see if she can revive him. (score: Co Hos 3.)
Card 3 BM:

Well, must be an attempt at an operation many years ago. Very unsanitary conditions, can't see why man in suit is there, maybe a flashback, its this man being operated on in his youth. (Score: 0.)

Looks like maybe this boy had taken a rifle and either killed or seriously wounded this man here. These 2 men are trying to remove the bullet. Boy looks very unconcerned. Man lying down looks like he's in a lot of pain, might die. (score: Ex Hos 3.)

A dream, held by a young boy. Possibly a parent, father, just recently died on the operating table and the boy may be blaming the inadequacy of medical techniques. He's visualizing how the operation was carried on. (Score: Co Hos 3.)

Young boy, looking, had been looking at a picture of an operation and he seems lost in thought, as to what the outcome will be. Man must have been shot, from gunplay in earlier days of our country. Man is probably his father. (score: Ex Hos 1.)

This is a boy whose father was in prison and died under a surgeon's knife. And I think he'll get revenge on the Surgeon. (score: Ex Hos 3.)
APPENDIX B

MANUAL FOR SCORING RESPONSES TO THE HOSTILITY AROUSAL-EXPRESSION SITUATION

Following the frustrating and hostility arousing situation, subjects are given two opportunities to express their feelings. The first is to the accomplice who has just suffered through the situation with them and who starts the conversation by expressing her anger towards the experimenter and the task with the following speech, "Boy he makes me mad, first we have to do that stupid thing and then he tells us we're wrong, doesn't that get you?" The accomplice listens to the response of the subject and later records it. This dialogue between accomplice and subject, with the accomplice's role more or less constant, forms the main part of the subject's response to the situation. The second part consists of the subject's response to three questions put by the experimenter in an interview following the dialogue between accomplice and subject.

I. The Accomplice-Subject Dialogue:

Subject's responses in this part of the situation are divided into five categories. Definitions and examples of each are as follows:

1. Strong Expression of Hostility: In this category are placed those responses which leave little or no doubt
as to the subject's anger toward the experimenter. Instances in which the subject refers to the experimenter in vulgar terms (bitch, bastard), or make clear statements of their anger toward him ("he makes me so mad," or "I was getting ready to hit him"), are placed in this category with little difficulty. The intensity of the subject's anger is not as important a criterion as is its direct and undefended expression. This means that statements of anger or dislike directed toward the experimenter or the task are not rationalized or denied or minimized.

Instances in which the subject mimics or imitates the experimenter are usually placed in this category, as are obviously sarcastic remarks (e.g., "What a friendly guy he is!"). In addition, those instances in which subject has some insight into the experimenter's actions and the hostility arousing properties of the situation and also expresses anger, in the manner described above, are scored for expressed hostility in preference to insight.

Examples of responses scored Strong Expression of Hostility:

(1) S: Oh, that bitch! All that proves is that we're not steady. What in the hell does he want? If he said one more thing I would have told him to go to hell.

(2) S: I'd like to slug him. I've already got 3 credit hours and I don't need this, I could drop it. All my others were really nice, but... It's like playing with toys.
(3) S: He was kind of mad wasn't he?

Acc: (speech)

S: Maybe it was just part of the experiment, because no matter how long I did it, I couldn't do it perfectly. I didn't even know what alignment meant the first time. I would have liked to have thrown the pegs at him.

(4) Acc: (speech)

S: Yeah, it got me kind of angry too. I think it was part of the whole thing. At first I thought he was going to yell at me, to see if you would improve. I really couldn't care how it comes out.

(5) S: Is my arm tired. Boy is he grouchy. For awhile I didn't feel like working at all. I wish he'd hurry up.

(6) Acc: (speech)

S: Oh, it's all got something to do with the experiment.
Acc: Oh God, it couldn't!
S: Well, boy, nah, nah, nah, nah, who does he think he is anyway (mimics), 'you two will never get it right' well crap on him.

2. Mild Expression of Hostility

Responses in this category show some evidence of the subject's ability to express hostility, but lack the clarity, undefensiveness, or strength of the responses scored Strong Expression of Hostility. Here are places responses which vacillate between blaming the experimenter and turning the blame inwards, with the former predominating. Also, those responses in which some hostility is expressed, but the subject then minimizes it by talking about her own failure with the pegs, or changing the subject in a forced
manner. In general, responses in which the subject's expression of anger is present, but is not the central theme of her remarks, which are most frequently concerned with the task itself.

Examples of Responses Scored Mild Expression of Hostility:

(1) Acc: (speech)

S: All he does is yell at you. Some of those you had to touch because the hole was too small. It was stupid. What college are you in?

(2) Acc: (speech)

S: Oh, it made me a little mad, I think he was either trying to or else we really did it wrong.

Acc: It really got me angry.

S: I never could get them all in without touching the sides. It was really stupid.

(3) Acc: (speech)

S: I kept laughing, I couldn't help myself, he must be crazy. He said to put all the X's the same way, he was really angry.

3. Insight:

Responses are placed in this category if they indicate insight into the hostility arousing properties of the situation and/or E's actions. References to E's trying to get them mad, being "nasty" to see how it effects their performance with the pegs, etc. all qualify. Subjects who just state, "it was part of the experiment," but don't comment further on the hostile elements involved, do not qualify. The most important general consideration is that
subjects do not **repress** the hostile contents of the situation, although they may use a variety of intellectual defenses that keep them from being angry. Thus, mention that the experimenter was "supposed to make them mad," or was, "trying to make us angry to test our reactions," even though Subject is not angry, qualify as **Insight**.

**Examples of Responses Scored Insight**

1. **Acc: (speech)**
   
   S: It might be part of the experiment to see how we did after he yelled at us.
   
   Acc: I don't think so.
   
   S: He acted kind of funny during the first part but not like this.

2. **Acc: (Speech)**
   
   S: I thought it was kind of funny, I think he was acting nasty on purpose.
   
   Acc: Why would he do that?
   
   S: It's probably a part of the experiment. He's probably seeing how his nastiness effects us in this experiment. On the first part he was nice.

3. **Acc: (speech)**
   
   S: He was just trying to get us mad on purpose. Don't let it bother you. I never let it bother me. Who cares about the experiment anyway.

4. **Strong Repression of Hostility**
   
   Responses in this class indicate that the subject is utilizing repressive and avoidance defenses to keep her aroused hostility at bay. The most common of these are a focusing on the task itself, especially with emphasis on
their own poor performance. Here would come all those remarks regarding how many "mistakes" they made, how they "did it wrong," and a general acceptance at face value of the experimenter's criticisms given during the situation. In line with this masochistic trend would go all those responses which emphasize how "nervous" they feel, or how "stupid" they feel because they didn't do it right. In addition, blunt avoidance of the accomplice's expressed anger, by changing the subject, or returning to a discussion of the task itself are important clues to Repressed Hostility.

Subjects whose only expressed anger is a passive agreement with the accomplice's remarks (e.g., Acc: "But doesn't that make you mad?" S: "yeah") and the rest of whose response is in line with the repressive picture described above, may still be placed in this category.

Finally, it would be noted that a denigration of the task per se (e.g., "It was stupid," "I didn't like it," "I felt disgusted") may be consistent with Repressed Hostility if the dislike or disgust stems from dissatisfaction with their own performance. This differentiation should be made, if possible, in these cases.

Examples of Responses Scored Strong Repressed Hostility

(1) Acc: (speech)

S: I feel like I'm mentally retarded or something. My nails are so long I can't pick up those little pegs. I feel so embarrassed. I couldn't pick up the pegs, my nails are so long. I read
in the text that these tests are supposed to measure manual dexterity. I guess I don't have any.

(2) Acc: (speech)

S: Oh! (shy self-conscious giggle)

Acc: He made me so mad, doesn't that get you?

S: Oh, I wondered what the X's were for.

(3) Acc: (speech)

S: It was stupid and I couldn't seem to get it correct. Why did it make you mad? My arm hurts. I kept trying to get it correct, I wonder what it all means?

(4) Acc: (Speech)

S: I thought it was funny, playing with little pegs like a kid, and he was so concerned.

Acc: Yes, it sure made me mad a few times in there.

S: I wonder when he's coming, I want to find out what it was all about.

(5) Acc: (speech)

S: I'm very nervous, my hands are shaking.

Acc: But doesn't that make you mad?

S: Yes. I wish I were all through with these experiments. They make me so nervous.

(6) Acc: (speech)

S: (laughs)

Acc: Doesn't that get you?

S: I don't care. He means nothing to me, as long as I get my card signed. My arm is tired.
5. Mild Repression of Hostility

Like Mild Expression, the Mild Repression of Hostility category is reserved for those responses which do not permit a clear-cut placement in the Strong category. Here would go those responses in which some minimum anger is expressed (more likely to the situation than to the Experimenter) but is then denied or overlaid with self-blame, etc. In general, the repressive elements such as talking about the task, avoiding the accomplice's statements of anger, changing the subject, etc. must predominate. Those responses in which some insight into the hostility arousing properties of the situation are present, but are outweighed by repressive elements are also scored in this category.

Examples of Responses Scored Mild Repression of Hostility

(1) Acc: (speech)

S: He just trying to frustrate us. I listened and tried to do the best I could, but nobody's perfect. Actually I felt very amused by the thing myself, I really don't care as long as I get my card signed. I saw the X's on the pegs but I figures they were just there for something else.

(2) Acc: speech)

S: Yes I guess it gets you mad. I wondered about the colors, but then those X's. My hands are sweating anyway, and I didn't get enough sleep last night.

II. The Interview with the Experimenter

The interview consists of the subject's responses to three questions put by the experimenter. These questions
are increasingly specific as to the hostility experienced by the subject in the immediately preceding situation.

The questions are as follows:

1. What did you think of that part of the experiment you just finished?

2. How did you feel when I kept telling you were doing it wrong?

3. Did it make you angry?

Responses in the interview are divided into three categories: Expression of Hostility, Insight, Repression of Hostility. Definitions and examples of each are as follows:

1. Expression of Hostility: Responses are placed in this category if they indicate at some point, an expression of hostility by the subject. Those cases in which the hostility is expressed in response to questions 1 or 2 (typically to 2) are easily placed in this category (e.g., 2. "I got mad," "Sort of frustrating, it makes you a little mad"). In addition, those subjects who respond positively to question 3. are by and large placed in this category.

Examples of Responses Scored

**Expression of Hostility**

(1) 1. All I could think of was that I wasn't very steady. I got a little bit peeved.
    2. Felt like telling you to go to hell.
    3. Yes, it did.

(2) 2. Well, I don't know, rather--just didn't know what to do, what I was doing wrong, I didn't think I hit the side that many times, I suppose I was a little anger, because when you said to keep them straight they would roll.
    3. Yes.
(3) 1. I didn't like it.
   2. I didn't understand what I was supposed to do, I didn't care if I did it right or not.
   3. Umm Hmm (Yes).

(4) 2. In the beginning I sort of resented it, but then it seemed like it was for a purpose. First I didn't think there was much sense, because we were doing it the right way. Resentful I suppose.
   3. At first.

(5) 2. I wanted to do better, felt a little discouraged.
   3. Yeah, a little.

2. **Insight:** Responses are placed in this category if they indicate that the subject has some insight into the hostility arousing nature of the experimenter's actions and/or the situation. Again, those whose insight is expressed earlier in the interview, particularly in question 1, can be placed with more certainty in this category. However, reference at any point in the interview to such things as the experimenter's being "nasty on purpose," or "trying to get us mad," or "just acting mean to see how it effects us," all qualify for placement here. Subjects may deny feeling angry, particularly when asked directly in question 3 and still classified as **Insight**, in fact this is most often the case.

**Examples of Responses Scored Insight**

(1) 1. I thought you were deliberately trying to bug us.
   2. I thought I knew what you were doing so it didn't bother me, I didn't enjoy being harangued, but it didn't make me mad.
   3. No.
(2) 1. Kinda tested our patience, how easier we are to get angry. Maybe how much we would say to you, if we would argue, according to what you said. Don't think it tested skill.

(3) 1. I thought you were purposefully trying to irritate us, because the last time you weren't quite so nasty. It bothered me that I didn't get the X's all up because I usually try to get things uniform.

3. The first couple of times, but after I thought of it it didn't.

(4) 2. It was very frustrating, it made me feel bad. Maybe you were just frustrating us on purpose to see the effect.

3. No, because I thought you were doing it on purpose.

3. Repression of Hostility. Responses are placed in this category if there total content lacks direct expression of hostility. The flavor of these responses tends to be masochistic, with references to being, "nervous," "doing it wrong," "wanting to do better when criticized," and the like. Most subjects in this category respond with a direct "no" to question 3. Some speak of being "disgusted," with themselves, or "discouraged." Some express curiosity or wonder as to what was going on, and if no hostility is expressed, these are also scored Repression of Hostility. In general, these subjects focus their remarks on the mechanics of the situation, and talk about getting, or not getting, the pegs in the holes, etc.

Examples of Responses Scored Repression of Hostility

(1) 1. Little things like that make me nervous, my hands were shaky, I don't get like that often. I felt like I was doing something tedious and small.
2. I knew I was (doing it wrong) because I wouldn't hit the things, didn't make me feel good, but I tried to do better.

3. No.

(2) 1. Well, I guess the purpose was to find out how well you use your hands, dexterity for certain purposes, I guess it would be good.
2. I felt as though I was retarded or something, couldn't do a simple thing like that.
3. I wasn't angry, a little disturbed that I couldn't do it right.

(3) 1. Well, I don't know, I got a little nervous I think. I think there was something to the other girl being with me. Maybe she made me nervous, maybe I was just nervous doing it.
2. No, I don't think so. I thought it was a little crazy game (laughs).

(4) 1. It wasn't hard, a little ridiculous, interesting though, I didn't mind. Showed up a person's ability to observe steadiness, accuracy, I wouldn't want to do it all day.
2. I wondered what you were judging it on. One thing, it could keep a person trying. If you tell him he's good a person doesn't put too much more effort in. (How did you feel?) Honestly, I don't care.
3. No, not at all.
APPENDIX C

PERSONAL REACTION INVENTORY

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally.

Do not make any marks on the test booklet. Record your answers in the true or false columns of the separate answer sheet that has been given you. Fill in your name and sex on the answer sheet.

Remember: Answer each item as it pertains to you personally.

1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.

2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.

3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.

4. I have never intensely disliked anyone.

5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.

6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.

7. I am always careful about my manner of dress.

8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.

9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it.

10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.

11. I like to gossip at times.
12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.

13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.

14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.

15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.

16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.

17. I always try to practice what I preach.

18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.

19. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.

20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.

21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.

22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.

23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.

24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.

25. I never resent being asked to return a favor.

26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.

27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.

28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.

29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.

30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.

32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.

33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.
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Preliminary Study

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Key

1 - Subjects
2 - Conformity
3 - TAT Ex Hos
4 - TAT Co Hos
5 - TAT In Hos
6 - TAT Total Defended Hostility
7 - Arousal-Expression Situation (Strong Expression = SE, Insight = I, Strong Repression = SR, Doubtful = D)
8 - Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability
## Final Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Final Study (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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