1981

Defense Mechanisms and Their Modifiability in Mixed-Sex Interacting Pairs

Rachelle Joan Zalman
Loyola University Chicago

DEFENSE MECHANISMS AND THEIR MODIFIABILITY IN MIXED-SEX INTERACTING PAIRS

by

Rachelle Joan Zalman

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

May

1981

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I gratefully thank the patient members of my committee; Dr. Alan de Wolfe for his hours of good-humored and encouraging consultation, and Dr. John Shack for his alert interest and enthusiasm for this research. I also owe thanks to Dr. Frank Slaymaker for his thoughtful advice on statistics. The assistance of John Corliss in computer programming and Denise Connelly in data collection is appreciated.

Those unnamed individuals who got me going and kept me going in connection with this thesis will always be remembered.

VITA

The author, Rachelle Joan Zalman, is the daughter of Harriet and the late Louis Zalman. She was born September 25, 1951 in Chicago, Illinois.

She went to grammar school at Solomon School and high school at Von Steuben High School, both Chicago public schools.

Her college education was obtained at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor from 1969-1973. She majored in Psychology in the Honors Program and received a Bachelor of Arts degree with Honors, High Distinction in May 1973.

After a year of working, she entered the Clinical Program in Psychology at Loyola University in September 1974. Her clerkship was done at Children's Memorial Hospital in Chicago during the summer of 1975, and she obtained practicum experience at Youth Guidance, Inc. during spring and summer 1977. She completed her internship at Hines Veterans Hospital during 1977-1978. From 1978-1979, she served as a trainee at the Loyola Child Guidance Center. From September 1979 through August 1980 she received training in the Clinical Program of the Center for Family Studies/Family Institute of Chicago. She is now a staff member at the Tri-City Youth Center in Highland, Indiana.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

This investigation will focus on two major questions of special importance to clinical psychologists. The first question asks about defense mechanisms: What is the relationship of individual differences in stable, characterological styles of coping to the specific defense mechanisms that people use? A possible mediating influence of gender on coping style and defense mechanisms will also be explored in relation to this first question.

The second major study question also asks about defense mechanisms, but with an important difference. It asks about defense mechanisms specifically in the context of interpersonal interactions: What impact to the coping styles and sexes of two people interacting with each other have on their individual employment of defense mechanisms and on their perceptions of each other?

In actual clinical practice, therapists similarly consider the symptoms and defenses of their clients from two perspectives. On one hand, to a certain extent, they view their clients as stable in personality; consistent in attitude, behavior and defense across life situations unless appropriate interventions are designed and implemented to produce change. Therapists speculate on the

major factors underlying their clients' consistencies in order best to plan their treatment interventions. On the other hand, however, therapists also view both their clients and themselves as participants in unique two-way interactions. They note not only their clients' behavior, but are also attuned to changes in their own behavior as they relate to personal characteristics of each client. Recognizing a family systems perspective, they may assume that their clients' behaviors will vary in relation to different members of their families. The questions of this study are offered as analogs to the two perspectives that thus characterize the approaches of clinicians.

Obviously, the first question posed in this study is derived from a trait or psychodynamic model of personality. It assumes the predictive validity of stable personal traits. Specifically, the question considers whether coping traits and traits related to sex might influence individuals' unique choice of specific defense mechanisms. Various attempts have been made to measure coping predispositions as traits (Ullman, 1960; Eysenck, 1959; Haan, 1965 and others). Such measures were designed to show coping and defensive behavior as valid and stable over time and situations. Two measures in particular, the Repression-Sensitization (R-S) Scale (Byrne, 1964) and the Defense Mechanism Inventory (DMI) (Gleser & Ihilevich,

1969) have been the subject of much interest. The relationship of coping style as measured by the R-S Scale to specific defense preferences as measured by the DMI will be examined in order to shed light on the first question of this study. Furthermore, since research on sex differences has found that some traits may be more characteristic of one sex or the other, R-S coping and utilization of defense mechanisms will be assessed for sex differences. Also, the interaction of coping style and gender will be explored for a better understanding of the factors that determine specific defense mechanism use, as it is possible that a repressing or sensitizing coping style may prescribe or preclude certain defense mechanisms, depending on the gender of the individual.

Despite their apparent value in generating both research and practical clinical hypotheses, in the late 1960's the trait and psychodynamic models of personality came under criticism. They were rejected in light of research that showed situational environment to be of greater predictive value than personality traits (Bandura & Walters, 1963; Farber, 1964; Mischel, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1973; and Vernon, 1974). Subsequently, the situationalist critics were themselves attacked for rejecting trait research without considering the merits of the personal consistency framework (Block, 1968). Several psychologists evolved the interactionalist viewpoint to

resolve the difficulty (Argyle & Little, 1972; Bowers, 1973; Endler, 1975). Even Mischel moved from the extreme situationalist to an interactionalist viewpoint on such characterological behaviors as aggression, attitude toward authority, conformity and dependency. Instead of asking how much behavioral variance is due to situations and how much to persons, the interactionalists ask, "How do individual differences and situations interact in evoking behavior?" Thus, the second question of this study is proposed to answer the interactionalist query as it applies to defense mechanisms. It asks how the individual differences in sex and R-S coping style of interactors affect an interpersonal situation, and how the situation created, in turn, affects the defense mechanisms employed by the participants.

The review of the literature to be presented will discuss defense mechanisms first from a trait perspective and later from an interactionalist perspective. Within the trait-perspective presentation, a first section will examine the concepts of defense mechanism and coping style. The next two sections will review the measures of coping and defense used in this study, the R-S Scale and the DMI, and speculate on their relationship to each other. Then, trait differences between men and women related to coping and defense will be overviewed. Finally, the interactionalist perspective will be represented by a section

devoting attention to evidence of interpersonal perceptual and behavioral effects related to sex and defense style of interactors in specific situations. Throughout the literature review, the specific predictions of the present study will be offered.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Defense Mechanisms from a Trait Perspective

The Concepts of Defense Mechanisms and Coping Traits

"The theory of repression is the cornerstone on which the whole structure of psychoanalysis rests." Freud stated this in 1925. By "repression," Freud was referring to all variety of defense mechanisms, as he stated:

> The essence of repression lies simply in turning something away, and keeping it at a distance from the conscious. We must now try to obtain some insight into the mechanisms of the process of repression. In particular, we want to know whether there is a single mechanism only, or more than one, and whether each of the psychoneuroses is distinguished by a mechanism of repression peculiar to it. (1915)

In the course of his many essays and case histories, Freud outlined and illustrated the operation of several defense mechanisms. In The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense, Anna Freud (1936) stated that her father had proposed nine mechanisms of defense-regression, repression, reaction formation, isolation, undoing, projection, introjection, turning against the self and reversal--and she herself added another, sublimation. Standard psychology textbooks may list anywhere from six to 30 defense mechanisms.

In his attempt to deal with their complex biological and phenomenological bases, Freud referred variously to the defenses as vicissitudes of sexual instinct, outcomes of repressed libido transformed into anxiety, and outcomes of self-presentative instinct in response to anxiety. Despite the complexity of the defense concept and the varying headcounts of defenses described above, most authors share a basic understanding of what is meant by the term. Most often, defenses are conceived of as specific unconscious mechanisms which enable the individual to cope with or minimize anxiety. According to Mahl (1971), defenses may interfere with the anxiety-provoking impulse or drive, with the behavioral responses related to that impulse, and/or the unpleasant emotions related to the conflicted drive. Defenses may be seen to alter perceptions that provoke anxiety, drives or drive related behavior, and/or subjective experience of drive-related or anxious emotion.

According to Madison (1961), "Adult motives (i.e., sex and hostility) are repressible only if connected with primal motives." A wealth of psychoanalytic writing (Freud, 1905, 1909, 1915, 1925; Madison, 1961; Mahl, 1971) has asserted that only anxiety that is symbollically related to childhood experiences or anticipations of loss of nurturance, loss of self-control, loss

of self-esteem, loss of a loved one or loss of sexual organs, is likely to engender the operation of unconscious defense mechanisms. Otherwise, it is implied, the individual may be expected to employ realistic coping with the current stress or conflict.

As such, defensive behavior has often been thought of as distinct from realistic coping, which would involve thinking, reasoning, appropriate feeling and adaptive problem-solving toward a stressful situation. Viewed from this perspective, coping behavior is deemed more adaptive than defensive behavior. It would seem to be expected, then, that increased reliance on defenses would impair adequate coping, and that optimal coping would be characterized by minimal reliance on intrapsychic defenses.

However, in fact, emphasis has developed in the literature on the commonalities of coping and defense, and their coexistence in the individual to increase successful adaptation. Defenses can be adaptive, too. In situations where an overwhelming danger beyond the individual's control really does exist, unconscious perceptual denial or repression of anxiety might allow a person to function, perhaps in life-saving ways, until the danger is passed (Mahl, 1971). Hartmann (1939, 1950, 1952, 1955) suggested that defenses could becom autonomous from the childhood conflicts which triggered them, and

lead to a stable, even adaptive style of coping that remains long after the original conflict has been resolved. Lazarus (1966) found that people tend first to try an active coping strategy (fight or flight) and only after this fails, to use cognitive defense mechanisms such as rationalization, denial, or intellectualization, often in characteristic patterns.

The classification of defense mechanisms and coping styles according to some meaningful pattern or system is of crucial theoretical and empirical importance. Anna Freud (1936) noted that "One and the same ego can have at its disposal only a limited number of possible means of defense. At particular periods of life and according to its own specific structure, the individual ego selects now one defensive method, now another." Sigmund Freud detailed mechanisms of defense characteristic of various mental disorders in his case histories; i.e., the repression and denial of the hysteric, the projection of the paranoid, the isolation and intellectualization of the obsessive. But systematic endeavors explaining the patterning of defenses by individuals, either theoretically or empirically, are relatively few in number.

Bibring (1961) attempted a classification of 39 defenses. Holland (1973) utilized an algebraic approach toward the concept of displacement, generating all other

defense mechanisms in terms of displacement of direction, displacement in time, displacement in number and displacement based on similarity. Suppes and Warren (1975) attempted to classify the defense mechanisms, describing their generation as systematic transformations of unconscious conflicted propositions of the form actor-action-object (i.e., I hate Daddy becomes Daddy hates me or I love Daddy).

Systematic exploration of defense organization into overriding personality and coping style has been featured in recent literature. Discussing Millon's (1969) theory of personality style, Carney (1978) states:

> Personality patterns refer to characterological ways of behaving, perceiving, thinking, feeling and relating. They signify a tightly knit organization of needs, attitudes and traits which produce an enduring personal style. These patterns are often referred to as coping strategies because they represent habitual ways of reducing anxieties and gratifying needs . . .

In his study of Millon's proposed personal patterns, Carney used the Defense Mechanism Inventory (DMI) to measure defense preferences and confirmed his hypothesis that specific patterning of defenses would be associated with each coping style. Also using the DMI, Minsky (1978) classified defenses on an activity-passivity dimension and found that defenses that reflect "passive" coping with the environment such as denial and repression more

prevalent among hypertensive men than more "active" coping defenses such as projection and displacement.

More than a decade prior to Minsky, Byrne (1964) had already classified coping according to an active-passive dimension or polarity. The "active" coping that approaches and leads to focusing on danger or conflict was termed Sensitization, and presumed to involve such defenses as intellectualization and isolation. "Passive" coping that avoids and leads to ignoring danger and conflict was termed Repression, and presumed to involve such defenses as denial and repression. An extensive literature grew out of the Repression-Sensitization (R-S) Scale that Byrne developed to measure the polarity. Because of their frequent apparent usefulness in research on defense and coping style, the DMI and the R-S Scale were chosen as instruments in the present research. The next section will describe these measures and introduce their roles in the present study.

Measuring Specific Defenses: The Defense Mechanism Inventory

Gleser and Ihilevich (1969) designed the DMI to be an objective measure that is "economical and yet general enough to encompass the most important defense mechanisms previously identified." On a priori basis, the authors

decided that defenses are best delineated into five types or clusters: (1) The first set of defenses are those that deal with conflict by attacking a real or presumed external frustrating object, i.e., identification with the aggressor and displacement. These defenses are referred to under the heading Turning Against Other (TAO). (2) Another classification Projection (PRO) includes defenses which justify the expression of aggression toward an external object by attributing negative intent or characteristics without proof or clear evidence. (3) Principalization (PRN) is based on the handling of conflict by invoking a general principle that "splits off" content from affect and represses the affect, i.e., intellecutalization, isolation and rationalization. (4) Turning Against Self (TAS) describes defenses that occur when a person handles conflict by directing aggression towards himself, i.e., masochism and autosadism. (5) Reversal (REV) defenses deal with anxiety by producing a positive or neutral response to a frustration that might otherwise be expected to evoke a negative reaction, and include negation, denial, reaction formation, and repression.

The DMI consists of ten brief stories of life situations, two each in conflict areas assumed representative by the authors--authority, independence, sex, competition, and situational. A respondent answers four

questions following each story, regarding actual behavior, fantasy behavior, thoughts and feelings evoked by the story situation. Five responses operationally defined as instances of the five kinds of defense are provided for each question. The subject chooses from these alternatives the one he believes most representative of his reaction and the one considered least representative. The choices are summed so the subject accumulates scores for REV, TAS, PRN, PRO and TAO. Thus, the DMI provides a measure of a subject's overall defensive traits.

The content validity of the DMI scales has been the subject of evaluation. Gleser and Ihilevich (1969) sought a high rate of clinician identification of items according to correct defensive category, but found the hit rate varied according to defensive category. Similar results were achieved by Blancha and Fancher (1977), who found correct identification for TAS, PRN and REV above 70%, but only 39% for TAO and 29% for PRO, because these items were often deemed nondefensive by the raters. Blancha and Fancher (1977) noted that over 50% of all DMI items, regardless of story situations, related to aggressive impulse, and Richert and Kettering (1978) found that story situation accounted for significantly more variation regarding TAO endorsement than REV endorsement. Another content validity problem is a disproportionate representation of typical defenses within each

category, i.e., REV contains three times more reaction formation than denial or negation.

With regard to internal consistency, Richert and Kettering (1978) found person x situation accounted for 28% of the variance, while only 24% accounted by the person factor. Thus, even within the DMI itself, a person's defensive traits appear significantly affected by the situation factor. This interactional caveat notwithstanding (Walsh, 1972), found internal consistency of subject's scores averaged around .75. Reliability over time has been substantiated ranging from .69 (PRN) to .87 (TAO) with an average of .76 over a three-month interval for graduate students (Gleser & Ihilevich, 1969). Similar test-retest correlations were discovered by Weissman, Ritter, and Gordon (1977).

Validity has received support from several investigations. Aldridge, et al. (1967), supported psychoanalytic hypotheses about alcoholics' defense patterns, finding them higher on TAS and REV and lower on TAO and PRN than normals. Carney (1978) found correlations of subjects' DMI preferences with their classification on Millon's personality measure, i.e., sociable histrionic personalities were found high on TAO and PRO and low on PRN, while disciplined obsessive persons were high on PRN and REV. Gleser and Sacks (1973) noted undergraduates'

responses to stress induced by leading these subjects to believe their performance was inferior on a test of scholastic ability. In general, low post-test estimates of ability, acknowledged decrease in self-appraisal and anxious mood were associated with high TAS scores. Further validity was obtained when sex differences were appraised.

An important trend in some validity studies merits comment. Minsky (1978) conceived of defenses as either active or passive coping mechanisms. On a sample of veterans, he found hypertensive patients, predicted to be passive copers, used significantly more passive defenses, REV and TAS, and significantly less of active defense TAO, than normals. A similarly conceived dichotomy was proposed by Witkin (1965). Witkin gave evidence that people found field dependent on the Embedded Figure Test and other similar tests are less psychologically differentiated with regard to sense of independence, body concept and sense of identity than field independent individuals, and use more repressing, global, passive mechanisms. Ihilevich (1968) found that psychiatric patients who relied mainly on global defenses (TAS and REV) were more field dependent than patients who relied on more differentiated defenses, (TAO and PRO). Like Witkin, Voth (1962) thought defensive style would be correlated with performance on a visual

task, the judgment of movement on the autokinetic effect (AKE). Voth, Cancro and Kissen (1968) found close scorers tended to use acting out, projection and repression, and distant scorers tended to employ isolation, intellectualization and withdrawal. Bogo, Wingert and Gleser (1970) correlated subjects' DMI scores with their performances on both Witkin and Voth's tasks. Although performance on one task was not significantly correlated with performance on the other, field independent men and distant AKE scorers did use more PRN than field dependent men and close AKE scorers, and close AKE men used more PRO. Field independent women used more TAO then field dependent women, but for women, there were no correlations of defense and AKE performance. Once again suggesting some kind of dichotomy of defenses, Woodrow (1973) found that discounting an independent TAS factor, subjects' preferences tended to cluster according to PRN-REV or TAO-PRO. A similar bifurcation related to masculine or feminine identification was discovered by Cramer and Carter (1978).

Thus, many validity studies have examined defense style in either/or or bipolar fashion. Whether the defensive poles are considered active or passive, independent or dependent, close or distant or masculine or feminine, the notion of two overriding defense or coping

styles has gained some credence. But the most well known dimension for evaluating defensive style is the Repression-Sensitization of Byrne (1962).

Measuring Coping Style Traits: The Repression-Sensitization Concept

The Repression Sensitization concept grew out of the seminal "New Look" studies on perception at the Harvard Laboratory of Social Relations (Bruner & Postman, 1947; McGinnies, 1949). These studies found subjects classifiable according to their perception of threatening material. Some subjects employed perceptual vigilance, approaching threatening material and lowered recognition thresholds and increased speed; while other subjects avoided anxiety-provoking stimuli with increased recognition thresholds and slower-reaction times. Numerous studies confirmed the two styles of perceptual defense (Eriksen, 1951, 1952; Moody, 1952; Lazarus & Longo, 1953; Stern, 1953; Chodorkoff, 1954; Kurland, 1954; Nelson, 1955; Carpenter, et al., 1956; Kagan, 1956; Singer, 1956; Kissen, et al., 1957; Spence, 1957; Mathews & Wertheimer, 1958; Perloe, 1960; Shannon, 1962; Hutt & Anderson, 1967). Byrne (1964) reviewed this literature, noting the consistency of findings despite diverse populations, varied dependent measures of perception, varied methods of increasing perceptual

difficulty and ease, and numerous measures of coping style utilized to correlate perceptual style with overall defensiveness, i.e., presence of overt conflict in Sentence Completions or TAT responses, ability to remember failure-associated material, scores on the Defensive Preference Inquiry for Blacky Pictures, Rorschach and case history or interview ratings, etc. Based on his review, Byrne concluded:

> Individuals who have difficulty in perceiving threatening material accurately also give evidence of blocking, repression and avoiding when responding to conflictual stimuli in other contexts. Conversely, those who perceive threatening stimuli as accurately or more accurately than neutral stimuli respond in other situations with intellectualization, sensitization and general approach behavior.

Byrne coined the terms Repression, to describe the coping style that avoids threat, and Sensitization, to describe the coping style that approaches threat.

Researchers next began work on instruments to specifically measure this approach or avoidance dimension of coping. Several were devised (Carlson, 1954; Eriksen & Davids, 1955; Page & Markowitz, 1955; Truax, 1957; Altrocchi, Parsons & Dickoff, 1960; Tort, 1962; and Ullman, 1962, 1968) frequently using MMPI scales to reflect Repression and Sensitization, i.e., K. L, F minus K, Hy, Hy denial, Hy admission, Hy minus Pt, MAS, Welsh A and Welsh P. Byrne incorporated and improved upon these efforts to produce the Repression-Sensitization (R-S) Scale.

Byrne's scale consists of 127 items from the MMPI. Seventy percent of them were found in Altrocchi's scale, and correlations with Ullman's scale were found of .77 to .94. Byrne tested his instrument, and recorded a split-half reliability of .94 and a test-retest reliability of .82 after three months. Although some doubt has been cast on the equatability of the two administrations, Byrne stated the scale could be administered within the usual MMPI format or as the "Health and Opinion Survey," which consists of the 127 R-S items and 55 buffer items (Simmons, 1966; Fischer, 1969).

Hearkening back to the New Look tradition, numerous studies have found the R-S Scale a valid predictor of perceptual defense and associational recall (Tempone, 1962; Gossett, 1964; Bootzin & Stephens, 1967; Nelven, 1967; Dublin, 1968; Markovitz, 1968; and Porzemsky, 1969). Contradictory evidence is relatively rare (Tillich, 1968; Lapidus, 1969; Lichenstein, 1969; and Millimet, 1969).

Since both Repression and Sensitization describe defensive coping, both might be expected to decrease physiological indices of anxiety when employed. Scarpetti (1973) confirmed this expectation--when sensitizers approached or sensitized to a threat stimulus (shock delivered by a confederate) by responding with return

shock, their electrodermal and plethysmographic monitors indicated catharsis; for repressors, catharsis was indicated when these subjects reacted to the shock stimulus with avoidant and rewarding responses toward the confederate.

It might also be wondered if the approaching sensitizers are generally more anxious than the avoiding repressors, however, and this hypothesis has also gained support (Pomeranz, 1963; Byrne & Sheffield, 1965; Paris & Goodstein, 1966). Critics have charged that the R-S Scale is no more than a simple measure of anxiety (Opton and Lazarus, 1968). Joy (1963), for example, found a .91 correlation of the R-S Scale with the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, and Byrne (1964) conceded that the TMAS and the Welsh Anxiety Scale are built from MMPI items in the same manner as the R-S Scale.

Nevertheless, subsequent research indicates complex relationships among R-S, perceptual and recall defense, self report of anxiety and physical manifestations of anxiety. Lomont (1964) found that inpatient repressors manifested more signs of disturbance (hesitation, blocking and reproduction failure) on a word association task than sensitizers, but sensitizers rated themselves as more nervous than repressors. Among subjects anticipating shock, repressors showed higher GSR

skin conductance than sensitizers (Hare, 1966). A similar pattern emerged in a series of related studies that showed a film of ritual subincision of a boy's penis and recorded physiological and self-report measures of viewers' anxiety (Davidson, 1963; Lazarus & Alfert, 1964; Lazarus, Speisman, Mordkoff & Davis, 1964). Lazarus and Alfert summarized: "High deniers (repressors) refuse to admit disturbance verbally but reveal it autonomically, while low deniers (sensitizers) are apt to say they are more disturbed while showing less autonomic activity." Still, Tucker (1970) reemphasized the anxiety-reducing features of both defensive styles, noting that in the Speisman et al., variation (1964), a commentary designed to promote intellectualization was most effective in reducing the skin conductance of a student group high in intellectualization, while a commentary promoting denial was most effective at reducing GSR among repressing business executives. Interestingly, related research suggests that the most efficient people at solving problems under stress are those who show the greatest autonomic reactivity (Blatt, 1961; Kagan & Moss, 1962). thus, perhaps, repressors.

Such efficiency might be expected to be a factor in adjustment. Indeed, despite Byrne's original hypothesis that the R-S Scale would show a curvilinear relationship

to indices of adjustment with extreme scores least adjusted, much literature exists to indicate the repressors are better adjusted than sensitizers. This difference has been noted on adjective checklists (Lucky & Grigg, 1960; Byrne, Golightly & Sheffield, 1964), the MMPI (Joy & Endler, 1963) and in psychiatric versus control populations (Feder, 1967; Tempone & Lamb, 1967). Sensitizers see their lives as more controlled by forces outside themselves than repressors (Tolor & Reznikoff, 1967; Altrocchi, Palmer, Hellman & Davis, 1968). Repressors have also been shown to surpass sensitizers on verbal ability, social intelligence, sex knowledge, and scholastic grades (Clark, 1969).

Perhaps related to poorer adjustment, sensitizers report lower self-esteem than repressors and greater self-compared-to-ideal-person discrepancies due to lower self descriptions than repressors (Gordon, 1959; Altrocchi et al., 1960; Byrne, 1961, 1963; Hanson, 1963; and Lomont, 1965). Rios-Garcia and Cook (1975) found sensitization correlated with self-derogation and anxiety, and Baldwin and Cabianca (1972) and Shavit and Shouval (1977), have shown sensitizers more willing to agree with negative evaluations of themselves than repressors.

Despite these consistent differences, the meaning of the above results has been disputed. Are repressors

really better adjusted and more self-confident than sensitizers, or do they just say so? Alternatively stated, are repressors more concerned about the good impressions they leave than sensitizers, and more likely to engage in social desirability responding? Evidence from several quarters suggests the answer is yes.

In the first place, some studies in which indices of adjustment do not require conventional socially desirable responses suggest that sensitizers may be capable of fuller development than repressors. Fretta (1974) found sensitizers more flexible and repressors more rigid on tasks requiring integration of cognition and affect. Gayton and Bernstein (1969) and Baker and King (1970) found sensitizers and neutrals higher in self-awareness of conflict than the more inhibited repressors. Weissman and Ritter (1970) stated that sensitizers, while "critical, impatient, action-oriented and personally more troubled" had greater capacity for "personal integration and creativity." Among psychiatric inpatients, repressors were rated more extremely disturbed than sensitizers, despite their unwillingness to acknowledge their disturbance directly (Lomont, 1965). It would seem important to ascertain whether hospitalized psychiatric patients were self-referred, referred by others, or committed, since sensitizers might be more likely to self-refer

than repressors. Studies that find sensitizers more prevalent in outpatient clinical samples (Feder, 1967; Tempone, 1967; Thelen, 1969) likewise fail to rule out self-selection as opposed to differential adjustment as the important difference. Byrne, Steinberg, and Schwartz, (1968) found that among extreme scorers on the scale, sensitizers made significantly more visits to the student health service than repressors.

The relevance of social desirability for repressors as opposed to sensitizers has been demonstrated specifically. The expected differences have emerged when investigators' instructions intensified social desirability considerations regarding TAT responding (Lefcourt, 1966; Gordon & Glass, 1970), recall of violent news stories (House, 1972), willingness to endure shock (Merbaum & Badia, 1967; Chabot, 1970), and estimation of shock intensity (Barton & Buckhout, 1969). Not surprisingly, when Lefcourt (1966) asked his subjects to assess the meaning of the R-S Scale, repressors were found to interpret the scale as an indicator of mental illness while sensitizers construed the scale as a measure of honesty with oneself.

Joy (1963) found a correlation of -.91 between the R-S Scale and the Edwards Social Desirability Scale. Crowne and Marlowe (1964) developed their social desirability scale in a manner uncontaminated by accurate

self-report of health adjustment. It correlates at .35 with the Edwards scale and -.37 with the R-S Scale. Ramaniah (1977) found that the denial items of the Marlowe Crown scale, which reject socially undesirable characteristics, correlate more highly with the R-S Scale (-.58) than the items that embrace socially desired characteristics, or the MC scale as a whole. It would seem, therefore, that R-S measures social defensiveness, rather than social desirability persay (Silber & Grebstein, 1964; Fischer, 1969; Schill, Althoff & Black, 1969; and Schill, Emanuel, Peterson, Schneider, & Wachowiak, 1970).

Studies of perceptual defense have found differences between repressors and sensitizers even when the salience of social defensiveness was reduced by the experimental design (Bootzin and Natsoulas, 1965; Bootzin & Stephens, 1967). One study, for example, required subjects to respond with a taboo word to indicate perception of a neutral word and to respond with a neutral word to indicate perception of a taboo word (Zigler & Yospe, 1960). With reference to such studies, Erdelyi (1974) effectively defended the New Look findings of perceptual style differences as evidence of more than just a response set. It seems likely that the R-S dimension, while encompassing a social desirability set tendency, reflects a more general difference of approaching or avoiding defense and coping style.

The Relationship of R-S Coping Style Traits and Specific Defense Preference

The Repression-Sensitization concept is not without flaw and lingering controversy. Still, its usefulness has received considerable support. It remains to be established that the Repression-Sensitization dimension is meaningfully related to psychoanalytic notions about defenses. Tucker (1970) extrapolated from the research and intuitively categorized psychoanalytic defenses into the repression and sensitization categories. For defenses characteristic of the Repression style of coping, he included repression, denial, reaction formation, and sweet-lemon rationalization. For Sensitization-type defenses he lists isolation, intellectualization, projection, compulsivity and sour-grapes rationalization. While believing the broad R-S dimension to be sound, Tucker warned that his classification of specific defenses must be viewed as tentative. The R-S Scale has failed to correlate with Rorschach indices of repression (Tillich, 1968; Cooper, 1969, Lewinsohn et al., 1970), defense ratings on Sentence Completion tests (Crowley & Nalven, 1969) and a recent defense measure of untested validity, the Problems Situations Test (Hirsch & Dana, 1968). It would seem that the construct validity of the R-S Scale might be better understood if its relationship to

a more psychoanalytically-oriented measure of specific defenses was delineated. Moreover, if R-S is assumed to represent a stable personal trait with respect to coping, it is necessary for the purposes of the present study to examine R-S as a factor related to the use of specific defense mechanisms. Therefore, the present study will address the relationship of repressing and sensitizing styles as measured by the R-S Scale to the specific defense mechanisms measured by the scales of the DMI, as part of its first main area of inquiry. R-S style will be expected to be predictive of the specific DMI scale scores according to the following rationale:

R-S high scores or sensitizers will be expected to obtain higher scores on DMI defenses that may be considered to admit to or approach conflict directly, specifically, TAS and TAO; R-S low scorers or repressors will be expected to obtain higher scores on DMI defenses that may be considered to avoid conflict, specifically, REV and PRN. Although PRN was designed to measure intellectualization and rationalization, which are thought to be sensitizing defenses, the actual items of the PRN scale seem pointed toward "sweet-lemon rationalization," which has been called a repressing defense. Thus, PRN will tentatively be proposed to be a defense used more by repressors. While PRO on one hand seems to admit, approach

and even ferret out the presence of conflict and threat, on the other hand PRO involves the avoidance of acknowledgement of conflict or threat within the self. PRO thus seems to tap both sensitizing and repressing tendencies. For this reason, PRO is expected to be no more characteristic of sensitizers than it is of repressors.

Hypothesis 1:

In sum, it is proposed that repressors will have higher DMI scores on REV and PRN; sensitizers will have higher scores on the DMI scales of TAS and TAO; and PRO will be equally endorsed by repressors and sensitizers.

Because the R-S Scale presents a dichotomous conceptualization of defensive style, perhaps the DMI Scales might best be grouped on opposing sides of a dichotomy. Since there are five DMI scales, combinations of two scales against the remaining three, or three scales against the remaining two, might be considered for the purpose of exploration. Nine combinations, determined by subtracting the sum of one grouping of scales from the sum of the remaining scales, would exhaust the possible combinations of dichotomizing DMI performance. The nine combinations are: (PRO+TAO)-(REV+TAS+PRN); (TAS+TAO+PRO)-(PRN+REV); (PRN+TAO+PRO)-(TAS+REV); (TAS+PRN+TAO)-(REV+PRO); (TAS+PRN+PRO)-(REV+TAO); (REV+TAS+TAO)-(PRN+PRO);

(PRN+TAS)-(REV+PRO+TAO); (TAS+TAO)-(REV+TAS+PRO); and (PRN+TAO)-(REV+TAS+PRO).

Hypothesis 2:

Based on the predictions and rationale of Hypothesis 1, it is expected that of the nine combinations: (TAS+TAO)-(REV+PRN+PRO) and (TAS+TAO+PRO)-(REV+PRN) will best differentiate the DMI performance of sensitizers from repressors.

Gender-Related Traits, R-S Coping Traits, and Defense Mechanism Preferences

Normative differences exist between men and women. Nonetheless, the sexes share many similarities, and there are many men and women who are exceptions to the normative differences. According to Thorndike (1911): ". . . the average man differs from the average woman far less than many men differ from one another." Ambert (1976) agrees: ". . . the sexes are more alike than dissimilar." Still, it has been a matter of vigorous research to determine and explain the differences between men and women (Hall, 1934; Mead, 1935; Terman & Miles, 1936; Parsons, 1955; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). It would be beyond the scope of this review to address the complex issues of the biology,

sociology, and even psychology of sex differences, and the balance of similarities and differences between the sexes. Still, normative sex differences might be expected to interact with and mediate individuals' defensive preferences. Certain traits commonly considered peculiar to either sex seem likely candidates as factors related to defense and coping.

From Freud on, the psychoanalytic tradition has assumed biological, instinctual and psychological differences between men and women (i.e., Horney, 1926; Deutsch, 1932). Eriksen (1964) concluded that the genital anatomical differences between the sexes require males to be concerned with "outer" space, expressed as exploring, conquering, achieving and discovering, and females to lean toward "inner" space, in terms of caring, nurturing and creating a stable environment. He was careful to note that each sex is capable of acquiring the other style, and that the proposed orientations are not rigid restrictions as much as predispositions. Jung also expected every individual to contain an androgynous balance of female anima or Eros, the ability to make connections, and masculine animus or Logos, the tendency toward abstract analysis, but he believed the sexes differed in that, "In men, Eros . . . is usually less developed than Logos while in women . . . Eros is an

expression of their true nature." More recent theorists have given other names to these same dichotomies in men and women, referring to agency in males and communion in females (Bakan, 1966) or noting that females emphasize "process" as their criterion of achievement while men consider "impact" or result the sine qua non of identity and success (Veroff, 1973).

Research has converged showing these polarities are neither universal or invariant. Mead's (1935) Arapesh, Mundugumur and Tschambuli, as well as the variety of marital patterns in Western culture prove that men and women exhibit "masculine" and "feminine" characteristics in multitudinous diversity. Terman and Miles (1936) notwithstanding, many researchers have shown that the presence of one sex-typed polarity does not automatically preclude the presence or development of the other (Constantinople, 1973; Bem, 1975; Merrill, 1978). Nevertheless, common sex differences that may be related to coping style have been documented in the areas of field dependence, aggression, anxiety, and self-disclosure of anxiety or weakness.

Witkin's (1950) proposals about field dependence and coping style have already been described. Field independence is associated with unemotional, independent analytic problem-solving, while field dependence is related to passive, suggestible, conforming, problem-solving.

Beginning in adolescence, men are more field independent than women (Green, 1955; Bieri et al., 1958; Witkin, et al., 1967). Thus, as psychoanalytic tradition asserts, it would seem that men are more active and analytic copers, while women are passive and global.

But the meaning of the sex difference in field task performance is no longer clear. Sherman (1967) attributed the results to male superiority on visual-spatial tasks as opposed to differences in analytic coping. On analytic tasks eliminating the spatial element, women often perform as well or better than men (Feather, 1968; Witkin, Birnbaum, Lomonaco, Lehr & Herman, 1968; and others reviewed by Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Even when spatial ability is involved, women's analytic ability has improved when performance is described in terms made more acceptable to the female role, i.e., labelling a test a fashion design task (Milton, 1957, 1959; Naditch, 1976). Freedom to break stereotypical sex-typed barriers appears important to expression of analytic ability among females. It has been shown that for women, field independence is associated with moderate cross-sex-typing (Kidd & Revoire, 1964; McCaulay, 1964; Greenwald, 1968; and Behrens, 1973).

It is debatable whether the same holds for men. MacKinnon (1962) proposed that rigid sex-typing involves

repression of cross-sex tendencies, and such repression entails loss of fluency in scanning thoughts and original or creative analytic ability. Hence, less sex-typed persons would be likely to be more fluid, field independent thinkers according to MacKinnon's logic. As mentioned, such a result has been found among women. Bieri (1960) also found field independent men more female-identified than field dependent men. But Vaught (1965) showed femininity inversely related to field independence among both sexes, and this factor was more significant than biological sex per say. While cross-typing among women may de-repress active analytic tendencies, cross-typing among men may also involve de-repression of passive-dependent "feminine" coping approaches which impede active, analytic coping.

Cross cultural evidence sheds further light on these issues. In the Temne culture of Sierra Leone, child rearing practices emphasize authority, strict, discipline, conformity and group reliance. Temne males are found to be more field dependent than males raised in the more permissive, initiative-tolerating Mende tribe. Still, even stricter control is emphasized on Temne females, so that males of this culture remain more field independent than their female counterparts (Dawson, 1967). Among Eskimos, where girls are allowed considerable

independence, there is no difference between the sexes on field independence. In western culture, Bieri (1960) found field-independence high when acceptance of authority was low and identification with mother was high in males; for field independent females, acceptance of authority was also low but identification was high with fathers.

In conclusion, active analytic coping as measured by field independence appears to be a complex issue involving sex differences. While lack of repression and flexibility of cross-sex identification appear to aid active analysis in both sexes, de-repression may be of greater aid to performance among females, while socially desirable sex-role sanctions may typically favor men (Kagan & Kogan, 1970).

Another area of sex-typed behavior is aggression. According to Lee (1976), the most consistent finding on sex differences in American society and cross-culturally is that males are more aggressive than females. Although aggressive behavior is also learned, the sex difference in aggression appears to have a biological, hormonal foundation (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Paulino (1968) found the expected sex differences in aggression in such social-sanction free behavior as dream content. Still, it may be true that because aggression is so obviously a male activity, females also learn to perceive aggression

as reprehensible in themselves, and repress it below their initially lower level. Rothaus and Worchel (1964) found evidence of greater aggression anxiety in women's TAT responses. Kagan and Moss (1962) found that girls required longer tachistoscopic exposures than boys to recognize aggressive scenes. Thus, between females, lack of aggression may be evidence of greater repressive tendencies coupled with social propriety considerations, while between men, lack of aggression may reflect deviance with regard to the male role.

Fear and anxiety are also aspects of coping associated with sex differences. Women have often been presumed to be more fearful or anxious than men. Physiological measures of anxiety do not appear to correlate highly with each other or with self-reports of anxiety (Rossi, 1959; Lacey, 1967). Duffy (1962) did find sex differences in a review of arousal indicators and Liberson (1973) found that men responded to electric shock stress with circulatory changes while women responded with respiratory changes. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) report that observational studies do not show clear sex differences in anxiety or timidity among males and females, and conclude, "We would not be surprised if the answer turns out to depend on the stimulus situation. That is, the two sexes may be afraid of somewhat different things, on the average."

One clear difference that does emerge, however, is the greater willingness of women to claim anxiousness compared to men. Sarason et al. (1960) suggested this explanation for girls' higher scores on self-report anxiety scales. Boys are more defensive on such scales, earning higher scores on lie scales by answering no to such items as, "When one of your friends won't play with you, do you feel badly?" Maccoby and Jacklin also offer this explanation for the fact that among 23 studies reviewed, males anxiety scores never outstripped females.

Philips and Segal (1970) and Merrill (1978) found women endorsed more items on the Langner scale than men. Although once considered a screening device for mental illness, the Langner is now seen as a self-report for "psychological stress and physiological malaise." While it is not clear that women experience more symptoms than men, it is clear that they are more likely to admit them if they do experience them.

Cozby (1973) reviewed research on self-disclosure and concluded that women are more likely to disclose themselves generally than men. Merrill (1978) found women both more likely to admit stress symptoms on the Langner scale, and to disclose more varied aspects of themselves such as attitudes, tastes, work, money and bodily information as measured by the Jourard scale, than men. Interestingly, Merrill discovered that while femininity in either sex correlates with increased symptom and general

self-disclosure, masculinity in either sex correlates with general self-disclosure but selects against symptom disclosure. It is possible that general self-disclosure among males includes a tendency to put one's best foot forward by disclosing positive aspects of the self.

The above limited review has outlined differences between men and women on such coping-related behavior as analytical thinking, aggression, and disclosure of anxiety and weakness. Factors in individual differences among men and women have also been considered. Some of these issues have been specifically addressed in research using the R-S Scale and the DMI.

In his early work with the R-S dimension, Byrne reported no significant sex differences (1961, 1964). Chabot (1972) reviewed the R-S literature at the time of his writing and found only half of studies included subjects of both sexes and of the less than one-third of these that analyzed sex differences, a plurality found them. Recent studies have discovered no sex differences in R-S scores per say, but evidence of interaction effects of R-S and sex with regard to a variety of behavior has become impossible to ignore.

Becker (1967) found relationships of sex, R-S and Guilford Introversion-Extroversion. Repression correlated with social extraversion in both sexes, but

females tended to be more repressed than males, significantly so as extraversion increased. Perhaps the increase of female repression with extraversion explains their greater conformity, suggestibility and lack of analytic set breaking in the field independence literature. Becker also found both men and women introverts to be sensitizers.

Studies of R-S and aggression seldom include women. Byrne (1961) found no difference in aggressive content on TAT stories between male repressors and sensitizers, but did find higher sexual content among sensitizers. The female sample was too small to be representative. Scarpetti's (1973) sensitizer males were more likely to retaliate against a confederate with shock after being shocked than repressor males, but once again females were not included in the investigation. When confederates in Baldwin and Cabianca's (1972) study gave male subjects self-discrepant negative feedback, repressors projected immaturity onto the confederates while sensitizers reduced their own self appraisals. Thus, privately held negative projection seems to tap a difference channeling of aggression than the active retaliation required in the Scarpetti study. It seems possible that while male sensitizers are consistently overtly aggressive in response to stress, male repressors are overtly aggressive only in situations where this sex-typed

trait is socially approved. House (1972) asked undergraduates to read violent and threatening news stories without and with instructions emphasizing the social desirability of attending to threatening current events. While sensitizers' recall did not change, male repressors remembered more threatening material while female repressors recalled less under social desirability instructions.

Sex, sex role concerns and expression of anxiety and weakness also appear related to R-S. Merbaum and Badia (1967) found that females, whether sensitizers or repressors tended to identify and avoid painful shock earlier, but that while male sensitizers tended to avoid the shocks, male repressors failed to identify and avoid them. Chabot (1973) explained the male repressor's behavior in terms of repression of pain in the interest of science. Another possible explanation also based on perceived social desirability might be that male repressors wish to appear more macho or masculine. Merrill (1978) found a high correlation between repression and stereotypical masculinity as measured by the Bem Scale. Not surprisingly, she also found that repressor, high masculine men were low disclosers of weakness. This finding contrasted with women, who disclosed weakness in relationship to their sensitization scores regardless of

their masculinity scores. Self-disclosure not specific to anxiety and weakness is also highest among sensitizing women, while male sensitizers are lowest in general self-disclosure (Chelune, 1975). Differential sensitivity to disclosure of weakness appears to be more of an issue among the more sex-typed repressor men and women.

Sex differences on the DMI have been reported since the outset. The authors found males significantly higher on TAO and lower TAS than females in both student and psychiatric outpatient samples, and males consistently higher on PRO (Gleser & Ihilevich, 1969). The TAO and TAS differences have been rediscovered in all subsequent research (Bogo, et al., Weissman, Ritter & Gordon, 1971; Gleser & Sacks, 1973; Woodrow, 1973; Cramer & Carter, 1978), and several studies have added the expected difference on PRO (Bogo et al., 1970; Weissman, et al., 1971; Carter & Cramer, 1978). A few studies have revealed women to use more PRN (Weissman, et al., 1971; Carter & Cramer, 1978) and REV (Gur & Gur, 1975; Carter & Cramer, 1978) than men.

These differences may relate to what is considered socially desirable for men as opposed to women. Subjects' Marlowe-Crowne social desirability responding regardless of sex relates to preference of PRN and REV over TAO and PRO (Woodrow, 1973; Dudley, 1978).

But, Richert and Kettering (1978) found that social desirability scores correlated positively with REV and negatively with TAO in certain situations; authority, especially, but also competition, independence and sex. It is not unlikely that in such situations, sex role prescriptions differ. Thus, in some situations, male sex role requirements and social desired "good" behavior may conflict.

Evans (1979) investigated the difference of social desirability for men and women and its relationship to defense preferences. Citing the work of Milham (1974) and Ramaniah et al. (1977), Evans suggested that social desirability sensitivity as measured by the Marlowe-Crowne scale may reflect either a desire to both obtain social approval and avoid censure, or a desire to maintain vulnerable self-esteem in tense social situations. The scale contains two clusters of items: (1) denial items, which reject negative characteristics, and (2) attribution items, which attribute positive, socially approved behavior to the self. Among women, total MC social desirability score correlates positively with PRN and REV, negatively with PRO and TAO, and positively with TAS. But among men, total MC score correlates with TAS only, in the negative direction. Men scoring high on MC denial items exclusively, indicating a need to protect self esteem

score, endorse PRO and fail to endorse PRN. But men scoring higher on MC attribution items endorse more PRN and less TAO. Thus, for women, it would appear that self-esteem and social desirability are simultaneously sought by doing good, not doing or seeming bad, and being willing to admit fault. For some men, social desirability is conceived as doing good and not doing bad, and this is not necessarily protective of self esteem. But for other men, maintenance of self-esteem determines denial of negative social desirability and projection of it onto others. For men, unlike for women, it is never socially desirable to draw attention to one's own flaws.

It is difficult to assess the above results without considering a related issue, sex identification, explored by Cramer and Carter (1978). These authors presumed a deep level sexual identification unrelated to more superficial sex-typed attitudes and behavior. To measure this deeply rooted gender identity, the authors used May's TAT Deprivation/Enhancement (D/E) pattern, in which stories told by men and obsessive individuals have tended to move from enhancement to deprivation, while stories told by women and hysterics have proceeded from deprivation to enhancement (May, 1966, 1969, 1975; Bramante, 1970). The following trends were found: subjects with masculine D/E patterns tended to score high on PRO and TAO, subjects with feminine D/E patterns

tended to score high on PRN; feminine D/E men tended to score higher on TAS and lower on REV; feminine D/E women tended to score higher on REV and lower on TAS than other women. Among extreme scorers on the DMI scales, the following significant differences emerged: extreme high REV female scored more feminine on D/E than extreme low REV females; extreme high PRO males score more masculine than extreme low PRO males; extreme high and low TAS and PRN females did not differ on D/E, while extreme high PRN and TAS males were more feminine than extreme low PRN and TAS males; extreme high and low TAO males did not differ on D/E, while extreme low TAO females were more feminine on D/E than extreme high TAO females.

Completing this review of sex, R-S coping and defense, it is time to return to the question of whether certain coping styles or specific defense preferences are gender-related for men and women.

Hypothesis 3:

In light of Byrne's own assertions, it is assumed here that there will be no significant differences between men and womens' scores on the R-S Scale itself.

Hypothesis 4:

In light of most DMI research on sex differences, there will be significant differences on DMI scales when gender is a factor, such that women

will have higher scores on TAS, REV, and PRN, and men will have higher scores on PRO and TAO. (Once again, PRN is deemed more reflective of "sweet lemon" rationalization than intellectualized, analytic tendencies, which might be expected to be endorsed more frequently by men).

Hypothesis 5:

Based on Hypothesis 4, of the nine dichotomous combinations that might be applied to DMI scores, (TAO+PRO)-(TAS+REV+PRN) is expected to best differentiate the performances of men and women.

However, given the complex relationships just reviewed involving gender identity, social desirability and social sanctions specific to gender, the more complex question about sex-related traits, R-S coping traits, and specific defenses used must also be addressed. That is, does the individual's gender influence his/her expression of a specific defenses associated with a given R-S coping style, or does his/her R-S style mitigate the utilization of specific defenses associated with his/her gender?

Interaction effects of gender by R-S style will be predictive for only certain DMI defenses. REV and PRN will be expected to be repressing defenses for both men and women (a PRN scale inclusive of more analytical

intellectualization than "sweet lemon" rationalization would have been expected to more predicted by R-S style among men than among women). However, interactional effects are predicted for TAS, TAO and PRO. TAS will be used more by cross-sex typing male sensitizers than sex-stereotyped male repressors, but female Rs and Ss will not be discriminated on this defense. TAO will be used equally by male Rs and Ss, but female Ss will be more cross-sexed and use more of it than more sex-typed female Rs. PRO will be associated with the denial of threat characteristic of male Rs, but with the greater preoccupation with threat for female Ss. In sum,

Hypothesis 6:

Interaction effects of gender and R-S style are expected for DMI scales TAS, TAO and PRO, but not for scales REV and PRN.

Defense Mechanisms From An Interactionalist Perspective

Sex, R-S Style, Interpersonal Interaction and Defense Utilization

Assuming that there are such interrelationships among sex, coping style and specific defense utilization, it seems likely that when men and women interact with each other, their behavior will reflect these complexities. A growing literature has investigated interpersonal behavior of men and women with each other. Data also has been collected describing interpersonal behavior of persons according to their styles of coping. Integrative efforts that view relationships with regard to both the sex and coping styles of the participants are relatively few. The present study may be viewed as an addition to this relatively unexplored area.

The primary hallmark of men and women together is that men tend to dominate these interactions, while women engage in non-dominating behavior. Women conform more to pressure in mixed-sex groups than in groups of women only (Tuddenham, MacBride & Zahn, 1958; Reitan & Shaw, 1964). Lockheed and Hall (1976) reviewed research on mixed-sex groups and found these consistencies: (1) On the average, men initiate more verbal acts than women; (2) A

woman is more likely to yield to a man's opinion than a man to a woman's; and (3) Men spend a larger percentage of their time giving suggestions, orientations, and opinions to the group, while women spend more time agreeing with or praising others. Males have been shown to make 98-100% of the interruptions or talk overs in same and mixed-sex dyads in natural settings (Zimmerman & West, 1975). In same and mixed sex groups and pairs, men simply talked more than women (Strodtbeck & Mann, 1956; Hilpart, Kramer & Clark, 1975) while women smile more in virtually every social context (Weitz, 1976).

Aries (1977) reported a careful study of differences among small all male, all female and mixed-sex groups. In the mixed-sex group, both men and women used more emphatic and exaggerated words, doubtful uncertain words, and qualifications than they used in their same sex groups, perhaps indicative of defensive coping. Male group conversations were characterized by storytelling, jumping from one anecdote to another, and emphasized themes of superiority, aggression, action and objective reports, while all female conversations reflected sticking to one topic, exploring feelings and self-revelation. In mixed sex groups, men made more frequent references to their feelings than usual for them, but the usual differences regarding amount and dominance of speech were

repeated. It would appear that the presence of women induces men to decrease aggressive and increase intimate content, while the presence of men induces women to reduce their amount of speech.

Aries study implies situational flexibility in the interactional behavior of women and men. Maccoby and Jacklin's (1974) review of Prisoners' Dilemma Game research suggest that on a neutral experimental task, so called pervasive sex differences in competition or cooperation need not come into play. Yet Megargee (1969) found that high dominance women will assume dominance over low dominance women but not over low dominance men, indicating that personal traits of one member of a dyad will lead to differential reactions based on both the sex and the traits of the other member. Pleck (1976) demonstrated that men high in "male threat from female competence" (MTFC) show an elevation in performance and greater desire to avoid future task interactions with their dates after competing with them on a task than did other men. Lips and Colwill (1978) speculated that female partners of high MTFC men may be high in fear of success and suggested the need to investigate ways in which "personality dispositions of a man-woman pair . . . may interact to influence the . . . behavior of each." Peplau (1973), in fact, discovered that women high in fear of success did considerably less well

on an anagram task when competing against their boyfriends than when joining them to compete against others. Among men and more "liberated" women, relationship to the competitor has no bearing on performance.

Research on marital interaction indicates substantial variation in dominance pattern (Strodtbeck, 1951; Kenkel, 1963). Leik (1963) and Burke (1972) failed to confirm Parson's model of instrumental dominance among husbands and expressive dominance of wives. While noting that wives tend to increase in dominance relative to length of marriage, Collins and Raven (1968) commented, "In the analysis of husband-wife interaction, the power structure shows even greater variability and multidimensionality than with other groups . . . " Nevertheless, men in experimental pairs such as those to be created in the present study may be presumed to exercise dominance, while the women in these pairs will probably behave in a comparatively more submissive and personal manner.

The interpersonal behavior of repressors and sensitizers has received considerable attention. Differences in their interpersonal perception with regard to situational factors, accuracy, and favorability has been studied. Several researchers found that repressors attribute less hostility to themselves and more to those with whom they interact, especially under stress or ego threat conditions, than sensitizers (McDonald, 1965; Altrocchi, et al., 1968; Webber, 1968; Baldwin &

Cabianca, 1972; Shavit & Shouval, 1977). A lone discrepant result occurred in Davis' (1976) all female sample.

Some studies have investigated repressor-sensitizer differences in how they evaluate or are evaluated by others with whom they may relate. Gordon (1959) found that contrary to repressors, sensitizers perceived less similarities between themselves and someone who they interacted with after the interaction than prior to it. This difference characterized sensitizers whether their partners had been repressors, sensitizers or neutrals. Sensitizers are also less favorably perceived than repressors, regardless of the perceiver's R-S score (Joy, 1963; Kornfeld, 1977).

Sensitizers appear to show greater verbal activity and interpersonal aggressiveness than repressors (Carroll, 1972). After asking his subjects to interview R-S neutrals, Kaplan (1967) found that when the interviewer was a sensitizer, the interviewers took a more active and the interviewee took a less active role than in interviews where repressors or neutrals did the interviewing. Furthermore, while interviewee content did not differ, sensitizers were found more critical of their interviewees than repressors post interview. Scarpetti (1973) found sensitizers inclined to react to punishment with

retaliation, while repressors tended to reward or mollify the agent of the punishment. Berquist and Crandall (1972) found sensitizers to perceive themselves as more aggressive in a group situation. In contrast, however, repressors rated their group behavior as less aggressive than sensitizers in a study by Parsons et al. (1967). Since Parsons' groups were task oriented, perhaps a distinction should be made between aggressive behavior toward a task and aggressive behavior toward persons. Cohen and Forest (1968) compared five man homogeneous groups of repressors and sensitizers. Repressor groups were found to settle more quickly on efficient, stable ways of approaching the tasks and produce more stable leaders than sensitizer groups.

Sensitizers focus their interactions on threat and anxiety more actively than repressors. Gleason (1969) discovered repressors under threat of shock became less anxious when talking with someone who avoided the topic of the shock, while sensitizers became less anxious when they could talk with someone who would talk about the shock. McCashin's (1970) analog to therapy showed that sensitizers responded favorably to verbal reinforcement or interpretations to their references to a problem, while repressor failed to respond to verbal reinforcement and negatively conditioned to interpretations.

For the purposes of the present study, it is conceivable that pairs in which both partners are sensitizers would be characterized by greater perceived and actual conflict and disagreement, while homogeneous repressor pairs would perceive greater harmony and have more agreement between the partners. Pairs where one person is a sensitizer and the other a repressor may be presumed to manifest an intermediate pattern. But further hypothetical detail would be premature without first reviewing the research on the impact of defensive style on the behavior of interacting men and women, specifically.

Several researchers have explored the patterns of self disclosure of men and women sensitizers or repressors interacting with others. Studying men only, Baldwin (1974) found that on a paper and pencil test given during the first four hours of experimentally offered therapy, repressors indicated greater willingness to self-disclose than sensitizers. But detailed inquiry qualified this finding, since repressors also expected more planned rather than spontaneous activity by the therapist, felt therapist personality less important in facilitating change and estimated less likelihood of entering therapy in the future than sensitizers. It is not surprising, then, that Thelen (1969) found that males who tend to terminate actual therapy early are repressors,

while no difference in stage of termination was found between female repressors and sensitizers. While Chelune (1977) failed to find sex differences among subjects paired with same-sex interviewers, he found that male repressors made proportionally fewer negative self-references than male sensitizers, and female repressors made proportionally more negative self-references than female sensitizers when paired with opposite sex interviewers. Complex patterns of self-disclosure differ for male and female repressors and sensitizers according to whether the disclosures are specifically negative or not, given in private paper and pencil reports or in person, and so forth (Chelune, 1975, 1977; Merrill, 1978). But it is clear that in mixed-sex interaction, male and female repressors disclose in a more sex-stereotyped way than sensitizers, with men especially censorious of weakness and females especially demonstrative of it.

With such complex behavior occurring, a question arises as to how the interactors perceive their interactions and each other. Lomont (1965) studied the self-perceptions of college men and women as well as the perceptions of the fraternity brothers and sorority sisters who knew and interacted with them. For males, repression correlated with both self and peer estimates of dominance, which essentially agreed with each other.

But among females, repression correlated with both peer and self estimates for repressors only. Sensitization was correlated with a woman's underestimate of her own dominance compared to her sorority sisters' estimates. Turk (1963) found that repressive style of the female nurses in pairs with male student doctors was correlated with greater assumed similarity of perception of their relationship between them than actually existed. Wolfe et al. (1977) found that female perceivers' accuracy in evaluating the defense style of male targets depended on their R-S similarity with the target. Repressors perceived repressors more accurately, aided by social desirability assumptions, while sensitizers perceived sensitizers more accurately, perhaps aided by their lack of social desirability assumptions.

With a few exceptions, the cited research has paired male and female strangers in experiments designed to elicit interpersonal behavior. Such an approach will characterize the present study. However, studies of marital interaction and defense style exist and convey heuristic information about dominance and mutual perception. Sorenson (1974) compared Q-sort data of ten clinic couples with low marital adjustment scores and ten non-clinic couples with high measured marital adjustment. The R-S scores of both husbands and wives in the clinic

sample were significantly higher, discrepancy between husband and wife's scores were greater in the clinic group, and the non-clinic couples showed more agreement in their perceptions of their marital behavior. However, a random pairing of husbands and wives selected from the non-clinic group showed similar levels of agreement, suggesting social desirability responding may be a factor in the similarity of non-clinic husbands' and wives' endorsements.

Day (1972) compared 60 randomly chosen married college couples representing all paired combinations of repressors, sensitizers and neutrals. Among his findings, repressors reported significantly better marital adjustment than sensitizers and neutrals; for all subjects, including sensitizers, marital adjustment report was higher and life stress estimate was lower if the spouse was a repressor; sensitizers perceived themselves to be more aggressive than their mates perceived them while there was not such discrepancy for repressor or neutrals; sensitizers rated themselves significantly more aggressive than repressors rated themselves; sensitizers prevailed in having their judgments endorsed by repressor mates when confronted with ambiguous choice situations; and repressors' feelings about their life situations were more accurately perceived by their mates than sensitizers' feelings.

One implication of Day's work is that over time, repressor and sensitizer spouses affect and may even change each others' behavior and perceptions. Scarpetti (1973) and Dulany (1959) have discovered that defensive behavior may be altered and reversed when contingent rewards and punishments are delivered. It is possible to conceive of male-female couples or pairs differentially rewarding and punishing each other based on the compatability of their defensive styles.

The research cited in this section suggests effects of mixed-sex interaction on the defenses used by the interactors. The present investigation will allow men and women to interact, influence, and thus possibly even reward and punish each other. The pairs will engage in discussions, including discussions of defense-provoking situations. In fact, they will be discussing the stories and item alternatives of the DMI. Both male and female in each pair will have been previously administered both the R-S Scale and the DMI.

The effects of their interactions will be assessed on: (1) Changes in each partner's characteristics defense preferences as measured by the DMI, and (2) Partner's perceived similarity or difference from the partner regarding defense preference behavior. Due to the complexity of studying factors that influence an interaction

only to be influenced by the interaction itself in turn, the following predictions must be regarded as tentative.

In general, it might be supposed that each subject will be more inclined to endorse defenses that are generally characteristic of her/himself under the stress of the experimental DMI discussion procedures than under the less stressful initial DMI testing, so that scales most endorsed prior to interaction should increase most post-interaction. Repressors might be expected to use even more of defenses associated with repressing, sensitizers might be expected to use more sensitizing-linked defenses, males more male-related defenses, and females more female defenses. However, it is even more likely that the presence of a repressor in a pair will strengthen the repressive defense endorsements of both partners. Furthermore, since males tend to dominate females in interactions, the R-S style of the male may be more influential upon the interaction than the R-S style of the female partner. Thus:

Hypothesis 7:

Pairs in which two repressors are paired, or FRMR pairs will increase utilization of repressing defenses, due both to the enhancement of their characteristic preferences under stress of interaction and to their mutual influence on each

other in a repressive direction, aided by the dominance of the repressor male. Specifically, both partners will increase REV and PRN and decrease TAS and TAO. However, they will remain sex-typed in use of TAO and TAS, with males and females maintaining or even increasing their levels of these defenses, respectively. PRO need not be affected. With regard to their perception of their defensive similarity, both males and females will expect that their partners' defensing and coping behavior is similar to their own.

Hypothesis 8:

Pairs in which two sensitizers are the partners, (FSMS) will be characterized by increased use of defenses associated with sensitization and decreased use of defenses associated with repression, so that both will use more TAO and TAS and less REV and PRN. Cross-sexed type use of TAS and TAO will increase, so that men use more of the first and women use more of the second. PRO may increase only for the women. Both males and females will expect that their partners' choices of defenses will differ from their own.

Hypothesis 9:

Pairs with repressor females and sensitizer males or FRMS pairs will be characterized either by defensive stability or a slight increase in repressing REV and PRN and decline in TAO and TAS, due to the presence of a repressor. However, the presence of a male S will influence the pair in the direction of decreased sex-typed defending, so that males increase TAS while females increase TAO and perhaps PRO. The males will expect their partners' defensive coping to differ from their own, while the females will expect similarity.

Hypothesis 10:

Pairs with sensitizer females and repressor males or FSMR pairs will be characterized by increased use of PRN and REV and less sensitizing TAS and TAO, because of the dominant repressor influence of the male. However, males will use more sex-typed denial of threat or PRO, while females will also increase use of sex-typed TAS in reaction to this male. The males will expect their female partners to use defenses similar to their own, but the females will expect difference.

METHOD

Subjects

All students of one introductory undergraduate psychology class as well as students selected randomly from the psychology research subject pool at Loyola University of Chicago were the subjects of this study. All students were fulfilling points toward course credit given in return for their participation in research. The total sample included 97 students, 50 men and 47 women, but three men were eliminated from analyses because they fell on the R-S Scale median. Of the remaining 04, 56 subjects, 28 men and 28 women were randomly picked for participation in the pair-interaction experimental group sensitizer. At the same time that another 14 were similarly assigned to be used as controls, but the data of the control subjects was not pertinent to the present study, so further presentation about the control subjects will not be made in this paper. The remainder of the original 97 subjects (27) were not recontacted after their initial pre-test sessions, or in a few cases where contact was made, the students were not available for further participation, due to schedule conflicts.

Materials

The following materials were used in pre-test sessions:

1. The Health and Opinions Survey. This is the Repression-Sensitization Scale (Byrne, 1964) described in the review of the literature.

2. The Defense Mechanism Inventory (Ihilevich and Gleser, 1969). This test was also described in the review of the literature. Subjects in the present study were asked to endorse not only their most and least representative choices in response to each question as required by the standard instructions of Gleser and Ihilevich, but also to respond to the remaining three defense choices as to whether each was "generally true" or "generally false" for them. Thus, the DMI scale scores could be computed in two ways: (1) According to the standard or "Traditional" method of Gleser and Ihilevich, in which responses marked most representative were accorded two points toward the appropriate scale, responses marked least representative were accorded zero points, and the remaining unmarked responses were accorded one point each toward the appropriate scales, and (2) According to an untested but possibly more sensitive "revised" method in which responses marked most representative were accorded plus two points toward the appropriate scale totals,

responses marked lease representative earn minus two points, and the remaining responses were given plus one point if marked "generally true" and minus one point if marked "generally false."

3. All pre-test subjects received a short mood, attitude-toward-the-experiment and personality checklist. Adjectives on the checklist were suggested by the Gough Personality Checklist.

Subjects included in the mixed-sex pair portion of the study received the following materials:

1. Two Topics of Discussion, which were presented in oral and printed form. These topics and the discussions they generated were designed primarily for analysis in a subsequent dissertation and are not of specific importance for the present study. For this study, they served primarily as "icebreakers" for the pair participants. The Topics of Discussion appear in the Appendix.

2. The Defense Mechanism Inventory, presented with certain modifications. Each DMI story situation (with the exception of #4, which is completely dissimilar in its male and female form) was presented with its five possible behavioral alternatives, as a Topic of Discussion. On the following page, all DMI questions and response alternatives appeared. "If something like this situation were in fact to occur, I think my partner and I would

probably react in similar ways. True or False." This item, thus, appeared after each of nine story situation and response alternative series, and will be referred to as the Perceived Similarity Question.

3. Each pair partner also received a short form asking questions about mood, overall perceived similarity to partner, reaction to partner and reaction to the experiment. Also included was an adjective endorsement section similar to the pre-test adjective checklist, describing both self and partner. These forms were not included in the thesis analyses, but will be used in subsequent research.

All experimental materials used in this study appear in the Appendix.

Procedures of Data Collection

In the pre-test sessions, large mixed-sex groups of 15-50 subjects were administered, first the R-S Scale, then the DMI, and finally, a mood and personality checklist form. The experimenter read the instructions for the materials aloud while the participants followed along reading identical printed instructions. A sample item for the DMI was illustrated on the blackboard to elucidate response requirements. The pre-test sessions took place in large classrooms equipped with bright lighting and classroom desks. An hour and a half was provided for completion of the testing, which was sufficient for the subjects. Subjects were informed that they might be called back for additional participation in the experiment.

The R-S scores for all subject obtained in the pre-test sessions were used to classify subjects with regard to the pair interaction portion of the study. R-S scores for the men and the women were independently ranked from lowest to highest, and the male and female medians were found. Thus all repressor scores were below the median for each sex, and all sensitizers scores above the median. Subjects were then randomly assigned to be paired with each other in Female Repressor-Male Repressor (FRMR), Female Sensitizer-Male Sensitizer (FSMS), Female Repressor-Male Sensitizer (FRMS), Female Sensitizer-Male Repressor (FSMR) pairs. In this manner, seven FRMR, seven FSMS, seven FRMS, and seven FSMR pairs were constructed.

Experimental pair sessions occured two to three weeks following the pre-test sessions. The female experimenter, a female experimental assistant and two male experimental assistants instructed the pairs so that sex of experimenter was roughly equivalent among all types of pairs. Instructions were made standard, and appear in the Appendix.

In the experimental pairs, each set of opposite sex pair partners were seated facing each other across a desk in a brightly lit, comfortable testing office. The desk was divided by a seven inch high, twelve inch long

obstruction which allowed the pair to see each others' face and torso, but prevented visual comparison of their written responses. After briefly introducing the partners and the experiment, the experimenter asked the subjects to discuss the Two Topics of Discussion provided. The experimenter allowed ten minutes for each of these discussions, leaving the room at the beginning and returning at the end of each discussion. After this ice-breaking warm-up, the experimenter instructed the pair to discuss the DMI story situations and answer the related questions following each discussion. A sample DMI-like story for discussion with related questions was provided to allow subjects to familiarize themselves with the procedure, and to allow the experimenters to check that all subjects understood what was being asked of them. The experimenter then left the room to allow the couples uninhibited freedom for their DMI discussions, having asked the pairs to interact as fully as possible during the discussions but to refrain from speaking with each other when answering the response questions. A tape recorder was left on in the testing office to record all discussions, in order to provide data for subsequent dissertation research. After the discussion period was completed, usually after one or one and one quarter hours, the subjects notified the experimenter, who was available in a nearby room.

The experimenter then gave each subject the mood, attitude and personality checklist form to be completed by each subject in separate rooms.

Following these procedures, the experimenters explained the nature of the study to the subjects.

RESULTS

The results will be presented in two main parts. The first part will deal with results that pertain to the question asked by this study from the trait perspective. Within this first part, the relationship of defensive style as measured by the R-S Scale to utilization of specific defenses as measured by the DMI scales will be presented first; thus Hypotheses 1 and 2 will be addressed. Second, this presentation of results from the trait perspective will focus on results concerning the corollary question, do people's gender predict their utilization of defense style or defense mechanisms; thus Hypotheses 3, 4 and 5 will be covered. Third, the findings about the question of the interaction of the main effects of defensive style and sex as they are associated with the DMI defense mechanism measures will be described; thus dealing with the predictions set forth in Hypothesis 6. The second main part of the results will present findings pertaining to the interactionalist perspectige. It will first exhibit a variety of analyses that investigated the predictions about pre-to-post interaction changes in the experimental subjects' DMI defense preferences based on their interaction situations. Last, the experimental subjects' perceptions of their defensive similarity with

their partners will be examined. Thus, the second main part of the results will present data pertinent to Hypotheses 7 through 10. To aid the reader, all abbreviations frequently used in the results section are listed and explained in Appendix.

Results Pertaining to the Trait Perspective

The Relationship of R-S Style to DMI Defense Preference

Table 1 (Parts A and B) presents the results of ANOVAS computed on DMI scale scores with R-S and sex (gender) the main factors. It appears that R-S has a significantly predictive main effect on only certain DMI defenses. When the DMI was scored using the traditional scoring method, (Table 1, Part A), the relationship of R-S to TAS approaches significance $F(1,93)=3.23$, $p=.07$, and its relationship to PRN is highly significant $F(1,93)=13.60$, $p=.000$. Examination of means shows that sensitizers score higher on TAS than repressors, while repressors are significantly higher than sensitizers in use of PRN. When the DMI was scored using the revised scoring method (Table 1, Part B), the main effect of R-S is once again present, and here, highly significant with regard to TAS $F(1,93)=7.65$, $p=.007$, and PRN, $F(1,93)=4.20$, $p=.04$, with the scores of repressors differing from those of sensitizers in the same pattern. Furthermore, when revised DMI scores are compared, sensitizers are also found to use more TAO than repressors ($p=.07$). Hypothesis 1 had predicted the differences between repressors and sensitizers' use of PRN, TAS and TAO that were found.

TABLE 1
(PART A)

ANOVAS ON DEFENSE MECHANISMS BASED ON
DMI SCALES SCORED BY TRADITIONAL METHOD;

N of Total Sample = 94; Repressors = 46; Sensitizers = 48;
Females = 47 and Males = 47*

Defense (DMI Scale)	Source	df	MS	F	P	R^2
Reversal (REV)	Main effects	2	113.07	1.79	.17	
	R-S	1	20.61	.33	.56	.0036
	Sex	1	205.54	3.26	.07	.036
	Interaction (R-S/Sex)	1	12.33	.19	.66	
	Total	93	63.65			
Mean REV = 39.50		Deviations:				
		Repressors = .48		Females = 1.48		
		Sensitizers = -.46		Males = -1.48		
Turning Against Self (TAS)	Mean effects	2	221.31	4.04	.02	
	R-S	1	177.05	3.23	.07	.032
	Sex	1	265.57	4.85	.03	.0484
	Interaction	1	.23	.00	.94	
	Total	93	57.80			
Mean TAS = 36.51		Deviations:				
		Repressors = -1.40		Females = 1.68		
		Sensitizers = 1.34		Males = -1.68		
Principalization (PRN)	Main effects	2	315.61	9.23	.000	
	R-S	1	464.50	13.60	.000	.1225
	Sex	1	166.22	4.87	.03	.0441
	Interaction	1	.00	.143	.94	
	Total	93	39.88	6.15	.001	
Mean PRN = 46.01		Deviations:				
		Repressors = 2.27		Females = 1.33		
		Sensitizers = -2.18		Males = -1.33		
Projection (PRO)	Main effects	2	140.75	3.71	.02	
	R-S	1	2.32	.06	.80	.0009
	Sex	1	279.19	7.36	.008	.0729
	Interaction	1	.78	.02	.94	
	Total	93	94.10	2.48	.001	
Mean PRO = 38.62		Deviations:				
		Repressors = -.16		Females = -1.72		
		Sensitizers = .15		Males = 1.72		
Turning Against Other (TAO)	Mean effects	2	433.26	4.75	.01	
	R-S	1	113.80	1.25	.26	.0121
	Sex	1	752.72	8.25	.005	.0841
	Interaction	1	11.13	.12	.72	
	Total	93	97.78	3.20	.02	
Mean TAO = 39.30		Deviations:				
		Repressors = -1.12		Females = -2.83		
		Sensitizers = 1.08		Males = 2.83		

*Three subjects whose R-S scores were at the median were not included in these analyses.

TABLE 1
(PART B)

ANOVAS ON DEFENSE MECHANISMS BASED ON
DMI SCALES SCORED BY REVISED METHOD

N of Total Sample = 94; Repressors = 46; Sensitizers = 48;
Females = 47 and Males = 47*

Defense (DMI Scale)	Source	df	MS	F	P	R^2
Reversal (REV)	Main effects	2	1579.01	4.35	.01	
	R-S	1	55.90	.15	.69	.0016
	Sex	1	3102.13	8.54	.004	.0841
	Interaction (R-S/Sex)	1	9.91	.03	.86	
	Total	93	385.69			
Mean REV = -2.23			Repressors =	-.79	Females =	5.74
			Sensitizers =	.75	Males =	-5.74
Turning Against Self (TAS)	Mean effects	2	2554.06	7.08	.001	
	R-S	1	2758.12	7.65	.002	.0729
	Sex	1	2350.00	6.52	.01	.0625
	Interaction	1	.04	.00		
	Total	93	403.99	.00		
Mean TAS = -11.53			Repressors =	-5.53	Females =	5.00
			Sensitizers =	5.30	Males =	-5.00
Principalization (PRN)	Main effects	2	1748.76	7.80	.001	
	R-S	1	943.26	4.20	.04	.04
	Sex	1	2554.26	11.38	.001	.1089
	Interaction	1	134.52	.60	.44	
	Total	93	256.19	5.40		
Mean PRN = 14.85			Repressors =	3.24	Females =	-4.52
			Sensitizers =	-3.10	Males =	4.52
Projection (PRO)	Main effects	2	1086.84	3.03	.05	
	R-S	1	252.13	.70	.40	.0081
	Sex	1	1921.54	5.36	.02	.0576
	Interaction	1	82.34	.23	.63	
	Total	93	371.217	2.10		
Mean PRO = 8.46			Repressors =	-1.67	Females =	-4.52
			Sensitizers =	1.60	Males =	4.52
Turning Against Other (TAO)	Mean effects	2	2007.01	3.39	.05	
	R-S	1	1916.84	3.24	.07	.0324
	Sex	1	2097.20	3.54	.06	.0361
	Interaction	1	657.52	1.11	.29	
	Total	3	623.19			
Mean TAO = =4.19			Repressors =	-4.61	Females =	-4.72
			Sensitizers =	4.42	Males =	4.72

*Three subjects at the R-S median not included in the analyses.

It also had anticipated the lack of difference between sensitizers and repressors in use of PRO. The only prediction of Hypothesis 1 not confirmed in these results pertained to REV, which had been expected to be a defense particularly associated with repressing, but was not found to be so. As a sidenote, it is interesting that the traditional scoring method appears more sensitive to differences in defenses associated with repressing (PRN), while the revised scoring format more successfully discovers differences between repressors and sensitizers on defenses associated with sensitizing (TAS and TAO).

Table 2 (Parts A, B and C) presents F and p values for the main effects (R-S and Sex) and their interaction for the numerous ANOVAS computed using the possible dichotomous DMI combinations described in Hypothesis 2. The grand mean for the sample for each dichotomous combination is also shown, as well as the deviation from this mean for both sexes and R-S types. Searching the Table, (Part A) it is apparent that the combinations that best differenyiate repressors from sensitizers are: (TAS+TAO+PRO)-(PRN+REV), $F(1,93)=4.77$, $p=.03$ with traditional scoring and $F(1,93)=4.26$ $p=.04$ with revised scoring; (TAS+TAO)-(REV+PRN+PRO), $F(1,93)=6.78$, $p=.01$ and $F(1,93)=5.90$, $p=.01$; and (REV+TAS +TAO)-(PRN+PRO), ($F(1,93)=10.05$ $p=.002$ and $F(1,93)=14.77$, $p=.000$. Thus, all three best discriminating combinations

TABLE 2

F AND p VALUES AND DEVIATIONS FROM THE MEANS
FROM ANOVAS ON THE NINE DMI DEFENSE COMBINATIONS;
BOTH SCORING METHODS INCLUDED, N = 94.
PART A: COMBINATIONS BEST DIFFERENTIATING REPRESSORS-SENSITIZERS

COMBINATION	SOURCE	TRADITIONAL SCORING METHOD F	TRADITIONAL SCORING METHOD p	REVISED SCORING METHOD F	REVISED SCORING METHOD p
(TAS+PRO+TAO) - (REV+PRN)	R-S	4.77	.03	4.26	.04
	Sex	5.46	.02	5.05	.02
	Interaction	.08	n.s.	.16	n.s.
	Combination Mean:	28.91		-36.80	
	Deviations: Repressors	-5.44		-14.27	
	Sensitizers	5.21		13.67	
	Females	-5.68		-15.20	
	Males	5.68		15.20	
(TAS+TAO) - (REV+PRN+PRO)	R-S	6.78	.01	5.90	.01
	Sex	1.35	n.s.	1.96	n.s.
	Interaction	.07	n.s.	.03	n.s.
	Combination Mean:	-48.32		-19.88	
	Deviations: Repressors	-5.12		-10.92	
	Sensitizers	4.90		10.47	
	Females	-2.23		-6.16	
	Males	2.23		6.16	
(REV+TAS+TAO) - (PRN+PRO)	R-S	10.05	.002	14.77	.000
	Sex	.31	n.s.	2.80	.09
	Interaction	.02	n.s.	.00	n.s.
	Combination Mean:	30.68		-24.35	
	Deviations: Repressors	-4.16		-12.50	
	Sensitizers	3.99		11.98	
	Females	.72		5.33	
	Males	- .72		- 5.33	

TABLE 2

F AND p VALUES AND DEVIATIONS FROM THE MEANS
FROM ANOVAS ON THE NINE DMI DEFENSE COMBINATIONS;
BOTH SCORING METHODS INCLUDED, N = 94
PART B: COMBINATIONS BEST DIFFERENTIATING WOMEN & MEN

COMBINATION	SOURCE	TRADITIONAL SCORING METHOD F	p	REVISED SCORING METHOD F	p
(TAO+PRO) - (REV+TAS+PRN)	R-S	.84	n.s.	.20	n.s.
	Sex	10.39	.002	13.17	.000
	Interaction	.08	n.s.	.15	n.s.
	Combination Mean:	-44.11		-13.73	
	Repressors	-2.63		-3.20	
	Sensitizers	2.52		3.07	
	Females	-9.04		-25.20	
	Males	9.04		25.20	
(TAS+PRN) - (REV+PRO+TAO)	R-S	.80	n.s.	1.15	n.s.
	Sex	10.99	.001	9.92	.002
	Interaction	.00	n.s.	.21	n.s.
	Combination Mean:	-34.89		18.20	
	Repressors	1.68		4.78	
	Sensitizers	-1.61		-4.58	
	Females	6.09		13.71	
	Males	-6.09		-13.71	
(PRN+TAO+PRO) (REV+TAS)	R-S	.69	n.s.	.32	n.s.
	Sex	8.06	.006	6.92	.01
	Interaction	.15	n.s.	.81	n.s.
	Combination Mean:	47.91		15.97	
	Repressors	1.91		3.27	
	Sensitizers	-1.83		-3.13	
	Females	-6.38		-14.78	
	Males	6.38		14.78	

TABLE 2

F AND p VALUES AND DEVIATIONS FROM THE MEANS
FROM ANOVAS ON THE NINE DMI DEFENSE COMBINATIONS;
BOTH SCORING METHODS INCLUDED, N = 94
PART C: REMAINING COMBINATIONS

COMBINATION	SOURCE	TRADITIONAL SCORING METHOD F	p	REVISED SCORING METHOD F	p
(PRN+TAO) - (REV+TAS+PRO)	R-S	1.87	n.s.	3.82	.05
	Sex	3.39	.06	2.99	.08
	Interaction	.19	n.s.	.93	n.s.
	Combination Mean:	-29.32		Combination Mean:	32.88
	Repressors	2.23		Repressors	6.62
	Sensitizers	-2.14		Sensitizers	-6.34
	Females	-2.94		Females	-5.73
	Males	2.94		Males	5.73
(TAS+PRN+PRO) - (REV+TAO)	R-S	1.03	n.s.	.19	n.s.
	Sex	4.08	.04	2.21	n.s.
	Interaction	.00	n.s.	.00	n.s.
	Combination Mean:	42.34		Combination Mean:	1.29
	Repressors	1.36		Repressors	1.43
	Sensitizers	-1.30		Sensitizers	-1.37
	Females	2.64		Females	4.67
	Males	-2.64		Males	-4.67
(TAS+PRN+TAO) (REV+PRO)	R-S	.15	n.s.	1.67	n.s.
	Sex	.09	n.s.	1.60	n.s.
	Interaction	.18	n.s.	.93	n.s.
	Combination Mean:	43.70		Combination Mean:	9.82
	Repressors	-.57		Repressors	-4.45
	Sensitizers	.55		Sensitizers	4.26
	Females	.43		Females	4.27
	Males	-.43		Males	-4.27

include TAS and TAO in one group while including PRN in the opposing group, and, as would be expected, sensitizers are higher than repressors on these combinations. It is interesting that the most significant prediction of repressors ratios versus sensitizers occurred when REV was grouped with TAS and TAO, as if it were a sensitizing defense, and PRO was grouped with PRN. Once again, Hypothesis 2 like Hypothesis 1 appears to have been confirmed with the exception of its prediction about REV, and perhaps PRO.

The Relationship of Gender to Coping Style and Defense Preference

A simple *t*-test was conducted to test the prediction of Hypothesis 3, that no significant differences would be found between men and women's R-S scores. The result confirmed this Hypothesis; $t(96)=1.13$, $p=.26$. The mean male R-S score was 41.00, *SD* =17.82, the mean female R-S score was 44.74, *SD* =14.77.

Referring back to Table 1, A and B, the main effects for sex on the DMI scales that were predicted in Hypothesis 4 may be discovered. Looking at Part A of the table, which shows results based on traditionally scored DMI scales, the means of females are higher than males on REV, $F(1,93)=3.26$, $p=.07$; TAS, $F(1,93)=4.85$, $p=.03$; and PRN, $F(1,93)=4.87$, $p=.03$, and the means of the

males are higher than those of the females on PRO, $F(1,93)=7.36$, $p=.008$, and TAO $F(1,93)=8.25$, $p=.005$. A similar pattern of sex differences appears in Part B of Table 1, which covers the revised scoring format analyses. Females are significantly higher than males on REV, $F(1,93)=8.54$, $p=.004$, TAS, $F(1,93)=6.52$, $p=.01$, and PRN, $F(1,93)=11.38$, $p=.001$, while males scores are higher than females on PRO $F(1,93)=5.36$, $p=.02$ and TAO, $F(1,93)=3.54$, $p=.06$. Again as a sidenote, it is interesting that the traditional scoring format is best at differentiating the defense preferences of the sexes when the scales in question tend to be associated with males (TAO and PRO) while the more detailed revised scoring format better reveals the differences between men and women when the scales in consideration are those usually used more by females (REV, TAS and PRN).

Referring to Table 2, it is evident that many of the combinations that dichotomize the DMI are significantly related to the sex of the subject. But the combinations that predict best are (TAO+PRO)-(REV+TAS+PRN), $F(1,93)=10.39$, $p=.002$ and $F(1,93)=13.17$, $p=.000$; (TAS+PRN)-(REV+PRO+TAO), $F(1,93)=10.99$, $p=.001$ and $F(1,93)=9.92$, $p=.002$ and (PRN+TAO+PRO)-(REV+TAS), $F(1,93)=8.06$, $p=.006$, $F(1,93)=6.92$, $p=.01$, both scoring methods respectively. These results support Hypothesis 5.

The Interaction of the Main Effects in Relationship to Defense Preferences

Hypothesis 6 made predictions about the interaction of gender and defense style in relation to endorsement of specific scales on the DMI. Referring back to the ANOVAS described in Table 1, Parts A and B, it is clear that no interaction effects whatsoever were found significant. Hypothesis 6 had, in fact, anticipated a finding of no interaction effects for REV and PRN, where only main effects were predicted. But the interaction effects suggested for TAS, TAO and PRO were found to be so low as to be nonexistent. R-S fails to be more predictive of use of TAS among women than men, or of TAS among men than women. PRO fails to emerge as a repressing defense for men and a sensitizing defense for women. In sum, the study has provided evidence for significant main effects of sex and coping style with respect to specific defense mechanism utilization, but expected interaction effects failed to obtain.

Results Pertaining to the Interactionalist Perspective

Changes in DMI Defense Endorsements

Hypotheses 7 through 10 predicted changes in DMI defense endorsement patterns from pre- to post-interaction in pairs. The predictions were made according to aspects of interaction conceived of as affected by the interplay of the gender and R-S defense style of the partners. The changes predicted were set forth in terms of relative increase or decrease of DMI defenses associated with repressing or sensitizing, and relative increase or decrease of defenses typical or atypical for males and females. Several types of analyses were used to examine these predictions. First, t-tests were done comparing subjects on their changes from pre- to post-interaction on the nine combinations computed to dichotomize the DMI defenses, as described above. Next, the t-tests were completed between the subjects using their changes in scores on the five specific defenses of the DMI. Finally, an analysis of covariance was undertaken to simultaneously compare the data that could otherwise be compared only two subject groups at a time, in the t-tests. The ANCOVA also used the five specific scales of the DMI.

Table 3 presents the results of t-tests comparing repressors and sensitizers, and males and females, on their changes in DMI scale endorsement after partner interaction. Both the analyses using changes in DMI combinations and the analyses using changes in the specific DMI scales are shown in this table (and in subsequent tables). The t-tests comparing repressors with sensitizers show one DMI combination that discriminates between them, that is (TAS+PRN+PRO)-(REV+TAO), $t(54)=-2.59$, $p=.01$. Sensitizers increased their sum of scores on this combination while repressors decreased, so that sensitizers increased (TAS+PRN+PRO) while repressors increased (REV+TAO). The t-tests between repressors and sensitizers on specific DMI defense scales revealed that only with regard to REV, which repressors increase more than sensitizers, $t(54)=1.71$, $p=.09$; $t(54)-1.69$, $p=.09$, do the differences approach significance.

The t-tests comparing males and females failed to find any one specific DMI scale on which the changes resulting from interaction were significantly different between the sexes. But on the revised method scored ratio (PRN+TAS)-(REV+PRO+TAO), males increase while females decrease, $t(54)=1.87$, $p=.06$. Thus, for men and women, one result of participation in paired interaction may be a decrease in sex-typed and an increase in cross-sex

TABLE 3

RESULTS OF *t*-TESTS OF CHANGES IN DMI SCORES OF DEFENSE USAGE AFTER PAIR INTERACTION, *df* = 54

SUBJECTS COMPARED			DMI SCALE OR COMBINATION	*t*	*p*
	REPRESSORS N = 28	SENSITIZERS N = 28			
(Mean)	-7.75	6.82	(TAS+PRN+PRO) - (REV+TAO) Revised Method	-2.59	.01
(Std. Dev.)	(20.96)	(21.15)			
			All other defense combinations.		n.s.
M	1.42	-1.35	REV, Tradit. Method	1.71	.09
SD	(5.94)	(6.23)			
M	4.28	-1.67	REV, Revised Method	1.69	.09
SD	(12.59)	(13.84)			
	FEMALES N = 28	MALES N = 28			
M	-8.17	6.89	(PRN+TAS) - (REV+PRO+TAO), Revised Method	-1.87	.06
SD	(32.59)	(27.43)			
			All other defense combinations		n.s.
			All other specific defenses.		n.s.

defense preferences. Regression toward the mean cannot be ruled out as an explanation for this, however.

Table 4 considers combinations of interactors according to the sex and R-S style of their partners. An examination of the difference in defense changes of females based on whether they were paired with a male repressor as opposed to a male sensitizer shows that only among the following combinations did significant differences obtain: Revised scored (PRO+TAO)-(REV+TAS+PRN), (TAS+TAO+PRO)-(PRN+REV), (PRN+TAO+PRO)-(TAS+REV), (ps range from .07 to .01). All of these combinations have in common the combining of TAO+PRO, which were defense associated with male gender. Thus, regardless of their own defensive styles, females use more cross-sex DMI defenses when the male with whom they interact is a sensitizer as opposed to a repressor.

For males, the defense style of their female partners also appears to make a difference in the males changes in DMI defense utilization. The combinations of importance here are revised score (TAS+TAO+PRO)-(REV-REV) and (TAS+TAO-(REV+PRN+PRO), (ps range from .02 to .04), so that the defense TAO and TAS occur together in the defense combination pattern. Since these defenses were thought to be associated with sensitizing tendencies, it becomes apparent that the presence of a female R reduces males'

TABLE 4

RESULTS OF t-TESTS ON CHANGES IN DMI SCORES OF DEFENSE USAGE ACCORDING TO SEX AND R-S STYLE OF PARTNER, df = 26

	SUBJECTS COMPARED		DMI SCALE OR COMBINATION CHANGE	t	p
	Females with MRs N=14	Females with MSs N=14			
(Mean)	-4.14	8.78	(PRO+TAO)-(REV+TAS+PRN),	-1.86	.07
(Std. Dev.)	(16.23)	(20.27)	Traditional Method		
M	-17.57	26.50	(PRO+TAO)-(REV+TAS+PRN),	-2.58	.01
SD	(44.69)	(45.55)	Revised Method		
M	-19.28	-.35	(TAS+TAO+PRO)-(PRN+REV),	-1.85	.07
SD	(15.05)	(16.80)	Revised Method		
M	1.71	12.07	(PRN+TAO+PRO)-(TAS+REV),	-2.31	.02
SD	(15.62)	(18.47)	Revised Method		
M	5.57	-21.92	(PRN+TAS)-(REV+PRO+TAO)	2.43	.02
SD	(32.08	(27.74)	Revised Method		
			All other defense combinations and all specific defenses		
	Males with FR N=14	Males with FS N=14			
M	-13.85	-1.85	(TAS+TAO+PRO)-(PRN+REV)	-2.43	.02
SD	(11.70	(14.32)	Traditional Method		
M	-34.14	-4.50	(TAS+TAO+PRO)-(PRN+REV)	-2.35	.02
SD	(33.05)	(33.81)	Revised Method		
M	-11.42	-1.42	(TAS+TAO)-(REV+PRN+PRO)	-2.15	.04
SD	(11.05)	(13.41)	Traditional Method		
M	-25.42	-2.92	(TAS+TAO)-(REV+PRN+PRO)	-2.13	.04
SD	(23.74)	(31.57)	Revised Method		
			All other defense combinations and all specific defenses		n.s.
	Females with MR N=14	Males with FR N=14	All defense combinations and specific defenses		n.s.
	Females with MS	Males with FS		-2.38	.02
M	-21.92	3.35	(PRN+TAS)-(REV+PRO+TAO)		
SD	(27.74)	(28.51)	Revised Method		

use of sensitizing defenses and increases their use of repressive defenses more than the presence of a sensitizing female. It is also apparent that changes in DMI endorsements are not significantly different between males versus females paired with repressor partners, but they are significantly different between males and females paired with sensitizers on the combination (PRN+TAS)-(REV+PRO+TAO), $t(26)=-2.38$, $p=.02$. Males paired with FSs increase in cross-sex female associated typed TAS and PRN, while females paired with MS use the more male associated cross sex-typed REV+PRO+TAO.

Table 5 compares the changes in DMI endorsement of the partners within their own pairs. No differences were found significant between the male and female partners in the FRMR, FSMS, and FSMR pairs, suggesting that in these pairs, any changes in use of specific defenses or combinations of defenses are relatively homogeneous within the pair. Only in the FRMS pairs do the changes made by the partners significantly differ from each other. Females in these pairs increase while their male partners decrease their sums on the combination (PRO+TAO)-(REV+TAS+PRN), while the same pattern appear in reverse on the mirror-image combination (PRN+TAS)-(REV+PRO+TAO), with ps ranging from .03 to .07. This result was anticipated by Hypothesis 9, which predicted decreased

TABLE 5

RESULTS OF t-TESTS ON CHANGES IN DMI SCORES OF DEFENSE USAGE FOR PARTNERS WITHIN PAIRS, df = 12

	SUBJECTS COMPARED		DMI COMBINATION OR SCALE	t	p
	Females in FRMR Pairs N=7	Males in FRMR Pairs N=7	All Defense Combinations and all specific defenses		n.s.
	Females in FSMS Pairs N=7	Males in FSMS Pairs N=7	All Defense Combinations and all specific defenses		n.s.
	Females in FRMS Pairs N=7	Males in FRMS Pairs N=7			
M	5.71	-10.00	(PRO+TAO)-	2.00	.06
SD	(16.14)	(13.06)	(REV+TAS+PRN), Traditional Method		
M	26.57	-20.28	(PRO+TAO)-	1.97	.07
SD	(49.39)	(39.08)	(REV+TAB+PRN), Revised Method		
M	-2.28	8.85	(PRN+TAS)-	-2.04	.07
SD	(13.28)	(5.64)	(REV+PRO+TAO), Traditional Method		
M	-27.71	10.57	(PRN+TAS)-	-2.34	.03
SD	(35.54)	(24.75)	(REV+TRO+TAO) Revised Method		
M	-5.57	-1.28	TAS,	-2.24	.04
SD	(4.15)	(2.87)	Traditional Method		
			All other defense combinations and specific defenses		n.s.
	Females in FSMR Pairs	Males in FSMR Pairs	All defense combinations and specific defenses		n.s.

sex-typing for the partners in these pairs. Similarly, females in these pairs decline in their use of female-linked TAS more than do the male sensitizers here, $t(12)=2.24$, $p=.04$.

Table 6 shows females' changes in DMI defense endorsements based on the characteristics of their interaction situations. Females in homogeneous FRMR pairs appear to tend to decrease sensitizing and increase repressing defenses, while the opposite hold for females in homogeneous sensitizer FSMS pairs, as is shown by the results pertaining to the (TAS+TAO+PRO)-(PRN+REV) combination, $t(12)=.-1.91$, $p=.08$, and $t(12)=2.74$, $p=.01$. A specific defense on which the difference between these females was significant was PRO, $t(12)=2.14$, $p=.05$. These results confirm hypotheses 7 and 8 with respect to their predictions for females.

While it seems that no significant differences in DMI changes were found between female repressors according to their male partners' R-S style, such differences were detected when the females were sensitizers. Female sensitizers paired with male sensitizers changed in the direction of more male-associated defenses, while female sensitizers paired with male repressors changed in the opposite direction; this pattern was evident on the combinations (PRO+TAO)-(REV+TAS+PRN), revised scoring, $t(12)=1.85$, $p=.08$, and (PRN+TAS)-(REV+PRO+TAO), revised scoring,

TABLE 6

RESULTS OF t-TESTS ON CHANGES IN FEMALES' DEFENSE USAGE ACCORDING TO THEIR INTERACTION SITUATION df = 12

SUBJECTS COMPARED		DMI SCALE OR COMBINATION CHANGE	t	p
FR in FRMR N=7	FS in FSMS N=7			
M -9.71 SD (13.63)	4.71 (14.56)	(TAS+TAO+PRO)-(PRN+REV) Traditional Method	-1.91	.08
M -27.71 SD (31.98)	18.14 (30.71)	(TAS+TAO+PRO)-(PRN+REV) Revised Method	-2.74	.01
M -6.57 SD (18.57)	11.85 (13.14)	PRO, Revised Method	-2.14	.05
		All other defense combinations and specific defenses		
FR in FRMR N=7	FR in FRMS N=7	All defense combinations and specific defenses		n.s.
FS in FSMS N=7	FS in FSMR N=7			
M 26.42 SD (45.35)	-16.28 (40.70)	(PRO+TAO)-(REV+TAS+PRN) Revised Method	1.85	.08
M -16.14 SD (18.05)	12.85 (25.63)	(PRN+TAS)-(REV+PRO+TAO) Revised Method	-2.45	.03
		All other defense combinations and defenses		n.s.
FR in FRMR N=7	FS in FSMR N=7			
M -14.85 SD (28.70)	9.71 (11.16)	(TAS+PRN+PRO)-(REV+TAO) Revised method	-2.11	.06
		All other defense combinations and defenses		n.s.
FS in FSMS N=7	FR in FRMS N=7	All defense combinations and defenses		n.s.

$t(12)=-2.45$, $p=.03$. These results give support to Hypotheses 8 and 10 as they apply to the female partners of the FSMS versus the FSMR pairs.

For females paired with male repressors, the females' R-S style is a significant factor in predicting DMI change, but for females paired with male sensitizers, the females' R-S is not a predictive factor. Thus, FRs paired with MRs decrease with respect to the combination (TAS+PRN+PRO)-(REV+TAO), revised scoring, $t(12)=-2.11$, $p=.06$, while FSs paired with MRs increase on this combination. Hypotheses 7 and 10 are only partially supported by these findings, since the FRs appeared to increase TAO rather than REV and TAS, hypothesized.

Table 7 likewise shows males' changes in DMI defense endorsements based on the characteristics of the interaction situations. Like the females, the males in homogenous repressor pairs become more repressing in their choice of DMI defenses, while male sensitizers in homogenous sensitizing pairs fail to increase in DMI defenses associated with repressing; hence a significant difference was found using the combination (TAS+TAO+PRO)-(PRN+REV), traditionally scored, $t(12)=-2.40$, $p=.03$. Consistent with this finding, the MRs in MRFR pairs increased use of REV, while the MS in FSMS pairs reduced endorsement of REV, $t(12)=2.52$, ($p=.02$, and $t(12)=2.69$, $p=.02$.

TABLE 7

RESULTS OF t-TESTS ON CHANGES IN MALES' DEFENSE USAGE ACCORDING TO THEIR INTERACTION SITUATION, df = 12

SUBJECTS COMPARED		DMI SCALE COMBINATION CHANGE	t	p
MR in FRMR N=7	MS in FSMS N=7			
M -15.14 SD (11.99)	.28 (12.02)	(TAS+TAO+PRO)-(PRN+REV) Traditional Method	-2.40	.03
M 3.71 SD (6.34)	-3.28 (3.72)	REV, Traditional Method	2.52	.02
M 5.71 SD (10.24)	-8.14 (8.97)	REV, Revised Method	2.69	.02
		All other defense combinations and defenses		n.s.
MR in FRMR N=7	MR in FSMR N=7			
M -23.42 SD (12.09)	-3.85 (23.79)	(TAS+TAO)-(REV+PRN+PRO) Revised Method	-1.94	.08
M -7.85 SD (14.16)	-.85 (13.53)	TAO, Revised Method	-1.91	.08
		All other defense combinations and defenses		n.s.
MS in FSMS N=7	MS in FRMS N=7			
M .28 SD (12.02)	-12.57 (12.20)	(TAS+TAO+PRO)-(PRN+REV) Traditional Method	1.99	.07
M -8.14 SD (8.97)	4.85 (11.09)	REV, Revised method	-2.41	.03
		All other defense combinations and defenses		n.s.
MS in FSMS N=7	MR in FSMR N=7	All defense combinations and specific defenses	n.s.	
MR in FRMR N=7	MS in FRMS N=7			
M -2.00 SD (6.83)	7.14 (6.20)	(TAS+PRN+PRO)-(REV+TAO) Traditional Method	-2.62	.02
		All other defense combinations and specific defenses		n.s.

These results basically confirm Hypotheses 7 and 8 as they pertain to males.

Whether the male is a repressor or a sensitizer, his female partner's R-S style appear to have some effect on his change. For male repressors, there is a trend, $t(12)=-1.94$, $p=.08$, for greater decrease in use of TAS and TAO relative to other defenses when the female partner is a repressor as opposed to a sensitizer. This result supports the predictions of Hypotheses 7 and 10 as they apply to the male partners, and indeed, the test completed on TAO specifically also demonstrates the same trend $t(12)=-1.91$, $p=.08$, revised scoring. When the male is a sensitizer, once again there is a greater decline in sensitizing and increase in repressing defenses when the female partner is a repressor than when she is a sensitizer, hence, the significant findings on the combination (TAS+TAO+PRO)-(PRN+REV), traditional scoring, $t(12)=1.99$, $p=.07$; and REV, revised scoring, $p=.03$. These results conform to the predictions of Hypotheses 8 and 9 as they apply to males.

When a male is paired with a female sensitizer, his own R-S style does not appear to make a significant difference in predicting his change on DMI endorsements. But when his partner is a repressor female, a significant difference occurs between male and repressors and male

sensitizers such that MS show an increase while MR show a decrease in the combination (TAS+PRN+PRO)-(REV+TAO), $t(12)=-2.62$, $p=.02$. This result clarifies the increase in repressive male associated defense choice for male repressors in FRMR pairs predicted in Hypothesis 7 as opposed to a repressive but cross-sexed associated change anticipated for males in FRMS pairs predicted by Hypothesis 9.

It is also possible to consider change in DMI defense endorsements for the partners in the heterogenous defense style pairs, FRMS pairs discussed in Hypothesis 9 and FSMR pairs discussed in Hypothesis 10. The FR in FRMS pairs decreased while the FS in FSMR pairs increased on the combinations (PRN+TAS)-(REV+PRO+TAO) and (TAS+PRN+PRO)-(REV+TAO). Respectively, the results were $t(12)=2.45$, $p=.03$ and $t(12)=-2.27$, $p=.05$. Too, the same FR decreased use of TAS, revised scoring, $t(12)=-1.92$, $p=.09$ at the level of a trend, while the FS slightly increased TAS. These results support Hypothesis 9 and 10 for females, since sex typing with regard to TAS and perhaps TAO seem more prominent for the female S paired with an R male than for the female R paired with an S male, so that the male partners' R-S style seems to have a greater influence on females sex-typing of defenses than the female partners' style. The same combinations, that is,

(PRN+TAS)-(REV+PRO+TAO) and (TAS+PRN+PRO)-(REV+TAO), traditional scoring, $t(12)=2.35$, $p=.03$ and $t(12)=2.41$, $p=.03$ reflect differences between the MS in the FRMS pairs and the MR in the FSMR pairs, with the MS showing less increase in sex typing of DMI preferences while the MR shows more. PRO seems equally used by men in both interaction situations, disconfirming the increased use of PRO expected for the MR in the FSMR pairs, proposed in Hypothesis 10.

Analyses of covariance for repeated measures were conducted on the post-interaction DMI scale scores (Note: Scale as opposed to change in scale scores), using both the traditional and revised scoring procedures, on the experimental subjects. The covariates were the initial pre-testing DMI scale scores prior to experimental interaction. The independent factors were designated Femaletype, based on whether the female in the pair was a repressor or sensitizer, and Maletype, based on whether the male in the pair was a repressor or sensitizer. The within pair factors concerned the relationship of the male and female scores to each other within a pair based on the Maletype and/or Femaletype of the pair. The ANCOVAS thus, were used to compare post-interaction DMI defense endorsement among the different types of pairs and subject in them, while controlling for the initial pre-test

differences that existed among the subjects. Table 8 presents the specific DMI defense scales for which significant effects were found. Defense scales which failed to yield significant results in the ANCOVAS are not presented due to space considerations.

Table 8 shows that with regard to REV, a pair's joint overall reliance on this defense depended to a significant extent, $F(1,26)=6.11$, $p=.02$, on whether the Male member of the pair was a repressor or a sensitizer. The pairs with male repressors were found to use more REV, while pairs with male sensitizers used significantly less, as the table of means adjusted for covariates depicts. Thus, the adjusted mean REV score for the MRFR pairs was 41.73 for the males and 42.42 for the females and the means for the MRFS pairs were 39.02 for the males and 39.94 for the females. In contrast, the REV scores for the MSFR pairs were only 37.35 for the males and 38.52 for females, and for the MSFS pairs were 35.53 and 35.64 respectively. This phenomena failed to occur when the revised scoring method was used, Maletype $F(1,26)=2.69$, $p=.11$, however. These results partially confirm the predictions of Hypotheses 7 through 10 regarding the increase in repressing-associated defenses according to the presence of repressors, especially male repressors in the pair.

TABLE 8

ANCOVA RESULTS ON SELECTED DMI SCALES

REV: Traditionally Scored

Source	df	MS	F	p
Female type	1	96.62	2.75	.11
Male type	1	214.74	6.11	.02
FM	1	.65	.02	.89
1st Covar.	1	992.05	28.23	.000
Error	23	35.14		
Within Pair (W.P.)	1	12.50	.47	.50
W.P.F	1	2.11	.08	.78
W.P.M	1	.00	.00	.99
W.P.FM	1	3.52	.13	.719
1st Covar.	1	814.65	30.52	.000
Error	23	26.69		

Adjusted cell means:

PAIR:	FRMR	FRMS	FSMR	FSMS
Female in Pair	42.42	38.51	39.94	35.63
Male in Pair	41.73	37.35	39.01	35.52

TABLE 8 (continued)

TAS: Traditionally Scored

Source	df	MS	F	p
Female type	1	7.14	.031	.58
Male type	1	3.08	.13	.71
FM	1	.03	.00	.96
1st Covar.	1	844.10	.3687	.000
Error	23	22.89		
Within Pair (W.P.)	1	.89	.08	.78
W.P.F	1	2.29	.19	.66
W.P.M	1	53.34	4.51	.04
W.P.FM	1	4.08	.34	.56
1st Covar.	1	392.66	33.16	.000
Error	23	11.84		

Adjusted Cell Means:

PAIR:	FRMR	FRMS	FSMR	FSMS
Female in Pair	35.00	32.02	35.30	33.77
Male in Pair	32.96	34.91	33.67	34.68

TABLE 8 (continued)

TAS: Revised Scored

Source	df	MS	F	p
Female type	1	372.16	2.75	.11
Male type	1	386.74	2.86	.10
FM	1	100.51	.74	.397
1st Covar.	1	8909.02	65.94	.000
Error	23	135.11		
Within Pair (W.P.)	1	174.00	2.18	.15
W.P.F	1	236.86	2.96	.09
W.P.M	1	451.17	5.65	.02
W.P.FM	1	3.23	.04	.84
1st Covar.	1	3829.55	47.94	.000
Error	23	79.88		

Adjusted Cell Means:

PAIR	FRMR	FRMS	FSMR	FSMS
Female in Pair	-15.01	-21.59	-3.18	-15.71
Males in Pair	-18.20	-15.87	-15.22	-16.18

Table 8 also shows that TAS showed significant effects of sex and R-S aspects of the pairs for both types of scoring methods. The relationship of a females TAS endorsement to that of her male partner post-interaction depended on whether the male was a repressor or a sensitizer, so that females used more TAS than their partners (with adjustment for covariates) when they were paired with male repressors, but they used relatively less TAS than their partners when these men were sensitizers. Examining the use of TAS measured by the traditional scoring format, WithinPair MaleType was significant, $F(1,26)=4.51$, $p=.04$, and the adjusted means for the females in the FRMR pairs were 35.07 against their partners' 32.96, and for females in the FSMR pairs, 35.30 against the males 33.67, showing the female-male relationship with regard to TAS in pairs with male repressors. But in pairs with male sensitizers, the female-male relationship with respect to adjusted TAS scores was reversed; the adjusted mean for females in FRMS pairs was 32.02 against their male partners' 34.91, and the means for females in FSMS pairs was 33.77 for the females against the slightly greater 34.69 for the males. Looking at the revised method scores also presented in Table 8, Within Pair Maletype once again predicts the relationship of female-male adjusted TAS scores at a significant

level $F(1,26)=5.65$, $p=.02$, and the same pattern of adjusted means is apparent. These findings confirm the hypotheses about increase or decrease of sex-typed and cross-sex-typed DMI preferences set forth in Hypotheses 7 through 10.

Perceptions of Defensive Similarity to Partners

Besides predicting DMI defense utilization for the subjects as affected by pair interaction, Hypotheses 7 through 10 also addressed the subject's perceptions of their partner's defensive similarity to them. The procedure required that after each DMI story-related discussion, the partners must answer True or False the question: "If something like this situation were in fact to occur, I think my partner and I would react in similar ways." Partners' combined answers to this question might, thus, fall into one of three different categories: (1) mutually perceived agreement about defensive coping, in which both partners answered the question "True," (2) mutually perceived disagreement about defensive coping, in which both partners answered "False," and (3) non-mutual perceptions about defensive coping, in which one partner expected similarity with his/her partner, answering "True," while the other perceived disagreement and answered "False."

ANOVAS with Type of Pair as the independent factor were conducted on each of these categories of response combinations. The results are presented in Tables 9, Parts A, B and C, respectively. According to Table 9A, FSMR pairs showed significantly more mutual agreement than FRMS pairs $t(52)=2.35$, $p=.02$ based on the a priori contrast of these pairs. Although the contrast between FRMR and FSMS pairs was not significant, FRMR pairs manifested less mutual agreement than FSMS pairs. This is an unexpected finding and disconfirms Hypotheses 7 and 8. Table 9B shows that the FSMR pairs exhibited the least mutual disagreement, while FRMS and FRMR showed substantially more and most, respectively. This ANOVA shows an overall level of significance of $F(3,55)=3.19$, $p=.03$. This finding was also contrary to the Hypotheses. Table 9C indicates that FRMR and FSMR pairs show the least amount of non-mutual perception, while FRMS shows most and FSMS shows an intermediary amount. The difference between the FSMR and FRMS pairs approaches significance, $t(52)=1.72$, $p=.09$. Only the result for the FRMS pairs were expected. In general, the results of Table 9 appear to contradict the experimental hypotheses. It would seem they give some support to the experimental predictions only if the predicted expectations for the males in the pair are extended to the agreeing behavior of the pair as a whole.

TABLE 9

ANOVAS ON PERCEPTIONS OF DEFENSE SIMILARITY OF PAIRS

PART A

Mutual Agreement	df	MS	F	p
Between groups	3	4.76	2.28	.09
Within groups	52	2.08		

Pair Type Means:

1. MRFR 6.57
2. MSFS 6.71
3. MSFR 6.42
4. MRFS 7.71

Contrast of 1 and 2:
$t(52) = .26$ $p = .79$
Contrast of 3 and 4:
$t(52) = -2.33$ $p = .02$
Contrast of 1, 2 and 3, 4:
$t(52) = .27$ $p = .27$

TABLE 9 (continued)

PART B

Mutual Disagreement	df	MS	F	p
Between groups	3	3.11	3.18	.03
Within groups	52	.97		

Pair Type Means:

1. MRFR 1.42
2. MSFS .72
3. MSFR .85
4. MRFS .28

Contrast of 1 and 2:
$t(52) = 1.91$ $p = .79$
Contrast of 3 and 4:
$t(52) = 1.52$ $p = .13$
Contrast of 1, 2 and 3, 4:
$t(52) = 1.89$ $p = .06$

TABLE 9 (continued)

PART C

Non-Mutual Perception Agreement and Disagreement	df	MS	F	p
Between groups	3	1.97	1.65	.18
Within groups	52	1.19		

Pair Means

1.	MRFR	1.00
2.	MSFS	1.57
3.	MSFR	1.71
4.	MRFS	1.00

Contrast of 1 and 2:
$t(52) = -1.38$ $p = .17$

Contrast of 3 and 4:
$t(52) = 1.72$ $p = .09$

Contrast of 1,2 and 3,4:
$t(52) = -.24$ $p = .80$

DISCUSSION

Although all of the hypotheses of this study did not find complete confirmation in the results, many were given substantial support. In the discussion, the hypotheses will be discussed in detail in relation to the statistical findings. Where relevant, the efficacy of the measures and design used will be commented upon. The value of this study for investigating the theoretical and practical questions that gave rise to it will be considered.

Hypotheses 1 through 5 concerned prediction of individual differences in use of defense mechanisms from a trait perspective. These hypotheses considered the main effects of overriding coping style as measured by the R-S Scale, and of gender, on subjects' utilization of specific defense mechanisms, according to the DMI. As predicted by Hypotheses 1 and 2, sensitizing subjects used TAS and TAO, defenses which approach and admit to conflict and threat, more than repressors. Repressors were significantly more likely to use PRN than sensitizers. Attention to the items in the PRN scale of the DMI reveal it to be composed largely of "sweet lemon rationalization" statements rather than statements involving unemotional, detached

analytical intellectualization, a manner of defense that was considered associated with sensitizing coping. Therefore, it is not surprising that PRN is more predicted by the threat-avoiding repressive R-S scores than the threat-approaching sensitizing scores. The prediction that there would be a lack of significant difference between repressors' and sensitizers' use of PRO, which involves both searching after or approaching and misplacing or avoiding threat, was not repudiated. The failure of REV to be associated with repressive R-S performance invites explanation. Attention to the items of the REV scale shows a preponderance of items involving the use of reaction formation, as well as denial and repression items. Reaction formation, although involving a positive bias attractive to repressors, is nevertheless a defense often associated with obsessive-compulsive undoing of hostile or negative affect that is kept from consciousness and replaced by its opposite. Therefore, the DMI may be criticized for gathering under the rubric of REV both repression and denial, which might be considered simply conflict avoidant, and reaction formation, which approaches and actively transforms conflict. Hence, REV might reflect both a repressing and a sensitizing style. Due to the failure of the DMI to provide scales truly reflective of either affectless intellectualization that

approaches conflict, or pure avoidant repression and denial, its construct validity for measuring the defenses it purports to measure, as well as its usefulness for exploring conceptualizations of defensive styles that include specific defenses, such as Byrne's or Tucker's, is less than optimal. Therefore, a revision of the DMI to ameliorate these difficulties might be considered a next step prior to replications or expansions of the present study.

The main effects predicted by Hypotheses 3, 4 and 5 regarding gender were also supported. R-S per say was found not significantly related to sex, although to a slight extent women did use a more sensitizing coping style than men. Although this result was anticipated by previous R-S Scale research, it is nevertheless somewhat counter-intuitive. Clinical practice attests to the greater frequency of hysterical, repressive features in female clients and obsessive, intellectualizing features in men. Chelune (1977) and Merrill (1978) have found male sensitizers to be low disclosers in actual interpersonal behavior, perhaps explaining the fact that although willing to honestly acknowledge their conflict and anxiety to a paper and pencil test, these sensitizer men become tight-lipped or withdrawn when expressing their personal selves to others. This fact may be

particularly evident when obsessive (thought to be sensitizing) men are seen in relation to hysterical wives, with whom they are often paired in clinical couples (Barnett, 1971). The R-S scale may be contaminated for women, too in its emphasis on willingness to admit weakness as evidence of objectivity and intellectualization. Women admit more weakness than men in general, whether in person or on paper, so the R-S Scale may be even less useful in differentiating repressors and sensitizers among women than it is among men. Like the DMI, the R-S Scale could only beimproved if specific attention was paid to assessing specifically analytical as opposed to either positive or negative attitudinal tendencies.

Hypotheses 4 and 5, relating to the use of specific DMI defenses by men and women were also supported. Overall, men used more TAO and PRO while women used more REV, TAS and PRN. The sex difference literature is compatible with these findings, as is literature on what is differentially socially acceptable for men and women. Unfortunately, as stated above, the DMI fails to include a scale accurately representing an unemotional, objective tendency that sex difference literature suggests might also differentiate the specific defending of men and women.

A word of caution must be added with regard to the main effects discovered in the study. Although the

aforesaid differences found between repressors and sensitizers, and men and women were often highly significant, the prediction afforded actually accounted for only small portions of the variance, that is, 12.25% at most. Thus, choice of specific defense mechanisms, though clearly affected by a person's general coping style and sex is by no means completely determined by these variables. It is also true, however, that much of the variance unaccounted for may have been due to unreliability or validity problems of the measured used. The relative importance of gender and coping style as factors in individuals' use of defense remains continues to be a question of heuristic value for research.

Another issue that arises when interpreting the results is the difference in significance levels obtained when specific singular DMI scales are predicted by the main factors as opposed to the levels obtained when the results predicted are the combinations of dichotomous groups of DMI defenses with each other. In general, significance was improved when the hypotheses were studied in terms of combinations as opposed to when single DMI defenses that were included in the combinations were studied independently. Sex, and particularly R-S coping style were more related to appropriate combination scores than the single scores that composed them. Therefore, it

seems useful to view the use of any particular DMI defense as a choice from any of several related and compatible defenses that may easily substitute for each other. Use of specific defense seems less reliable and more vulnerable to chance factors, than does use of general defense groupings that may be related to variables such as gender and coping style.

With regard to the interaction of main effects, outlined in Hypothesis 6, it is most interesting that none of the interactions of sex and coping style hypothesized to predict DMI performance were found. These hypotheses had been a major feature of the study, and their failure to occur merits comment.. It was predicted that TAO, while a universal defense for males which male repressors and sensitizers would use roughly equally, would differentiate between repressor and sensitizer women. Repressor women were expected to repress this sex-deviant and therefore conflict-ridden defense, while sensitizer women were expected to acknowledge and use it more. TAS was expected to be a universal defense among women used fairly equally by repressors and sensitizers, but male repressors were expected to repress this weakness-admitting sex deviant defense while male sensitizers more readily admitted to and used this cross-sex defense mechanism. PRO was expected to characterize repressing

men, who in certain situations would be covert about the hostility that sensitizer men could more openly acknowledge, especially when self-esteem was at stake; but PRO was also expected to characterize the sensitizer women who would generally scan situations for presence of threat more than repressor women. A possible explanation for the marked failure to find evidence for these interactions lies in the strength of sex-stereotypes and social sanctions that are reflected in the main effects. TAO and PRO are so heavily sanctioned against for women, and TAS so heavily sanctioned against for men that interaction effects were completely wiped out. Still, it may have been possible to discover the interaction effects proposed had the effects of sex-stereotype and social desirability been controlled for as mediating factors. Subsequent research exploring the expression of specific defense mechanisms based on general coping style and sex might therefore employ such scales as the Marlow-Crowne measure of social desirability and the Bem Scale of Androgyny to help tease out complex interaction effects.

As a counterpoint to the trait-research approach that underlies the study questions addressed thus far, the focal point of the present study was an interactionalist interpretation of defense mechanisms. The effect on each other's defensive behavior of interactors according to

their interaction situation, as it was created out of their own sex and coping style and the sex and coping style of their partners was studied in detail. The expected effects were described for each type of interaction pair in Hypothese 7 through 10. In general, these hypotheses received considerable support from the experimental findings.

Hypotheses 7 through 10 predicted changes in usage of DMI defenses for the partners in each pair in terms of two bipolar dimensions, that is, whether the changes in defense preference might reflect more repression or sensitization, and whether the changes might reflect more sex-stereotyped or cross-sexed choice of defense. Table 10 shows a summary of the changes in defense as a result of pair interaction for women (Part A) and men (Part B), depicting which significant differences were found. The table notes whether the change may be seen to reflect a change in the repression-sensitization aspect of defense choice, or whether the change seems to reflect a change in the sex-stereotyped or cross-sexed dimension associated with specific defenses. Table 10 may be referred to as a summary reflecting the success of Hypotheses 7 through 10 in predicting the results obtained.

Hypothesis 7 predicted that both partners in the FRMR pairs would change in the direction of using

TABLE 10

SUMMARY OF PAIR INTERACTION FINDINGS

PART A: COMPARISONS BETWEEN FEMALES

PAIRS COMPARED	DMI DEFENSES OR COMBINATIONS WHERE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN CHANGES WERE FOUND	INTERPRETATION
FEMALES in:		
RR vs. SS	(TAS+TAO+PRO) - (PRN+REV); PRO	RR females increase Repressive defenses; SS females increase Sensitizing defenses.
RR vs. RS	n.s.	-
RR vs. SR	(TAS+PRN+PRO) - (REV+TAO)	RR females decrease defenses opposed to socially-approved aggression; SR increase defenses opposed to socially approved aggression.
SS vs. RS	n.s.	-
SS vs. SR	(PRO+TAO) - (other defense combinations) esp. (PRO+TAO) - (REV+TAS+PRN)	SS females increase cross-sex defenses. SR females decrease cross-sex defenses.
RS vs. SR	(PRN+TAS) - (REV+PRO+TAO); (TAS+PRN+PRO) - (REV+TAO)	RS females decrease defenses opposed to socially-approved aggression; SR females increase defenses opposed to socially approved aggression.

TABLE 10

SUMMARY OF PAIR INTERACTION FINDINGS

PART B: COMPARISONS BETWEEN MALES

PAIRS COMPARED	DMI DEFENSES OR COMBINATIONS WHERE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CHANGES WERE FOUND	INTERPRETATION
MALES in:		
RR vs. SS	(TAS+TAO+PRO) - (PRN+REV); REV	RR males increase repressive defenses; SS males increase sensitizing defenses.
RR vs. RS	(TAS+PRN+PRO) - (REV+TAO)	RR males decrease defenses opposed to socially-approved aggression; RS males increase defenses opposed to socially approved aggression.
RR vs. SR	(TAS+TAO) - (PRN+REV+PRO); TAO	RR males decrease sensitizing defenses; SR male decrease sensitizing defenses less.
SS vs. RS	(TAS+TAO+PRO) - (PRN+REV)	RS males decrease sensitizing defenses; SS males decrease less.
SS vs. SR	n.s.	
RS vs. SR	(PRN+TAS) - (REV+PRO+TAO); (TAS+PRN+PRO) - (REV+TAO)	RS males increase defenses opposed to socially-approved aggression; SR males decrease defenses opposed to socially-approved aggression.

repression-associated defenses, REV and PRN more, relative to other defenses, and that both partners would maintain or increase the respective defenses appropriate to their sex, TAS and TAO. The *t*-tests that compared the males and females in these pairs to their male and their female counterparts in homogenous sensitizer pairs of FSMS confirmed Hypothesis 7 with respect to the increase in the repressive defenses for both partners in the homogenous repressor pairs. The females in these pairs did not increase use of repressive REV and PRN significantly more than female repressors in the heterogenous FRMS pairs. But the male repressors in the homogenous repressor pairs did use significantly more of these repressive defenses after interaction than the repressor males in the heterogenous FSMR pairs, suggesting that the sex of the partners in the heterogenous pairs effects how much mitigation occurs in the tendency of repressors to increase repression during interaction. Hypothesis 7's prediction regarding sex-typing of change in defense were not reflected in significant increase on the part of either the males or females in sex-stereotyped defenses. The general sample tendency to reduce both these defenses, as well as some possible effort of the repressor females in these pairs to appear more "liberated" by endorsing more TAO as a reaction to a warm-up Topic of Discussion that

focused on recent changes in sex roles for women, are possible explanations for the lack of increase in sex-stereotyping that had been predicted for the FRMR pairs.

Hypothesis 8 had predicted that the male and female sensitizers in the homogenous sensitizer FSMS pairs would both increase use of sensitization-associated defenses, such as TAS, TAO and possibly PRO in their interaction situation. They were also expected to increase in cross-sexed defense endorsement, more TAS (and REV and PRN) for the men and more TAO (and PRO) for the women. The t-tests mentioned comparing the homogenous repressor pair counterparts agrees with the prediction that the sensitizers would increase their sensitizing-associated defense choices, notably TAS, TAO and PRO. The females in the FSMR are particularly increased in PRO, which had been expected to reflect increased sensitization in females as opposed to males. Females in homogenous sensitizing pairs are not clearly more increased post-interaction than female sensiziters paired with male repressors with regards to the sensitizing-associated defenses, but they are specifically changed in a more cross-sexed direction of endorsement, choosing more PRO and TAO than the female sensitizers in the heterogenous pairs, who increased endorsement of more female sex-stereotyped TAS, PRN and REV. Thus, additional

partial support to Hypothesis 8 was afforded. With respect to sensitizing males in homogenous sensitizing pairs, they are not more cross-sex stereotyped than the sensitizing males in heterogenous FRMS pairs, but they do decrease less on endorsement of sensitizing-associated defenses than the men paired with repressor women. Sensitization in males appears to increase cross-sexed behavior in their females interactors; sensitization in women appears to decrease repression in their male partners, and male and female sensitizers use more sensitizing defenses when interacting with each other.

Hypothesis 9 had predicted changes for the females and males in the heterogenous FRMS pairs. Slight increases for both partners were suggested for repression-associated REV and PRN, but the male sensitizers were expected to induce decreased sex-stereotyping and increased use of cross-sex defenses for the men and women in these pairs. The female repressors in these pairs differed from neither the defense-style similar repressor females in the homogenous FRMR pairs, nor the similarly-paired (to sensitizing males) sensitizing females in the FSMS pairs. Since Hypothesis 9 assumed that the increase in repressive-associated defenses would be slight for the females in the FRMS pairs, the hypothesis may be considered not to have been disconfirmed. The sensitizer

males in these heterogenous pairs were found to increase more in use of defenses other than those which might be thought to reflect socially approved aggression, that is REV and TAO, than repressor males similarly paired with repressor females in FRMR pairs. The sensitizer males in the FRMS pairs also differed from sensitizer males in homogenous sensitizing pairs by increasing significantly less in sensitizing defenses, as might be expected. Thus, Hypothesis 9 seems to have received considerable confirmation with regard to changes proposed in the repression-sensitization associated aspect of defense choice, and for males with regard to the sex-typing aspect of defense, if a reduction in aggression that occurs with social approval seeking might be considered evidence of a decrease in stereotyped male defensive behavior.

Hypothesis 10 predicted changes for the partners in FSMR pairs. Repressive-associated defenses were expected to increase for both partners due to the presence of a male repressor in the pair. Males were expected to increase in use of a specific male-associated defense, PRO, while females were expected to increase female-associated defenses, especially TAS. These females did, in fact, show a more sex-typed change in their interaction situation than did their counterparts in homogenous sensitizer pairs. Females in the heterogenous FSMR pairs also differed from females in the homogenous repressor

pairs, who were likewise paired with male repressors, for the former tended to increase in defenses other than REV and TAO while the latter increased REV and TAO more than other defenses. A possible explanation for this difference is that the female sensitizers described in Hypothesis 10 were induced in a more sex-typed, TAS utilizing fashion by their male repressor partners, as would be expected for females paired with male repressors, but the female repressors in the homogenous repressor pairs were more affected by a demand characteristic promoting "liberated" assertive responding among women related to a warm-up Topic of Discussion that made reference to changes in the roles and status of women. Repressors might be more sensitive to demand characteristics than sensitizers, so that their responsiveness of the coping style of their male partners was somewhat diminished. Regarding the males referred to in Hypothesis 10, they were somewhat less repressing in their choice of defenses than males in homogenous FRMR pairs; so the presence of female sensitizers does mitigate the repressive changes of their male partners. But since repressive changes nevertheless remained present, Hypothesis 10 can be considered supported. There is no difference between the changes of these repressor men paired with female sensitizers and sensitizer men paired with female sensitizers, again suggesting

the effect of a female sensitizer on her male partner's repressive preferences.

Hypotheses 9 and 10 concerned pairs that are mirror images of each other in terms of their combination of the partner's sex and R-S style. It is interesting that when paired with a male sensitizer, female repressors become more cross-sexed in defense preference, a result that goes against what might be considered a more expectable adherence to sex stereotypes among repressors, and the female sensitizers paired with male repressors become more sex-stereotypically female in defense choice, a result that opposes what might be considered typical for female sensitizers. For males, despite the opposing influences of their female partners, the male repressors shows their typical sex-stereotypical defense choice tendencies, while the male sensitizers continue to grow more cross-sexed in defense endorsement. The heterogenous pairs, then do seem to confirm the prediction that the R-S style of males has more of a change-inducing effect on their female partners' endorsement of defenses than the R-S style of females on their male partners.

In general, the t-analyses presented in the results give strong support to the study hypotheses regarding post-interaction changes in defensive behavior. Given the complexity of these hypotheses, such

support must be considered especially worthy of note. However, even where they confirm experimental hypotheses, accepting the findings of numerous t-tests must be viewed with caution. Some of so numerous t-analyses may have reached significance that actually is attributable to chance. In order to analyze the data in a manner less vulnerable to Type I error, as well as to better control for the possible regression effects, the ANCOVA was used.

Specific evidence of significantly different changes for subjects in interaction pairs was less abundant in the ANCOVA findings, perhaps due to the reduction of any significant effects aided by regression towards the mean. However, the major patterns that seemed to underly the t-test findings to receive support from the ANCOVA. Therefore, it is not surprising that FRMR pairs used more repressive defenses, especially REV, than FSMS pairs, and FSMR pairs were slightly more repressive than FSMS pairs, since a repressive coping style in the male was found to be the most significant factor determining the choice of repression-associated defenses by a pair. The ANCOVA also supported the assumption that the R-S style of the male had most influence on the same or cross-sexed dimension of defense choice changes from pre- to post-interaction. Thus, the ANCOVA on TAS showed a cross-sex relationship of males and females in pairs with male

sensitizers, and a sex-stereotyped relationship of males and females in pairs with male repressors. The unanticipated finding that females in FRMR pairs were less stereotyped and more likely to use REV and TAO than females in FSMR pairs did not appear in the ANCOVA, suggesting that the female repressors may have been showing some regression toward the mean with regard to TAO as much as real increased acceptance of this defense, even in line with experimental demand characteristics.

However, another explanation for the failure of the ANCOVA to find some of the differences discovered by the t-tests is also possible. The ANCOVA computation of the pre-pair interaction DMI scores as covariates eliminated the likelihood that regression of all subjects toward the same population mean would contribute to significant findings. But it is possible that repressors and sensitizers as well as men and women are of distinct and different populations. Therefore, regression toward their respective population means would produce different effects. Many current researchers (Millon, 1969; deWolfe, 1981; Shack, 1981) take the position that perceptual, cognitive and coping styles are related to differences in individuals' physiological, neurological and hormonal organization. Therefore, it may be more accurate to view men and women and repressors and

sensitizers as belonging to different populations. Thus, the ANCOVA used in this study may be viewed as a conservative analysis.

The results pertaining to the Perceived Similarity question merit special comment. The findings of the ANOVAS failed to support Hypotheses 7 through 10 in the manner demonstrated by the change in DMI endorsement data. Instead of manifesting the most perceived agreement in their estimations of each others defensive style, the partners in the FRMR pairs showed the least agreement. One possible explanation of this surprising finding is that the repressor pairs were exaggerated in their wish to seek social approval from the experimenter by openly disagreeing with each other as an expression of liberation from sex role stereotypes. They may have perceived the demonstration of such liberation desirable in reaction to the Topic of Discussion that read, "Taking into account your general knowledge and personal experiences, discuss what you consider to be the most important effects of the changing ideas about sex roles on school, work and social relationships for young men and women today." Such a demand characteristic may have been uniquely affecting for female repressors, who might otherwise be most traditionally agreeable. Perhaps this explanation thus accounts for the fact that the most mutual agreement was

found between sensitizer women and repressor men, who might not only be somewhat similar in their approach to assertive behavior, but also comfortable enough with this fact not to exaggerate it for the purpose of demonstrating liberated behavior. The finding that the most nonmutual perception occurred in the FRMS pairs may be attributed to the possibility that not only do female repressors expect agreement and male sensitizers expect disagreement from others, but also the demand characteristic on female repressors to appear more assertive or oppositional was mitigated by interaction with the less sex-stereotype-upholding male sensitizers.

These explanations for the similarity of perception data are possible at best and so convoluted as to be implausible at worst. The results of the agreement of perception data cannot be seen as supportive of the hypotheses. The problem may be inherent in the Perceived Similarity question itself. Appearing only once at the end of a page of items assessing defenses for each DMI story discussed, these questions may be too vague and nonspecific to be of value. Perhaps the partners should have been asked to guess their partner's endorsements of each DMI item, so that interpersonal accuracy related to each type of defense, as well as general accuracy, could have been assessed.

Furthermore, despite the positive results of this study regarding change in defense utilization as a result of interpersonal interaction, it must still be wondered if defensive behavior measured by a paper and pencil instrument such as the DMI can truly reflect changes that occur within each interactor's behavior toward his or her partner while they were interacting. Such changes in the defensive characteristics of the actual discussions could only be evaluated if the interactions themselves were recorded and analyzed. As stated in the procedure section, the discussions were recorded, and will be analyzed for evidence of defense-related behaviors in a subsequent study.

In general, it appears that both the trait and the interactionalist perspectives shed light on the defense mechanisms of such interest to clinicians. Stable individual differences in utilization of defense mechanisms between repressors, sensitizers and men and women do exist, but situational demands of interpersonal processes clearly interact with these differences in persons interacting with each other. Finally, a heavy word of caution is necessary about the context of this study. The relative success of the hypotheses predicting change in defense related to interaction should not be considered necessarily generalizable from this experiment to

non-experimental conditions, such as marital or therapist/client interactions. The results presented here were obtained on a sample of subjects derived from a narrow life context, and the material on which they interacted had little long-range or personal significance to them. Thus, the results of this study may be quite vulnerable to superficial social and experimenter affects. Long-term relationships like marriage and therapy must be expected to involve more complex and gradual but perhaps more far-reaching, stable changes in their participants. The great challenge remains to study these changes experimentally.

REFERENCES

Aldridge, R.G., Baxter, G.I., Nopziter, L.M., Roggenbuck, A.L., Shimansky, R.L., and Wolthius, D.J. Defense mechanisms of an alcoholic population as compared to a normal population. Unpublished master's thesis. Michigan State University, 1967.

Altrocchi, J., Palmer, J., Hellman, R., and Davis, H. The Marlowe-Crowne, Represser sensitizer and internal-external scales and attribution of unconscious hostile content. Psychological Reports, 1968, 23, 1229-1230.

Altrocchi, J., Parsons, O.A., and Dickoff, H. Changes in self-ideal discrepancy in repressors and sensitizers. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 67-72.

Ambert, A.M. Sex structure. Don Mills: Longman Canada, 1976.

Argyle, M. and Little, B.R. Do personality traits apply to social behavior? Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 1972, 2, 1-35.

Aries, E. Male-female interpersonal styles in all male, all female and mixed groups. In Sargent, A. (Ed.) Beyond Sex Roles, St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1977.

Backan, D. The duality of human existence. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Baker, R.P. and King, H.H. The relationship between the Repression-Sensitization Scale and the Incomplete Sentences Blank. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1970, 34, 492-496.

Baldwin, B. Self-disclosure and expectations for psycho therapy in repressors and sensitizers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 455-456.

Baldwin, B. and Cabianca, W. Defensive strategies of repressors and sensitizers in counseling. Journal of Counseling, 1972, 19, 16-20.

Bandura, A. and Walters, R. Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Barnett, J. Narcissism and dependency in the obsessional hysteric marriage. Family Process, 1971, 10, 75-84.

Barton, M. and Buckhout, R. Effects of objective threat and ego threat on repressors and sensitizers in the estimation of shock intensity. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1969, 3, 197-205.

Becker, G. Ego-defense patterns in extraverts and introverts. Psychological Reports, 20, 387-392.

Behrens, M.G. Effects of global-analytic style, female role orientation, and fear of success on problem-solving behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1973.

Bem, S.L. Sex-role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643.

Berquist, W.H. and Crandall, J.E. Perceptions of self and group roles as a function of repressor-sensitization and tolerance-intolerance of ambiguity. Journal of Psychology, 1972, 81, 97-103.

Bibring, G.L. A study of the psychological processes in pregnancy and of the earliest mother-child relationship. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1961, 16.

Bieri, J. et al. Sex differences in perceptual behavior. Journal of Personality, 1958, 26, 1-12.

Blancha, M. and Fancher, R. A content validity study of the Defense Mechanism Inventory. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1977, 41, 402-404.

Blatt, S.J. Patterns of cardiac arousal during complex mental activity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 272-282.

Block, J. Some reasons for the apparent inconsistency of personality. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 70, 210-212.

Bogo, N., Wingert, C., and Gleser, G. Ego defenses and perceptual styles. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1970, 30, 599-605.

Bootzing, R.C. and Stephens, M.W. Individual differences and perceptual defense in the absence of response bias. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6, 408-412.

Bowers, K.S. Situationism in psychology: An analysis and a critique. Psychological Review, 1973, 80, 309-336.

Bootzin, R., and Natsoulas, T. Evidence for perceptual defense uncontaminated by response bias. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6, 408-412.

Bramante, M.R. Sex differences in fantasy patterns: a replication and elaboration. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, City University of New York, 1970.

Bruner, G.S. and Postman, L. Emotional selectivity in perception and reaction. Journal of Personality, 1947, 16, 69-77.

Bryden, M.P. Evidence for Sex-Related Differences in Cerebral Organization. In M. Wittig and A. Petersen (Eds.), Sex-Related Differences in Cognitive Functioning, New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Burke, R.J. What do we know about hints in individual problem solving? Journal of General Psychology, 1972, 86, 253-265.

Byrne, D. The Repression-Sensitization Scale: Rationale, reliability and validity. Journal of Personality, 1961, 29, 344-349.

Byrne, D. Repression-sensitization as a dimension of personality. In B.A. Maher (Ed.) Progress in experimental personality research. New York: Academic Press, 1964.

Byrne, D. The relation of the revised Repression-Sensitization Scale to measures of self-description. Psychological Reports, 1966, 18. 739-742.

Byrne, D., Golightly, C., and Sheffield, J. The Repression-Sensitization Scale as a measure of adjustment: Relationship with the CPI. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 586-589.

Byrne, D., and Sheffield, J. Response to sexually arousing stimuli as a function of repressing and sensitizing functions. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1965, 70, 114-118.

Byrne, D., Steinberg, M., and Schwartz, M.S. Relationship between repression sensitization and physical illness. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 154-155.

Carlson, V.R. Individual differences in the recall of word association test words. Journal of Personality, 1954, 23, 77-87.

Carney, M.E. A validation study of Millon's theory and measure. Unpublished Masters thesis. Loyola University of Chicago, 1977.

Carpenter, B. Predictability of perceptual defense behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 52, 380-383.

Carroll, D. Repression-Sensitization and the verbal elaboration of experience. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1972, 38, 147.

Chabot, J.A. Repression-sensitization: A critique of some neglected variables in the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 122-129.

Chelune, G.J. Sex differences and relationship between repression sensitization and self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1975, 37, 920.

Chelune, G.J. Sex differences, repression-sensitization, and self-disclosure: A behavioral look. Psychological Reports, 1977, 40, 667-670.

Chodorkoff, B. Self-perception, perceptual defense, and adjustment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49,508-512.

Clark, L.F. Repressor-sensitizer personality styles and associated levels of verbal ability, social intelligence, sex knowledge, and quantitative ability. Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1969, No. 69-11, 203.

Cohen, A.M. and Forest, J.R. Organizational behaviors and adaptations to organization change of sensitizer and repressor problem-solving groups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 8, 209-216.

Collins, B.E. and Raven, B.E. Group structure: attraction, coalitions, communication and power. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. 4, Reading: Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Constantinople, A. Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.

Cooper, S. An exploration of ego defense mechanisms and related processes in clinic and non-clinic families. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1969, No. 69-4181.

Cozby, P.C. Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 73-91.

Cramer, P. and Carter, T. The relationship between sexual identification and the use of defense mechanisms. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1978, 42, 65-73.

Crowley, G.B. and Nalven, F.B. Relationship between two measures of repression and sensitization. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25, 431.

Crowne, D.P. and Marlowe, D. The approval motive. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Davidson, L.A. Experimental reduction of stress based on ego-defense theory. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 68, 367-380.

Davis, M.T. The effect of task ambiguity and relationship ambiguity on the verbal behavior of repressors and sensitizers in an initial interview. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Commonwealth University, 1976.

Dawson, J. Cultural and physiological influence upon spatial-perceptual processes in West Africa. International Journal of Psychology, 1967, 2, 115-128, 171-185.

Day, D.A. The relationship of repression-sensitization to aspects of marital dyad functioning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Florida, 1972.

Deutsch, H. Motherhood and Sexuality. In Neuroses and Character Types. London: International Universities Press, 1965, 190-202.

DeWolfe, A. Personal communication, 1981.

Dublin, D.L. Perception of and reaction to ambiguity by repressors and sensitizers--A construct validity study. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 198-205.

Dudley, G. Effects of sex, social desirability, and birth order on the Defense Mechanisms Inventory. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 1419-1422.

Duffy, E. Activation and behavior, New York: Wiley, 1962.

Dulany, D.E. Avoidance learning of perceptual defense and vigilance. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 55, 333-338.

Endler, N.S. A person-situation interaction model for anxiety. In C.D. Spielberger and I.G. Sarason (Eds.), Stress and Anxiety Vol. I, Washington: Hemisphere Publications, 1975.

Endler, N.S. and Joy, V.L. Personal communication, cited by D. Byrne, Repression sensitization as a dimension of personality. In B. Maher, B. Progress in Experimental Personality Research, New York: Academic Press, 1964.

Erdelyi, M. A new look at the New Look: Perceptual defense and vigilance. Psychological Review, 1974, 81, 1-25.

Eriksen, C.W. Perceptual defense as a function of unacceptable needs. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1951, 46, 557-564.

Erikson, C.W. Defense against ego-threat in memory and perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 430-435.

Eriksen, C.W. and Davids, C.T. An experimental and theoretical analysis of perceptual defense. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 52, 224-230.

Eriksen, E. Inner and outer space: Reflections on womanhood. Daedalus, 1964, 582-606.

Evans, R. The relationship of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale and its components to defensive preferences. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1979, 43, 406-410.

Eysenck, H.J. The Maudsley Personality Inventory. London: University of London Press, 1959.

Farber, I.E. A framework for the study of personality as a behavioral science. In P. Worchel and D. Byrne (Eds.), Personality Change. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Feather, N.T. Change in confidence following success or failure as a predictor of subsequent performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 38-46.

Feder, C.Z. Relationship between self-acceptance and adjustment, repression-sensitization and social competence. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 317-322.

Fischer, G. The Repression-Sensitization Scale: Effects of several variables and two methods of obtaining scores. Journal of General Psychology, 1969, 80, 183-187.

Fretta, N.C. The repression-sensitization continuum and the choice of coping and defense styles under stress and non-stress conditions. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 6209-B.

Freud, A. (1936) The Ego and the mechanisms of defense. York: International University Press, revised edition, 1966.

Freud, S. (1909) Three essays on the theory of sexuality. In The Standard Edition of Freud's Works III. London: Hogarth Press, 1955.

Freud, S. (1909) Notes upon a case of obsessional neurosis. In The standard edition of Freud's works X. London: Hogarth Press, 1955.

Freud, S. (1915) Instincts and their vicissitudes. In The standard edition of Freud's works XIV. London: Hogarth Press, 1955.

Freud, S. (1925) Negation. In Freud, S. Collected Papers V, London: Hogarth Press, 1950.

Gayton, W. and Bernstein, S. Incompatible need strength and the repression-sensitization dimension. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25, 192-194.

Gleason, F.G. The effects of three types of interaction with another person upon the anxiety levels of repressors and sensitizers. Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1969.

Gleser, G. and Ihilevich, D. An objective instrument for measuring defense mechanisms. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 51-60.

Gleser, G. and Sacks, M. Ego defenses and reaction to stress: A validation study of the Defense Mechanism Inventory. Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 40, 181-187.

Gordon, A. and Glass, D.C. Choice ambiguity, dissonance and defensiveness. Journal of Personality, 1970, 38, 264-272.

Gordon, J.E. The stability of the assumed similarity response set in repressors and sensitizers. Journal of Personality, 1959, 27, 362-73.

Gossett, J.T. An experimental demonstration of Freudian repression proper. Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1964, No. 64-10063.

Green, A. The relation of dancing experience and personality to perception. Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 1955, 69, 399.

Haan, H. Coping and defense mechanisms related to personality inventories. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 373-378.

Greenwald, E.R. Perceptual style in relation to role choices and motivational variables. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1968.

Gur, R.E. and Gur, R.C. Defense mechanisms, psychosomatic symptomatology and conjugate lateral eye movements. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 416-420.

Hall, S. (1904) Biological and anthropological differences between the sexes. In Lee, P. and Stewart, R. (Eds.), Sex Differences, New York: Urizen Books, 1976.

Hanson, J.E. Personal communication to D. Byrne, 1963. In B. Maher (Ed.) Progress in Experimental Personality Research, New York: Academic Press, 1964.

Hare, R.D. Denial of threat and emotional response to impending painful stimulation. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 30, 359-361.

Hartmann, H. (1939) Ego psychology and the problem of adaptation. New York: International Universities Press, 1958.

Hartmann, H. Comments on the psychoanalytic theory of the ego. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1950, 5, 74-96.

Hartmann, H. The mutual influences in the development of the ego and id. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1952, 7, 9-30.

Hartmann, H. Notes on the theory of sublimation. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1955, 10, 9-29.

Hilpart, F., Kramer, C. and Clark, R.A. Participants' perceptions of self and partner in mixed-sex dyads. Central States Speech Journal, 1975, 26, 52-56.

Hirsch, C.L. and Dana, R.M. Repression-sensitization and psychological defenses. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1968, 27, 32.

Holland, N. Defense, displacement and the ego's algebra. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1973, 54, 247-256.

Horney, K. The flight from womanhood: The masculinity-complex in women as viewed by men and by women. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, Vol. VII, 1926, 7, 324-329.

House, W.C. Repression-sensitization and response to the implicit cue requirements of a social sanction Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1972, 36, 258-263.

Hutt, L.D. and Anderson, J.P. Perceptual defense and vigilance: Prediction from the Byrne Scale of Repression-Sensitization. Psychonomic Science, 1967, 9, 473-474.

Ihilevich, D. The relationship between defenses and field dependence-independence. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Cincinnati, 1968.

Joy, V.L. Repression-sensitization and interpersonal behavior. Paper read at American Psychological Association, Philadelphia, August 1963.

Kagan, N. Authoritarianism and repression. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 173-177.

Kagan, J. and Kogan, N. Individuality and cognitive performance. In P. Mussens (Ed.), Carmichael's Handbook of Child Psychology, New York: Wiley, 1970.

Kagan, J. and Moss. H.A. Birth to Maturity. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Kaplan. M.F. Interview interaction of repressors and sensitizers. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 513-516.

Kenkel, W.F. Observational studies of husband-wife interaction in family decision making. In M. Sussman (Ed.) Sourcebook in marriage and the family. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963.

Kidd, A.H. and Revoire, J.L. The correlation between level of field-dependence and the elevation of MMPI scale scores. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1964, 20, 256-257.

Kissen, B. Inhibition and tachistoscopic thresholds for sexually charged words. Journal of Psychology, 1957, 43, 333-339.

Kornfeld, A. The favorability of person-perception and the R-S Scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1977, 33, 444-448.

Kurland, S.H. The lack of generality in defense mechanisms as indicated in auditory perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 173-177.

Lacey, J.I. Somatic response patterning and stress: Some revisions of activation theory. In M.H. Appley and R. Trumbull (Ed.), Psychological Stress. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967, 14-37.

Lapidus, S.M. Repression-Sensitization related to recall and recognition of arousal words. Doctoral dissertation, Illinois Institute of Technology. Ann Arbor, Michigan, University Microfilms, 1969, No. 69-13, 323.

Lazarus, A.S. Psychological stress and the coping process. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

Lazarus, R.S. and Alfert, E. Short-circuiting of threat by experimentally altering cognitive appraisal. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 69, 195-205.

Lazarus, R.S. and Longo, N. The consistency of psychological defense against threat. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 495-499.

Lazarus, R.S., Speisman, J.C., Mordkoff, A.M. and Davison, L.A. Experimental reduction of stress based on ego-defense theory. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 367-380.

Lee, P. Psychology and sex differences. In Lee, P. and Stewart, R. (Eds.), Sex Differences, New York: Urizen, 1976.

Lefcourt, H.M. Repression-sensitization: A measure of the evaluation of emotional expression. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 30, 444-449.

Leik, A. Closure as related to manifest anxiety and rigidity. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1963, 20, 1177-81.

Lewinsohn, P., Flippe, J. and Berquist, W. Leveling-sharpening: Its relation to R-S and memory. Psychological Reports, 1970, 27, 211-214.

Liberson, C.W. Sex differences in autonomous responses to electric shock. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1972.

Lichenstein, L. A construct validity study of a new scale for the measurement of the repression-sensitization distinction. Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1969, No. 69-6281.

Lips, H. and Colwill, N.L. The psychology of sex differences, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.

Lockheed, M.E. and Hall, K.P. Conceptualizing sex as a status characteristics: Applications to leadership training strategies. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 111-124.

Lomont, J.F. The repression-sensitization dimension in relation to anxiety responses. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 84-86.

Lomont, J.F. Repressors and sensitizers as described by themselves and their peers. Journal of Personality, 1966, 34, 224-240.

Lucky, A.W. and Grigg, A.E. Repression-sensitization as a variable in deviant responding. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1964, 20, 92-93.

MacKinnon, D.W. The nature and nurture of creative talent. American Psychologist, 1962, 4, 484-495.

McCashin, A.W. Repression-sensitization in a verbal conditioning paradigm, Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1970.

McCaulay, M.H. Dimensions of masculinity-femininity in relation to field dependence, dogmatism, and other estimates of perceptual-cognitive differentiation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1964.

McDonald, R.I. Ego control patterns and attribution of hostility of self, parents and others. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1965, 21, 339-348.

McGinnies, E. Emotionality and perceptual defense. Psychological Review, 1949, 56, 244-251.

Maccoby, E.E. and Jacklin, C.N. The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1974.

Madison, P. Freud's concept of repression and defense, its theoretical and observational language. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1961.

Mahl, G.F. Psychological conflict and defense. New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, Inc., 1971.

Markovitz, A. The influence of defensive mode, ego-threat, and stimulus affect value on incidental learning. Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1968, No. 68-11, 542.

Mathews, A. and Wertheimer, M. A "pure" measure of perceptual defense uncontaminated by response suppression. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 57, 373-376.

May, R. Sex differences in fantasy patterns. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1966, 30, 576-586.

May, R. Deprivation-enhancement patterns in men and women. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1969, 33, 464-469.

May, R. Further studies on deprivation-enhancement patterns, Journal of Personality Assessment, 1975, 39, 116-122.

Mead, M. (1935) The standardization of sex-temperament. In Lee, P. and Stewart, R. (Eds.), Sex Differences, New York: Urizen Books, 1976.

Megargee, E.I. Influence of sex roles on the manifestation of leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 377-382.

Merbaum, M. and Badia, P. Tolerance of repressors and sensitizers to noxious stimulation. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1967, 72, 349-353.

Merrill, K. An investigation into the relationship between sex role attitudes and sex-typed behaviors. Unpublished master's thesis, Loyola University of Chicago, 1978.

Milham, J. Two components of need for approval score and their relationships to cheating following success and failure. Journal of Research in Personality, 1974, 8, 378-392.

Millimet, C.R. Repression as a function of personality classification and induction of threat to self-esteem. Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1969, No. 69-14, 294.

Millon T. Modern psychopathology: A biosocial approach to maladaptive learning and functioning. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1969.

Milton, G. The effects of sex-role identification upon problem-solving skill. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 208-212.

Milton, G. Sex differences in problem solving as a function of role appropriateness of the problem content. Psychological Reports, 1959, 5, 705-708.

Minsky, P.J. High blood pressure and interpersonal "disengagement": A study of maladaptive coping styles and ameliorative treatments. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Loyola University of Chicago, 1978.

Mischel, W. Personality and assessment. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1968.

Mischel, W. Continuity and change in personality. American Psychologist, 1969, 24, 1012-1018.

Mischel, W. Introduction to personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Mischel, W. Towards a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. Psychological Review, 1973, 80, 252-283.

Moody, H.L. Perceptual defense as revealed by normal and clinically referred subjects in responses to these classes of pictorial stimuli. Dissertation Abstracts, 1957, 17, 1934.

Naditch, S.F. Sex differences in field dependence: The role of social influence. Paper presented at a symposium on Determinants of Gender Differences in Cognitive Functioning, meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., 1976.

Nelson, S.E. Psychosexual conflicts and defenses in visual perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 427-433.

Nelven, F.B. Some perceptual decision making correlates of repression and intellectualizing defenses. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1967, 23, 446-48.

Opton, E.M. and Lazarus, R.S. Personality determinants of psycho physiological response to stress. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 1, 179-186.

Page, H.A. and Markowitz, G. The relationship of defensiveness to rating scale bias. Journal of Psychology, 1955, 40, 431-435.

Paris, J. and Goodstein, L.D. Responses to death and sex stimulus materials as a function of repression-sensitization. Psychological Reports, 1966, 19, 1283-1291.

Parsons, O.A., Fulgenzi, L.B. and Edelberg, R. Aggressiveness and psychophysiological responsivity in groups of repressors and sensitizers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 12, 235-244.

Parsons, T. Family structure and the socialization of the child. In Parsons, T. and Bales, R., Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. New York: The Free Press, 1955.

Paulina, A. Dreams: Sex differences in aggressive content. In Schaeffer, D. (Ed.), Sex differences in Personality & Readings, Belmont, Calif.: Brooks-Cole Publishing Company, 1971.

Pleck, J. My male sex role--and ours. In David, D. and Brannon, R. (Eds.), The forty-nine percent majority. Menlo Park, Calif.: Addison-Wesley, 1976.

Peplau, A. Impact of sex-role attitudes and opposite-sex relationships on women's achievement: An experimental study of dating couples. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1973.

Perloe, S.I. Inhibition as a determinant of perceptual defense. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1960, 11, 59-65.

Philipps, D.L. and Segal, D.E. Sexual status and psychiatric symptoms. American Sociological Review, 1970, 34, 58-68.

Pomeranz, D.M. The repression-sensitization dimension and reactions to stress. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1963.

Porzemsky, J.M. Perceptual defense in depth perception. Doctoral dissertation, Illinois Institute of Technology. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1969, No. 69-9836.

Ramaniah, N., Schill, T. and Leung, L.S. A test of the hypothesis about the two-dimensional nature of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Journal of Research in Personality, 1977, 11, 251-259.

Reitan, H.T. and Shaw, M.E. Group membership, sex composition of the group and conformity behavior. Journal of Social Psychology, 1964, 64, 45-47.

Richert, A., and Kettering, R. Psychological defense as a moderator variable. Psychological Reports, 1978, 42, 291-294.

Rios-Garcia, L.R. and Cook, P. Self-derrogation and defense style in college students. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1975, 39, 273-281.

Rossi, A.M. An evaluation of what is measured by the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale by the use of electromyography. Dissertation Abstracts, 1959, 19, 2165.

Rothaus, P. and Worchel, P. Ego-support, communication, catharsis and hostility. Journal of Personality, 1964, 32, 296-312.

Sarason, S.B., Lightfall, F.F., Davidson, K.S., Waite, R.R. and Ruebush, B.K. Anxiety in Elementary School Children, New York: Wiley, 1960.

Scarpetti, W.L. The repression-sensitization dimension in relation to impending painful stimulation. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 40, 377-382.

Schill, T., Althoff, M., and Black, J. Differences in reactions to Rosenzweigs' P-F study by defensive and non-defensive sensitizers and repressors. Psychological Reports, 1969, 25, 929-930.

Schill, T., Emanuel, G., Peterson, V., Schneider, L., and Wachowiak, D. Sexual responsivity of defensive and non-defensive sensitizers and repressors. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 35, 44-47.

Shack, J. Personal communication, 1981.

Shannon, D.T. The effects of ego defensive reactions on reported perceptual recognition. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1955.

Shavit, H. and Shouval, R. Repression-sensitization and processing of favorable and adverse information. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1977, 33, 1041-1944.

Sherman, J.A. Problems of sex differences in space perception and aspects of intellectual functioning. Psychological Review, 1967, 74, 290-299.

Silber, L.D. and Grebstein, L.C. Repression sensitization and social desirability responding. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1964, 28, 559.

Simmons, B. A comparison of repression-sensitization scores obtained by two different methods. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1966, 22, 465.

Singer, B.R. An experimental inquiry into the concept of perceptual defense. British Journal of Psychology, 1956, 47, 298-311.

Sorenson, D.L. The relationship of perceptual incongruity and defensive style to marital discord. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, 1974.

Spence, D.P. A new look at vigilance and defense. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 54, 103-108.

Stern, K.B. Perceptual defense and perceptual sensitization under mental and involved conditions. Journal of Personality, 1953, 21, 467-478.

Strodtbeck, F.L. Husband-wife interaction over revealed differences. American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 468-473.

Strodtbeck, F.L. and Mann, R.D. Sex role differentiation in jury deliberations. Sociometry, 1965, 19, 3-11.

Suppes, P. and Warren, H. On the generation and classification of defense mechanisms. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1975, 56, 405-414.

Tempone, W.J. Some clinical correlates of repression-sensitization. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1964, 20, 440-42.

Tempone, V.J. and Lamb, W. Repression-Sensitization and its relation to measures of adjustment and conflict. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1967, 31, 131-136.

Terman, L. and Miles, C. (1936) Sex and personality: Studies in masculinity and femininity. In Lee, P. and Stewart, R. (Eds.), Sex Differences, New York: Urizen Books, 1976.

Thelen, M.H. Repression-Sensitization: Its relation to adjustment and seeking psychotherapy among college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 161-165.

Thorndike, E.L. Individuality. New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1911.

Tillich, S.R. Repression and memory for incongruous stimuli over time. Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley. Ann Arbor, Michigan. University Microfilms, 1968, No. 68-13,965.

Tolor, A. and Reznikoff, M. Relation between insight repression-sensitization, internal-external control, and death anxiety. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 72, 426-430.

Tort, C.F. Frequency of dream recall and some personality measures. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 467-470.

Truax, C.B. The repression response to implied failure as a function of the hysteria--psychasthenia index. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 188-193.

Tucker, I.F. Adjustment: Models and mechanisms, New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Tuddenham, R.D., MacBride, P., and Zahn, V. The influence of the sex composition of the group upon yielding to a distorted norm. Journal of Psychology, 1958, 46, 243-251.

Turk, H. Norms, persons and sentiments. Sociometry, 1963, 26, 163-177.

Ullman, L.P. An empirically derived MMPI scale that measures facilitation, inhibition of recognition-threatening stimuli. Research Representatives of VA Palo Alto, No. 10, 1960.

Ullman, L.P. An empirically derived MMPI scale which measures facilitation-inhibition of recognition of threatening stimuli. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1962, 18, 127-132.

Vaught, G.M. The relationship of role identification and ego strength to sex differences in the Rod-and-Frame Test. Journal of Personality, 1965, 33, 271-283.

Vernon, P.E. Personality Assessment. London: Methuen, 1974.

Veroff, J. Process vs. impact in men's and women's achievement motivation. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1977, 1, 283-293.

Voth, H.M. Ego autonomy, auto kinesis, and recovery from psychosis. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1962, 6, 288-293.

Voth, H.F., Cancro, R. and Kissen, M. Choice of defense. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1968, 18, 36-41.

Walsh, J. Defense Mechanism Inventory. In O. Buros (Ed.), The seventh mental measurements yearbook, (Vol. 1) Highland Park, NJ: Gryphon Press, 1972.

Weissman, H.N. and Ritter, K. Openness to experience, ego strength, and self-description as a function of repression and sensitization. Psychological Reports, 1970, 26, 859-864.

Weissman, H., Ritter, K. and Gordon, R. Reliability study of the Defense Mechanism Inventory. Psychological Reports, 1971, 29, 1237-1238.

Weitz, S. Sex differences in nonverbal communication. Sex Roles, 1976, 2, 175-184.

Webber, A.W. Repression-sensitization, prejudice and culture as predictors of projection, denial and intropunitiveness, extropunitiveness. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1968.

Witkin, H.A. Sex differences in perception. Transactions of New York Academy of Sciences, 1950, 12, 22-26.

Witkin, H.A. Psychological differentiation and forms of pathology. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1965, 70, 316-336.

Witkin, H.A., et al. Stability of cognitive style from childhood to young adulthood. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7, 291-300.

Witkin, H.A., Birnbaum, J., Lomonaco, S., Lehr, S. and Herman, J.L. Cognitive patterning in cognitally totally blind children. Child Development, 1968, 39, 768-86.

Wolfe, R., Young, S. and Bryant, L. Repression sensitization and item desirability as determinants of accuracy of person perception. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1977, 45, 59-68.

Woodrow, J.Z. A factor analysis and revision of the Defense Mechanism Inventory. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 2324-B.

Zimmerman, G.I. and West, H.H. A study of conversations. Journal of Comparative Psychology, 1975, 16, 265-273.

Zigler, E. and Yospe, L. Perceptual defense and the problem of response suppression. Journal of Personality, 1960, 28, 220-239.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Measures

R-S — The Repression-Sensitization Scale, a measure of coping style.

DMI — The Defense Mechanism Inventory, a measure of specific defense mechanism preferences including:

REV Reversal
TAS Turning Against the Self
PRN Principalization
PRO Projection
TAO Turning Against the Other

DMI Scoring Method:

Traditional: Items endorsed "Most" earn 2 points, items endorsed "Least" earn 0 points, remaining items earn 1 point. Maximum scale total: 40 points. Minimum scale total: 0 points.

Revised: Items endorsed "Most" earn +2 points, items endorsed "Least" earn -2 points, items endorsed "True" earn +1 point, items endorsed "False" earn -1 point. Max. total is 40; min. total is -40.

DMI Scale Combinations:

1. (PRO+TAO) - (REV+TAS+PRN)
2. (TAS+TAO+PRO) - (PRN+REV)
3. (PRN+TAO+PRO) - (TAS+REV)
4. (TAS+PRN+TAO) - (REV+PRO)
5. (TAS+PRN+PRO) - (REV+TAO)
6. (REV+TAS+TAO) - (PRN+PRO)
7. (PRN+TAS) - (REV+PRO+TAO)
8. (TAS+TAO) - (REV+TAS+PRO)
9. (PRN+TAO) - (REV+TAS+PRO)

Subject Categories:

Fs - females
Ms - males
Rs - repressors
Ss - sensitizers
FRs - female repressors
FSs - female sensitizers
MRs - male repressors
MSs - male sensitizers

APPENDIX B

EXPERIMENTER READS ALOUD:

In this experiment, we are interested in certain personality variables and how they influence behavior, experiences and opinions in a wide variety of situations. To make the experiment more interesting, we would like you to discuss your opinions with each other, first about some topics of interest and later, regarding a variety of different situations.

First, you will be given two topics to discuss. Please discuss each one as fully as you can with each other. Please involve yourselves as much as possible in each discussion. You may attempt to reach a consensus with your partner on each topic, but it is not necessary to do so. Your discussions will be taped. I will leave the room when you are talking with each other, but I will come back to tell you when to go on to the next phase of the experiment.

Here is your first discussion task:

(1) Taking into account your general knowledge and personal experiences, discuss what you consider to be the most important things incoming students should know to get the most out of being at the University. You should have plenty of time to discuss this before I return with the second discussion topic. (Leave room after turning on tape recorder.) (Return in ten minutes.)

(2) Here is your second discussion topic: Taking into account your general knowledge and personal experiences, discuss what you consider to be the most important effects of the changing ideas about sex roles on school, work and social relationships for young men and women today. You will have as much time to talk about this as you did for the first topic.

Now we will begin the last part of the experiment, which should take not quite an hour.

A few weeks ago you answered some questionnaires for this experiment. One of these was called the DMI. As you remember, the DMI consisted of short stories or situations for which you were asked to indicate most representative, least representative, and generally true or generally false reactions, in terms of actual behavior, thoughts, fantasy and feelings. What we want you to do now is for both of you, each with your own copy, to read

to yourselves each situation, as well as the choices of action regarding that situation. The situation and the choices of actual reaction will appear together on the same page. (Show the example page.) When you have finished the page, look up, so that your partner will know that you are ready. Now, you are to discuss what you have read with your partner, exchanging your views with each other about what would be most and least representative for you to do and why. You may also discuss the situation in general in terms of what you would generally do or not do, imagine, think and feel, if you really were in that situation. (EMPHASIZE) The actual reactions that are printed following each situation are there ONLY TO GIVE YOU FOOD FOR THOUGHT FOR YOUR DISCUSSIONS. Once you have read them you should NOT make any effort to look at them again during the course of the discussion, so you should put the paper down. This is because we DO NOT want you MERELY TO READ to each other what you would or would not do. Instead, we want you to DISCUSS your reactions, thoughts and feelings WITH each other, EXCHANGING your ideas and INTERACTING with your partner as much as possible. YOU AND YOUR PARTNER MAY TRY TO REACH A CONSENSUS OF OPINION, BUT IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO TRY TO DO SO.

Expect to discuss each situation for about five minutes, which should allow you to discuss each situation as fully as you want. After you have finished each discussion, turn the page.

The next page will show four questions with a choice of five answers for each. Let's read the instructions of how to answer what is on this page. (Read DMI Instruction page as subjects read theirs.)

Now, let's look at an example. Here is a situation followed by five choices of action regarding the situation. Read it to yourselves, put the paper down and look at your partner when you are ready to discuss the situation. Go ahead and discuss this example situation, so I can be sure you understand how to do it. (Allow subjects to discuss the situation. If they seem to finish without much discussion, tell them to discuss it more, stressing that they are to discuss each situation fully.) OK. That's the idea. Now, turn the page on the example. As you can see, here's an example of how you might mark your answers. Note that there is only one M and only one L, to indicate the one's that are felt most strongly about, and the remaining answers in each set are marked either True (T) or False (F). Finally, at the bottom of the page is a question which you should circle, either True or False.

Please make no special effort to remember the answers you marked when you took the DMI previously. Rather, answer the questions as if you were taking the questionnaire for the first time, trying to decide the answers that would describe how you would act and feel if you were to encounter these situations today. Your discussions will be tape recorded.

You must finish each discussion before turning the page to make your answers. Please do not speak to each other while marking your answers. Also, please do not go on to the next story until both you and your partner are finished marking your answers and ready to go on to the next one.

When you are finished, there will be a very very brief set of questions and then I will explain the entire experiment to you. Are there are questions? I will be back in an hour, but you may get me if you finish before then. You may begin.

APPENDIX C

DISCUSSION TOPIC I

Taking into account your general knowledge and personal experiences, discuss what you consider to be the most important things incoming students should know to get the most out of being at the University.

DISCUSSION TOPIC II

Taking into account your general knowledge and personal experiences, discuss what you consider to be the most important effects of the changing ideas about sex roles on school, work and social relationships for young men and women today.

APPENDIX D

READ AND DISCUSS:

You are waiting for the bus at the edge of the road. The streets are wet and muddy after the previous night's rain. A car sweeps through a puddle in front of you, splashing your clothing with mud.

What would your ACTUAL reaction be?

1. I would note the car's license number so that I could track down that careless driver.

2. I'd wipe myself off with a smile.

3. I'd yell curses after the driver.

4. I would scold myself for not having worn at least a raincoat.

5. I'd shrug it off; after all things like that are unavoidable.

What would your ACTUAL reaction be?

1. I would note the car's license number so that I could track down that careless driver.
2. I'd wipe myself off with a smile.
3. I'd yell curses after the driver.
4. I would scold myself for not having worn at least a raincoat.
5. I'd shrug it off; after all, things like that are unavoidable.

What would you IMPULSIVELY (in fantasy) want to do?

6. Wipe that driver's face in the mud.
7. Report that incompetent driver to the police.
8. Kick myself for standing too close to the edge of the road.
9. Let the driver know that I don't really mind.
10. Let that driver know that bystanders also have rights.

What THOUGHT might occur to you?

11. Why do I always get myself into things like this?
12. To hell with that driver!
13. I'm sure that basically that driver is a nice fellow.
14. One can expect something like this to happen on wet days.
15. I wonder if that fellow splashed me on purpose.

How would you FEEL and why?

16. Satisfied; after all it could have been worse.
17. Depressed, because of my bad luck.
18. Resigned, for you've got to take things as they come.
19. Resentment, because the driver was so thoughtless and inconsiderate.
20. Furious that he got me dirty.

If something like this situation were in fact to occur, I think my partner and I would probably react in similar ways.

True False

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Rachelle Joan Zalman has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Alan S. De Wolfe, Director
Professor, Psychology, Loyola

Dr. John Shack
Professor, Psychology, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

4/24/81
Date

Alan S. DeWolfe
Director's Signature