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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

The reasons for this study are several. There is a widespread interest today in racial prejudice. Recently, a book on anti-Semitism devoted an entire chapter to the discussion of the "anti-Semitic Personality." Upon the basis of one study, reported in this chapter, the author concludes that there are personality maladjustments and abnormalities that tend to characterize the prejudiced individual. This raises the question of whether or not such a conclusion can be corroborated on the basis of further studies. Another author in the field of racial prejudice claims that prejudice can be reduced or eliminated by knowledge and "by correction of personal frustrations, which may be shown by antiminority aggression." The author herein seems to indicate a belief in at least some relationship between prejudice and person-

---


ality maladjustment. Wechsler describes anti-Semitism as, in essence, "both an individual and a group neurosis... an atavistic malady, a reversion to primitive emotional ways of thinking and acting."³ If one holds the view of G. W. Allport regarding personality, one has a priori grounds for believing in a relationship between prejudice and personality because attitudes are basic expressions of personality according to Allport.⁴ Not only have authorities in the field assumed a relationship between personality maladjustment and prejudice, but probably the reader has either heard, read or entertained such an assumption. Therefore, not only because of the widespread interest in racial prejudice, but also because of the many assertions made as to the relationship of attitudes and personality, this study should be of current and practical interest.

Perhaps it is felt that enough such studies have already been made and that there is little need or excuse for another. But consider the following facts. As late as 1937 a well known reviewer of attitude research states that there were


few investigations in which data concerning both attitudes and personality were to be found, except those in which each had been inferred from the other. That same writer also states that even when relationships between attitudes and personality have been reported they have usually been the byproducts of investigations designed for other purposes. Then, too, contradictory findings are often reported. A more recent writer deplores the fact that up to July, 1940, college students seemed to be the only subjects used in attitude research and studies. As recently as 1946, it was reported that students, college students, and to some degree, high school students were still the principal subjects for attitude research. Newer, more refined tools and techniques have been developed since the earlier studies in this field. Therefore, a study using subjects other than students and one which utilizes the most recent and valid tools and me-

5 Ibid., p. 914.
6 Loc. cit.
7 John W. M. Rothney, and Bert A. Roens, "Applications of Personality and Character Measurement," REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, XI (February, 1941), 94.
8 Albert Ellis, and J. Raymond Gerberich, "Interests and Attitudes," REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, XVII (February, 1947), 69.
thods is in order and may prove to be a contribution to the field.

A brief survey of the better-known previous investigations related to the subject of this study may also indicate the need for further research into the relationship between attitudes and personality. These previous studies also suggest methods and problems for succeeding research.

As early as 1928, T. H. Howells did an experimental study on attitudes and personality. He administered a self-rating religious attitude test to 542 elementary psychology students. He also gave an I. Q. test, various sensory-motor tests, and a suggestibility test. The attitude test divided the group into religious radicals and conservatives. On the basis of correlations between conservatism and I. Q., etc., he concluded that the conservative person is more suggestible and also somewhat inferior in mental ability as compared to the radical. It was concluded from subjective reports that the religious conservative inclined toward pessimism and a feeling of inferiority, but that he or she leaned toward extroversion rather than introversion.


10Ibid., p. 39.
A somewhat similar study was made about 1935 using 300 college students. These were administered a "Test of Religious Thinking" and several other tests including: one of the Otis tests of mental ability, the Thurstone Test of Mental Ability, the Bernreuter, and the Pressy X-O Test. The purpose of the study was to investigate liberal religious belief and personality "characteristics." Correlations were made and it was concluded that there is a constant positive relation between liberal religious thinking and mental ability. It was also concluded that none of the psychopathic maladjustments as measured by the Bernreuter are peculiar to either religious liberals or conservatives. States the investigator, "It cannot be said that either liberals or conservatives are as a group more emotionally sick or emotionally well."  

Gardner Murphy reports an investigation, which is of interest for this study, made by Klein of Columbia University. It was a study of radicalism and antagonism toward one's

---


12 Ibid., p. 49

father. The test of antagonism was in reality a personality measure. Seventy male college students served as subjects. A correlation of .60 was found between the results on the antagonism test and extreme radicalism. Murphy concludes from Klein's study that personality traits are related to attitudes, i.e., certain personality patterns will tend to be associated with certain attitudes.\textsuperscript{14}

Another investigator made a study of prejudice and personality using 50 male and 50 female college students in several southwestern states.\textsuperscript{15} Among the tests given were: The Watson Test of Public Opinion; an intelligence test; a word-association test; the Pressy X-O Test, and the Woodworth-House Personal Inventory. Only the intelligence test yielded any statistically significant correlation with the total prejudice score, an r of -.24. But other findings were interesting. The seven subjects who made the highest scores in religious radicalism gave fewer responses suggesting maladjustments, and more suggesting self-sufficiency, than did the seven most conservative in religious scores, whose responses indicated fears and feelings of inferiority. The conclusion

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 942.

was that, "By an analysis both of total scores and of item responses, individual cases of prejudice can in almost every instance be related to the particular type of personality maladjustment revealed by the individual in question.""\textsuperscript{16}

A study was made by H. T. Moore to find if there is such a thing as a temperamental predisposition toward conservatism or radicalism.\textsuperscript{17} He gave a radicalism-conservatism questionnaire and an intelligence test to 377 undergraduate students from Yale, Dartmouth, and Columbia Universities. His conclusion from results on this group was that the I. Q. for radicals and conservatives is about the same. He then selected the extremes from the radicals and conservatives and gave this group individual tests, an intelligence test, an emotional stability test, and various psycho-motor tests. The evidence from this group points to some innate basis of difference, he reports, but not in general I. Q., or emotional stability, but in specific factors such as greater speed of reaction, ease of breaking habits, readiness to make snap judgments, and independence in the face of majority influence. The results of the psycho-motor tests

\textsuperscript{16} Murphy, \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 945.

\textsuperscript{17} Henry T. Moore, "Innate Factors in Radicalism and Conservatism," \textit{Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology}, XX (October, 1925), pp. 234-244.
are not of particular interest to this present study, but are included because they are a part of Moore's investigation.

Perhaps more closely related to the present investigation is Vetter's attempt to discover "fundamental cleavages of opinions" that mark off distinctive opinion groups or personalities and the personality differences of the individuals holding these positions. Vetter administered to 780 students from four different colleges a battery of tests including: a political attitude scale of his own construction, a modified form of the Woodworth Personal Data Sheet, an intelligence test, an ascendancy submission test, a word-association test, and a suggestibility test. He then correlated the results of these various tests. Among his specific conclusions were: that the liberal-radical groups are superior in intelligence; radical women stand out as "decidedly" ascendant; radicals are "decidedly" more introverted than "reactionaries." His general conclusion, however, is that one can't ascribe a "considerable degree" of abnormality to the holders of unusual or unpopular opinions.

---


19 Ibid., p. 186.

20 Ibid., p. 187.
D. D. Droba correlated the scores made on his own Scale of Militarism-Pacifism by 1,000 University of Chicago students with their scores on various other tests among them Thurstone's Psychological Examination and Thurstone's Personality Schedule. The mean age of the group was 20.3 years and the educational level ranged from freshman to graduate in various departments. A coefficient of correlation of -.01 was found between the scores on the personality schedule and the militarism-pacifism test, a coefficient which is not statistically significant.

Another investigation of interest to this present study was that made by Emily Dexter on personality traits related to attitudes. She had some 267 students from various colleges do the Lentz C.-R. Opinionnaire, a measure of conservatism-radicalism, and a variety of personality measures among them the Bernreuter, the Downey-Will Temperament Test, and the Morris Trait Index. A positive though low correlation was found in every group between radicalism and, respectively, I. Q., introversion, self-sufficiency, and dominance. Her


general conclusion was that radicals as compared with conservatives are brighter, more introvert, dominant, and self-sufficient, but have more feelings of inferiority. No distinction was noted with regard to emotional stability.

As part of a much broader study, Harris, Remmers and Ellison administered a "social study" questionnaire and The American Council on Education Psychological Examination to a group of elementary psychology students at Purdue University. The only finding relevant to this study was that of a coefficient of correlation of -.29 between I. Q., and liberalism for men. The correlation here for women was negligible.

One writer who made no actual study of his own, but summarized several studies on political and economic liberalism reports several general conclusions of present interest. This writer states that for most college student groups there is a positive correlation between liberalism and I. Q. He also says that liberals tend to be more introvertive and more

---

23 Ibid., p. 237.


pessimistic, but not necessarily lower in morale than conservatives. No general conclusion can be reached as to the relationship between liberalism and emotional stability reports this reviewer because one investigation reports as high as \(-0.18\) correlation between them and another reports a negligible correlation between the two.

Two rather recent and important investigations are of special interest to this present investigation because they report personality maladjustments in terms and groups of traits much like those employed in the personality inventory used in this study, and because they investigate racial prejudice and personality, the very subject of this paper.

The purpose of the first of these studies was to investigate the personality of those to whom "anti-Semitic ideology" appeals rather than the social and economic factors involved in anti-Semitism.\(^{26}\) An adaptation of Levinson and Sanford's Scale for the Measurement of Anti-Semitism was given to 100 University of California students seventy-six of whom were women. These questionnaires were unsigned. Accompanying this scale was a second set of questions pertaining

to public opinion, political adherence, etc. A questionnaire which was to indirectly get at the subjects' goals, fears and identifications was also given. A group of 20 was selected from the larger group on the basis of the results from these questionnaires. There were eight "high extremes," eight "low extremes," and four "intermediates" on the anti-Semitism scale. These subjects were then given the Murray Thematic Apperception Test and also interviewed with the interview aimed at: (a) ideology, such as social, political, and religious attitudes; (b) general attitude toward the Jews; (c) personal data such as early history, images of father and mother, etc. The Rorschach test was also given. One general conclusion from this was:

The most outstanding characteristic of anti-Semitic women as obtained from this small sample is a narrow personality with a strict conventional superego which takes over the function of the underdeveloped ego, producing a lack of individuation and a tendency to stereotyped thinking.27

Simmel, in a revised report of the above study says that a further conclusion regarding the anti-Semitic person is that there is evidence that can be interpreted as in accord with the "possibility of paranoid trends."28

27 Ibid., p. 285.
One of the psychologists of the study above continued the investigation somewhat later and with different subjects. This time, 140 women college students from the same school as in the previous study were given a questionnaire containing items on directly expressed anti-Semitism, ethnocentrism in general, political-economic conservatism, and indirect questions on fascistic attitudes. Forty high and low extremes on overt anti-Semitism were subjected to an adaptation of Murray's Thematic Apperception Test, The Rorschach, and clinical interviews. Many and varied conclusions were drawn, too complicated to present here because of the psycho-analytical terms used, but the general conclusion was that the unprejudiced show more neurotic anxiety and depressive trends, whereas, the maladjustment of the highly prejudiced tends toward schizoid and paranoid patterns.

These foregoing studies, while not too numerous, do indicate an interest in the relationship between attitudes and personality. The findings of some of these studies are contradictory. Others may not be too valid either because of the measuring instruments employed, or because of the methods of the study, or both. Since the first of these investigations

some fifteen years ago or more, significant progress has been made in the fields of personality testing and attitude research. The subjects for these studies in every case were college students. Most of them do not purport to measure personality maladjustment as related to attitudes, but they do attempt to measure some aspect of personality as related to attitudes. It is therefore felt that an investigation using other than college students for subjects, one utilizing the most recent and better measuring instruments, an investigation conducted under the most carefully controlled conditions and aimed primarily and specifically at studying the relationship, if any, between racial prejudice and personality maladjustment is in order. This investigation will attempt to be such. Its specific purpose is to investigate the relationship, if any, between racial prejudice as measured by a paper and pencil attitude test and personality trait constellations or syndromes of abnormal personality types as measured by a structured personality test. It is not claimed that some contribution of great significance will be made as a result of this study, but it is hoped that some further light will be shed on the subject and that perhaps some indications as to direction and type of further research will be made.

There follows a chapter devoted to the discussion of
the measurement of personality in which a trait of personality is defined and methods for measuring personality are presented. A chapter on the measurement of attitudes is also presented. This will treat the definition of an attitude and the various methods and techniques of attitude measurement. The methods of this study together with a description of the tests used and subjects tested will form the content of still another chapter. A chapter will be given respectively to the presentation of the findings and the analysis of those findings together with the conclusions.
CHAPTER II
THE MEASUREMENT OF PERSONALITY TRAITS

Before one can intelligently discuss the methods of personality measurement, one must have some idea of what it is that is being measured. Herein lies a great difficulty. There is much disagreement among psychologists over definitions of personality and how it can best be measured. Very often there is lack of agreement regarding the importance of the various aspects of personality different tests claim to measure. It seems to be agreed, however, that personality tests, especially structured tests, attempt to measure adult personality traits as found in society without trying to determine whether their origin is due to nature or nurture.\(^1\) To put it another way, tests of personality attempt to measure personality manifestations rather than determinants. But, again, the difficulty arises over the definition and concept of a trait of personality. The term "personality trait" has probably as many definitions as there are schools

---

of psychology. To a behaviorist a "trait" is the name for a certain kind of response manifested in a particular kind of situation.  

A "trait" for a psychoanalyst is the way in which basic drives find outlet. Gordon W. Allport holds that the term "traits" should be "...limited in their reference to a certain definite conception of a generalized response-unit in which resides the distinctive quality of behavior that reflects personality." He lists eight criteria to aid in the defining of "trait." They are as follows:

1. A trait has more than nominal existence i.e., it may be said to have the same kind of existence that a habit of a complex order has.
2. A trait is more generalized than habit, i.e., it may embrace anywhere from two to a legion of habits.
3. A trait is dynamic, i.e., it has the capacity of directing responses to stimuli into characteristic channels.
4. The existence of a trait may be empirically or statistically established.
5. Traits are only relatively independent of each other, i.e., they can never be completely isolated for study, since they never show more than a relative independence of one another.
6. A trait of personality, psychologically considered, is not the same as moral

---

2 Ibid., p. 779.
3 Loc. cit.
quality, but some moral qualities may represent true traits of personality.

7. Acts, and even habits, that are inconsistent with a trait are not proof of the non-existence of the trait. Different personalities have different traits. A trait may be major in one personality and minor or non-existent in another. Thus, all people must not be expected to show the same degree of integration in respect to a given trait. Not only so, but within a single personality there may be contradictory traits although frequently of unequal strength. Then again, there are in every personality instances of acts that are unrelated to existent traits. These acts are the product of the stimulus and the attitude of the moment.

8. A trait may be viewed either in the light of the personality which contains it, or in the light of its distribution in the population at large.5

It would seem from the foregoing discussion that that which personality tests are measuring is not total personality as such, but certain aspects of personality, the general likelihood of an individual's behaving in a defined manner, those characteristics in which individuals differ from one another. In short, the tests attempt to measure responses, characteristics and behavior which are reflections of personality. An extremely broad definition of personality is that personality is the possession of those characteristics that mark off one individual from another. Therefore, if a given

5 Ibid., pp. 368-372.
test can distinguish between individuals with regard to a
certain characteristic, it may be said to be measuring per-
sonality in a very limited sense. But personality is so com-
plex a thing that it almost defies definition and measurement.
A much better and more acceptable definition of personality
is that personality is "the dynamic organization within man
of those mental, physical and psycho-physical systems which
under the influence of intellect and will determine the in-
dividual's unique adjustment to his environment."\(^6\) It is
these "unique adjustments" that tests of personality try to
measure. These unique adjustments mark off one individual
from another. They characterize an individual. Thus, when
a test measures individuals with respect to some unique ad-
justment or constellation of such adjustments, it may be said
to be in a sense, measuring personality.

Again, it must be remembered that the difficulty with
the measurement of personality is that there is such lack of
agreement concerning a definition of personality and the
number and nature of the traits of which it is composed.\(^7\)

---

\(^6\) The writer of this paper is indebted for this definition
to the Reverend Charles I. Doyle, S.J., Ph.D., Professor of
Psychology at Loyola University, from whose lectures on mental
hygiene it was taken.

\(^7\) Arthur E. Traxler, "The Use of Tests and Rating Devices
in the Appraisal of Personality," \textit{Educational Records Bulletin},
No. 23 (Revised). New York: Educational Records Bureau, March,
1942, p. 3.
Some do not even agree that personality traits exist but hold that personality is dependent largely upon the immediate situation. If it is assumed, however, that personality is an entity, made up in part at least of a number of generalized traits, then it can within limits be measured.

There are many general ways in which personality can be appraised and measured. One way would be to observe a subject in a variety of social situations and take careful notes. An analysis is then made of this data. An anecdotal record is another way. Teachers, parents, counselors, etc., jot down significant happenings. These notes are then collected and analyzed. Ratings on certain carefully defined personal qualities by a large number of different persons who know the subject well is still another way of personality appraisal.

One writer gives ten main classes of methods of measuring or appraising personality. He classes them: observation, rating methods, questionnaire, tests, free association method, physiological measures, interviewing, psychoanalysis, external

---

8 *Loc. cit.*

9 *Loc. cit.*


signs, and measures of environment. Another writer presents a nine-fold classification as follows: records of uncontrolled observations, rating devices, behavior descriptions, self-inventories, tests utilizing life situations, paper and pencil tests of broad traits, scales for specific traits or attitudes, free association tests, and laboratory techniques. These classifications are presented merely to indicate the general ways in which personality can be measured. Very often the dividing line between some of the categories is very indefinite and some tests could be included in more than one class. It is with tests of personality that this study is concerned.

Personality tests are of two general types, the global and atomistic types, or, if one prefers, projective and non-projective types. The idea of the projective technique tests is that personality as a whole is being attacked in the test situation and then an attempt is made at analysis and interpretation of the data. Tests of this type are also called non-structured tests. Two outstanding examples of this type are the Rorschach Psychodiagnostik and the Murray Thematic Apperception Test. These require extensive training in use.


and administration and are valuable tools in the hands of trained experts. 14 The non-projective type tests cover a variety of specific techniques. During the last twenty years the majority of this type personality test have been based on self-inventory or psychoneurotic questionnaire techniques, in which the individual responds with either "yes," "no," or "doubtful," to a series of questions or statements concerning how he acts or feels in a variety of situations. 15

The most popular method of constructing this type test is to assemble a vast number of items gathered from psychiatric and psychological text books, previous tests, clinical records, observation, and careful analysis of the field being measured and administer these to contrasting groups such as unselected normals and patients known to be suffering from mental disorder. 16 The contrasting groups are gotten either by having them rated by associates on the quality to be measured, or by using groups that have already been selected by society of authorities such as psychologists, psychiatrists, mental hospitals and institutions. 17 To these

14 This type test is merely noted in passing simply to indicate that there is such a technique. It is not the type used in this study and is therefore not treated at length.


17 Loc. cit.
contrasting groups the initial list of items is administered. The non-discriminating items are eliminated. Those items are retained which are answered differently by the contrasting groups, or which show sufficiently high correlation with known degrees of the quality being tested in the criterion group.\(^\text{18}\)

After a series of such testings of contrasting groups with analysis of responses by the groups to every item and the elimination of non-discriminating items, the resulting test is then given to different groups and the groups that score as extremes on the test are used for extensive study both of a clinical and statistical nature.\(^\text{19}\) This extensive study of extreme groups as classed by the test provides a basis for making more definite the meaning of the scores yielded by the test and also indicates whether or not the test is ready for use.

The method of scoring a test is largely determined by means similar to those used in selecting items for the test. One is the "common-sense" method which credits those answers which apparently are in the direction of, or show harmony with the quality or characteristic being measured.\(^\text{20}\)


of judges may be used to determine the direction of the questions or items and scores assigned accordingly. Items may be weighted, those with known greater validity given greater weight.\textsuperscript{21} Again, various empirical and statistical techniques may be employed much like those of Thurstone and Likert in the measurement of attitudes.\textsuperscript{22}

Probably the first important questionnaire of this type is Woodworth's \textbf{Psychoneurotic Inventory} which had its inception in 1917 during World War I.\textsuperscript{23} This test contains over 116 questions to which a "yes" or "no" answer is to be given. The score is the number of unfavorable answers. Woodworth's test formed the basis of subsequent work and even today questions from it are still used.\textsuperscript{24} A test much like Woodworth's and one which illustrates the method being discussed is Thurstone's \textbf{Personality Schedule}.\textsuperscript{25} A list of questions regarding personal adjustment or maladjustment was gathered. Either the "yes" or "no" answer to each question was tentatively labeled as "neurotic." The number of questions thus

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 159.
\item \textsuperscript{22} These techniques are presented in the following chapter and are, therefore, not included here.
\item \textsuperscript{24} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 176.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Murphy, \textit{Op. cit.}, pp. 791-799.
\end{itemize}
answered was counted for about 700 subjects. Scores of the fifty highest were compared with scores of the fifty lowest. The high score group had higher M. scores on all but one question than the low score group. Those questions where the differences between the groups were statistically reliable were put into the inventory. Each question was also validated in terms of agreement with the total list. Next, 179 cases were selected on the basis of the completeness of their case histories. Of these, 98 clearly showed maladjustment and 81 showed only minor symptoms. These two groups were given the personality schedule and their scores compared. The results were that individuals sufficiently maladjusted to need psychiatric help showed far above average scores on the schedule.

The test used in this study was constructed very much in the same general manner as that described above. Items were taken from several psychiatric examination forms, from various text books of psychiatry, from certain of the directions for case taking in medicine and neurology and from previously published scales of personal and social attitudes. These were formulated as declarative sentences in the first person, singular, to which the subject responds with "true,"

"false," or "doubtful." These statements were given to contrasting groups and comparison, analysis and elimination made in very much the same manner as indicated above.

One difference between later tests and early ones is that the earlier test yielded only one single score, but many of the more recent tests yield several scores. Bernreuter in 1931 published a **Personality Inventory** which represents an attempt at integration of the various adjustment questionnaires and purports to measure four fundamental personality differences at once. Since then, the tendency has been toward an instrument that will measure several traits, trait constellations, factors, or syndromes. Examples of this type beside the Bernreuter are: The Bell Adjustment Inventory, the Adams Lepley Personal Audit, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and many others.

Something must be said regarding the reliability and validity of these tests. Do they consistently yield approximately the same score for a given subject and do they test

---

29 *Loc. cit.*
what they claim to test with any accuracy? A well known authority in this field recently surveyed the various published tests of personality.  

He reports that the better tests have a fairly high reliability, nine of the ten best tests as he lists them have a split-half reliability of approximately .85. But this same authority states in another article that if a test is to be used for individual diagnosis it should have a coefficient of reliability of .90 and no test he reports has this high a reliability. However, for use as an instrument to indicate trends toward and symptoms of maladjustment, the better tests have sufficiently high reliability. Another authority in the field of personality testing states that the big question is not the reliability of the tests, but the validity. Not only so, but an eminent statistician says,

31 Ibid., p. 429.
32 Ibid., p. 428.
Whatever the reason, it has been well established that coefficients of reliability estimated by chance-halves method are usually higher than those computed for the same test by correlating scores on independently administered equivalent forms. Coefficients of reliability estimated in this manner, then, are not only less dependable than those computed directly, but also are likely to be spuriously high, and must be interpreted accordingly.35

The reliability of .90, of which Traxler speaks is a split-half reliability. Thus, it is probable that a test having a reliability near .90, on a test, retest basis may have the equivalent or higher of a .90 split-half reliability. The test used in this study claims reliability coefficients of between .71 and .83 for all of the scales in final form. These correlations were obtained by the test, retest method.36 There is, therefore, no quarrel with the reliability of the instrument herein used.

The real question regarding the use of personality tests is that of their validity. One writer says, "Probably the greatest single need in personality measurement at the present time is the need for extensive studies of the validity of existing instruments."37 After a thorough review


of the field, another writer concludes that the validity of group tests is certainly open to question. The difficulty in establishing validity is that there is no satisfactory criterion with which to correlate test results. Most validity coefficients are really internal consistency studies. When an outside criterion is used, it most frequently consists of the ratings of judges, but it is claimed that these are not highly reliable. On the other hand, several authorities, among them H. C. Link, M. A. May, A. I. Root, and R. Stagner, hold that the traditional methods of validating questionnaires by outside criteria are themselves faulty and invalid; therefore, validation by internal consistency alone is perfectly sound. Such disagreement among those who should qualify as authorities indicates that the question of validity based on internal consistency is far from settled.

38 Albert Ellis, "The Validity of Personality Questionnaires," PSYCHOLOGICAL BULLETIN, XLIII (September, 1946), 426.
41 Traxler, "The Use of Tests and Rating Devices..." Loc. cit.
Another widespread objection to structured personality tests is that the subject can "slant" his score that is, the score depends on the subject's truthfulness and what he wants to reveal or hide about himself. It is argued against this objection that verbal expression tends to be an accurate guide to actual behavior and that it is the general rule rather than the exception that one's actions harmonize with one's statements. This argument is backed up by experimental evidence. It is also held that most persons would be unable to go against habit sufficiently to extensively alter their answers on a questionnaire. Two investigators, working together, took sixty widely used questionnaires and submitted them three different times to 132 sociology students. They found 72 percent of the responses consistent. Results of a study made with 206 elementary school pupils upheld the validity of the techniques used in measuring personality traits and other aspects of behavior by the self-

45 Loc. cit.
46 Ibid., p. 122.
estimates and self-ratings of the subjects. 48

It must be admitted that the validity of personality questionnaires is open to question. Anyone who has taken very many personality tests can become test-wise, or one who knows something about test theory and instruction certainly can "slant" his score. This does not mean, however, that the tests are useless, or completely invalid. Those who defend their use point out that: they do have some degree of validity; the traits posited by questionnaires have a real existence and are not the result of chance factors as shown by statistical analysis; since allowances are made for untruthful answers in the standardization or scoring of the tests it does not matter if respondents answer untruthfully. 49 It must also be remembered that personality questionnaires have the advantage that they are standardized instruments that can be easily administered and scored and can be handled in an objective, statistical fashion. 50 Neither can one ignore the fact that "paper and pencil" tests of personality are

48 M. E. Bonney, "The Validity of Certain Techniques of Gathering Psychological Data, with Special Reference to Personality Questionnaires," JOURNAL OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, XIII (February, 1941), 120.


50 Loc. cit.
very widely used by educators, psychologists, and sociologists for research and clinical purposes.\(^{51}\) Certainly, these tests must furnish the examiner with something of value regarding the personality of the subject, or they long ago would have gone out of use.

Even those who most question the validity of tests of personality admit that their validity is higher for some uses than for others. They admit that validity is "fair" in clinical diagnosis and occupational and military screening.\(^{52}\) If certain precautions are taken in the administration of tests such as will be described in Chapter IV of this study and common sense is exercised in the interpretation of the results so that too much will not be concluded on the basis of the scores of tests whose validity is still questionable, then these tests can be valuable tools and fairly accurate keys in the study and measurement of personality.


\(^{52}\) Loc. cit.
CHAPTER III
THE MEASUREMENT OF ATTITUDES

This chapter discusses the measurement of attitudes. It would be a happy state of affairs, indeed, if one could turn immediately to the presentation of the various techniques of attitude measurement, but the task is not that simple. There must first be a definition, or conception of what is to be measured so that the proper tools for measurement may be employed. At this point there arises a problem, the problem of defining an attitude. Authorities are by no means agreed concerning a definition of attitude, or basic concepts about attitudes. One recent work on attitudes states:

In spite of the vast literature on attitudes contributed by both psychologists and sociologists, there is as yet no recognized psychology of attitudes with basic concepts applicable to all cases of attitudes.¹

This same work goes on to say that the term "attitude" is not yet delineated by underlying psychological concepts.² All is not confusion, however. After an extensive study of the

² Loc. cit.
literature and use of the term, one eminent authority concludes that all agree that an attitude is "a certain subjective state of preparation to action." But this "preparation to action" is where the differences occur. There are about four leading schools of thought regarding what this "preparation to action" is. One school holds that an attitude is largely a physical preparation to action, either a "motor-set," or a "neural-set." Another school claims that an attitude is a very general preparation to action including both physical and mental preparation. A third school of thought holds that an attitude is not a state of preparation within the individual, but actual behavior itself. The fourth school regards an attitude as a mental preparation to act. Thus, while it is apparent that there is here somewhat of a problem, the problem is not as bad as it first appears, since most attitude researchers state their own definition and proceed to measure attitudes as they have defined them.

Sherif and Cantril define attitude:

Psychologically, an attitude implies an established state of readiness....An

---


4 Ibid., p. 337-449.
attitude has certain characteristic features or criteria which differentiate it from other states of readiness; an attitude is an established readiness which has a subject-object relationship of highly variable content, which is learned (formed), has affective properties with various degrees of motivational components, may refer to whatever stimuli are encompassed in the subject-object relationship, and which determines that an individual will react to a stimulus in a selective way.5

A briefer definition of attitude is, "An attitude is a belief or feeling which reveals a behavior tendency."6 Another brief definition of attitude is, "An attitude is a mental disposition of the human individual to act for or against a definite object."7 The author of this later definition stresses that an attitude is mainly a "felt disposition" to act in a certain way.8 Gardner Murphy adds the idea of the verbal nature of an attitude in his definition.

An attitude is primarily a way of being "set" toward or against certain things. Both the response and the situation are in most cases of verbal nature—almost exclusively so in so far as atti-


8 Loc. cit.
tudes lend themselves to measurement. Hence we shall regard attitudes, in conformity with general usage in their experimental literature, as verbalized tendencies, dispositions, or adjustments toward certain acts. 9

There seem to be several basic thoughts regarding attitudes in the foregoing definitions. All of them stress that attitudes are tendencies to action or "sets" of some sort. They limit them to humans; animals don't have attitudes in the sense here discussed. Some of the definitions stress the "feeling" elements or affective elements in attitudes. The verbal nature of an attitude is also brought out. That attitude is related to object or stimulus situations is also indicated. Perhaps, then, it is possible to find a definition that would not only include these concepts, but also be a practical working definition for this study. It is hoped that such a definition has been found in the following: An attitude is a disposition of the human individual to react in a favorable or unfavorable way toward any topic, group, institution, practice, person, object or idea. The reaction

may take the form of verbalized response or overt behavior. 10

Occasionally, in literature on attitudes the term "opinion" is used. This may cause one to wonder what difference in meaning there is between attitude and opinion. The terms seem to be used almost synonymously in the literature. One writer says that in so far as the measurement of attitudes is concerned, attitude, opinion and belief may be used almost synonymously. 11 D. D. Droba states that an opinion is a verbal expression of an attitude. 12 Thurstone and Chave agree with Droba, but go a little further and hold that an opinion symbolizes an attitude and that tests actually use opinions as the means of measuring attitudes. 13 It may be concluded, therefore, that in the measurement of attitudes, the terms "attitude" and "opinion" may be used, or are used synonymously.

One other definition needs clarification. The title of

---

10 This definition with the exception of the words, "of the human individual," is taken from, Helen J. Crossen, EFFECT OF ATTITUDES OF THE READER UPON CRITICAL READING ABILITY. Doctor's dissertation, The University of Chicago, Illinois, 1947, p. 3.


this study indicates that it is an investigation involving racial prejudice. But prejudice is actually an attitude. No less an authority than L. L. Thurstone says that the term "attitude" is used to denote "the sum total of a man's inclinations and feelings, prejudice or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about any specific topic."\(^{14}\) G. W. Allport defines prejudice as an attitude so strong and inflexible that it distorts perception and judgment and in connection with race, prejudice is a strong avertive attitude.\(^{15}\) Therefore, if one measures strong avertive attitudes with regard to race, one is measuring racial prejudice.

It is one thing to define attitude; to measure attitudes is quite another problem. One way of measuring attitudes would be systematic observation of overt behavior, but there are at least two serious difficulties with this method. Behavior is not always a valid indication of attitude since social pressure, political expediency, etc. may alter behavior, may cause one, for example, to join organizations,

\(^{14}\) Ibid., p. 6.

groups, etc., to which one is actually indifferent or antagonistic. The second serious difficulty is a very practical one. It is not always possible to systematically observe overt behavior. To measure the social attitudes of the group used in this study by systematic observation of behavior would be an impossible task. Thus, one must resort to the measurement of attitudes as inferred from or indicated by verbal expressions. The concept of attitudes involves the notion of two extremes between which individuals vary, from favorable to opposed to something. 16 It would, therefore, seem very logical to construct some sort of scale that would measure how favorable or opposed to an object, etc., an individual is as indicated by his verbal response. Every day people are in a rather crude way measuring attitudes when they rate their fellows as "more" or "less" favorable toward or opposed to some person, group, object, etc. If this "more" or "less" idea could be utilized in a scale, that scale in at least a limited sense would be measuring attitudes. This is just what attitude researchers have tried to do, utilize the "more" or "less" concept in a scale and thus measure attitudes.

There are three main techniques of attitude measurement. Two of these, Thurstone's method of equal-appearing intervals and Likert's summated ratings or internal consistency method, are more widely used than the third method. Because of their importance, it would perhaps be well to review in some detail these three basic techniques.

Thurstone's technique should be treated first. According to this method, the distribution of the attitudes of a group is represented in the form of a frequency distribution along a base line which represents the entire range of attitudes from extremely favorable to extremely unfavorable. This base line has as its unit of measurement equal appearing intervals, determined by the "weighting" given each "opinion" by a large number of judges. A description of the actual construction of an attitude scale by this technique should serve to make clear the foregoing statement. A list of 130 statements regarding attitudes toward the church was prepared. This list of 130 statements, each statement on

17 Albert Ellis, and J. Raymond Gerberich, "Interests and Attitudes," REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, XVII (February, 1947), 68.


a small slip of paper, was given to about 300 judges who were instructed to sort the statements into eleven piles. Eleven master slips lettered A to K were also given to each judge. Three of these master slips were labeled as to kind of opinion that should be placed on them. One asked for highest appreciation for the church; another called for strongest depreciation of the church and the third was for neutral expressions. The other slips were not described, the reason being that intervals between successive piles should be apparently equal shifts of opinion as judged by the subject.

The returns were tabulated and the scale values were determined graphically for each statement, that value being assigned to the statement at which point on the base the cumulative frequency curve crossed the 50 per cent level. If the $Q$-value of a statement on this cumulative frequency graph was above a certain amount, the statement was discarded as being ambiguous.\footnote{A look at Thurstone's diagrams, \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 44, will clearly show why this is a good criterion of ambiguity.} An objective criterion of irrelevance was also applied to each question as well as certain informal criteria.\footnote{Thurstone, and Chave, \textit{Op. cit.}, pp. 45-56.} On the basis of these various criteria...
and upon inspection of the statements a final list of 45 statements was selected from the original 130. They were so selected that they constituted a more or less uniformly graduated series of scale values. For purposes of scoring, the unit of measurement was the number of equal-appearing intervals into which the original list was sorted. The origin was arbitrarily assigned to the extreme pro-end of the scale and the score was the mean scale value of all the opinions the subject endorsed. The individual statements on the list, however, were presented to the subject in random order.

A coefficient of reliability of .848, or .92 if the Spearman-Brown formula is used, is reported for this scale. The correlation between self-rating and attitude scale scores done for purposes of establishing validity was .67. A special validation study made by the authors of this scale showed that scale scores indicating a favorable attitude toward the church "almost always" agreed with the subject's reply to questions that he was an active church member and


23 Ibid., p. 80.
attended frequently. Another validity study made as part of a Doctor's dissertation showed a "satisfactory" correlation between scale scores and case histories. Besides the high reliability and good validity claimed for this scale, another advantage is urged. It is pointed out that the units on the scale are equal whether at one extreme or the other, so that a given interval at one end of the scale represents a difference in attitude equal to the same interval at the other end of the scale, thus making meaningful comparisons between groups possible.

Several objections to, or criticisms of this scale and technique should also be considered. It is objected that the method is too cumbersome and time consuming both on the part of the judges and in the tabulation of returns for each item. Another criticism is that Thurstone's technique is based on an assumption which is seldom, if ever, realized in practice, that is, that acceptance of a given

24 Ibid., p. 84.
27 Loc. cit.
scale position implies acceptance of all positions less extreme in the same direction from the neutral position. The question also arises as to the validity of the scale if it is given to any but student and academically sophisticated groups like those on which it was constructed. One writer very nicely puts it:

The difficulties of building scales similar to Thurstone's and of applying them to the measurement of the attitudes of social groups, become increasingly difficult once we leave the classroom, the discussion club and the other small, comparatively infrequent and highly selected groups that enjoy having experiments tried on them. Such groups already have developed ways of making their attitudes articulate. It is the more numerous work-a-day groupings of society, which are inaccessible to his controlled measurements, about whose attitudes the social scientist is in the most need of information. Students may be required, good natured academicians may be cajoled, and sundry needy persons may be paid to sort cards containing propositions into eleven piles. But it is difficult to imagine securing comparable judgments, or satisfactory measurements in the final application, from bricklayers, business men, Italian-Americans, nuns, stevedores, or seamstresses. And, unless the scale itself is based upon equal-seeming differences to a random sample of the group which is to be measured,

---

29 Loc. cit.
its validity - the degree to which it measures that which it purports to measure - becomes open to question. 30

A well known authority in attitude test construction states that Thurstone assumes that the scale values of the statements are independent of the attitude distribution of the judges who sort the statements, but, he objects, this has not been verified. 31 Finally, it is claimed that experimental study has shown that the scales become obsolete as time passes and conditions change, so that a scale as old as Thurstone's is not adequate for the present. 32 This last objection doesn't seem as valid as the others since it doesn't hit at the basic technique involved herein.

Another technique very much like Thurstone's, but designed to improve the Thurstone technique and answer some of the objections to it, especially those regarding the time and laboriousness required to construct a scale, is that developed by H. H. Remmers. 33 The theory of


Remmer's technique is that a generalized scale may be devised to measure attitudes toward institutions or objects, within inclusive categories.\textsuperscript{34} Basically, this technique is the same as Thurstone's with the essential difference lying in the assumption that an attitude toward any one of a large group or class of objects can validly be measured on a single scale.\textsuperscript{35} Actual construction of a scale is by means of a modified Thurstone technique, but with the items arranged from "favorable to unfavorable" rather than in random order.\textsuperscript{36} Thus, instead of making a separate scale of attitudes for each racial group etc., one generalized scale on racial attitude is constructed by the Thurstone technique and the name of the group toward which attitude is to be measured is written in as required.

Various studies were made to ascertain or investigate the validity of this technique of a generalized scale as compared with a specific scale. The reported findings vary from perfect correlation between a generalized scale and a

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34} Crossen, \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 51.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Crossen, \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 52.
\end{itemize}
Thurstone scale to rather low correlation, but all of the investigators in these particular studies claimed that the validity was sufficiently high to warrant the use of a generalized scale over the more laborious, Thurstone specific scale.\(^37\) Besides the fact that a tremendous amount of time and effort is saved by this method over construction of specific scales by the Thurstone technique, another advantage that is claimed for this method is that since the statements in the scale are general, the scales tend to become "dated" or obsolete less rapidly than Thurstone's scales.\(^38\) There are also several objections or questions raised to this method in addition to those already voiced against the basic technique of Thurstone. Thurstone, himself, believes that if this method is used for measuring attitudes toward racial groups or nationalities, then the scale might be inadequate if it doesn't represent current stereotypes for some one nationality.\(^39\) Another criticism is that the phrasing is too general. Absurdities result when the scales are used to measure more specific atti-  

tudes. 40 It is also pointed out that reaction to a scale may be a stereotyped response to the title of the scale and not to the specific practice or institution in question. 41

There is another important and popular technique of attitude measurement. That is Likert's technique. 42 Likert constructed questionnaires on international, inter-racial, and economic attitudes by culling statements from questionnaires already administered by other psychologists, by taking questions from books, addresses, pamphlets and by using some original questions. These questions were presented in such a form and manner as to permit a "judgment of value" rather than a "judgment of fact" and to allow the subject to take sides as between two clearly opposed alternatives. After some preliminary experimental work, Likert found that the type of statements to which the subject was offered five choices of response, namely: "strongly agree," "agree," "undecided," "disagree," "strongly disagree," yielded a distribution resembling a normal distribution. On the basis of

40 Crossen, Loc. cit.
such findings, it was assumed that attitudes are distributed "fairly normally" and that it was justifiable to use this assumption as the basis for test construction. Then, using statistical procedures based on relationships under the normal curve, the percentage of individuals that checked a given position on a particular statement was converted into a sigma value.\textsuperscript{43} Thorndike's tables which assume that one hundred percent of the cases in a normal distribution fall between -3 sigma and +3 sigma were used. This was done for each of the "five-choice" statements having to do with internationalism. Sigma deviations were always taken from the Mean, the positive value being assigned to the end favoring internationalism and the negative value being assigned to the end favoring nationalism. The score was then in terms of these sigma values. For some of the preliminary work, Likert used over 2,000 undergraduate students from nine universities, but the above described computations were made using 100 male subjects from the same school.\textsuperscript{44}

After further experimentation and study, a simpler scoring method was adopted. Instead of using sigma values, numerical values of from one to five were assigned to each of the

\textsuperscript{43}Likert, \textit{Op. cit.}, p.22

\textsuperscript{44}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 23.
five positions of the "five-choice" statements. The One end was always assigned to the negative end of the sigma scale and the Five end was assigned to the positive end of the sigma scale. Scoring was then in terms of these numerical values, the sum of the numerical values of the positions the subject checked was used as the score. Scores by this method of scoring correlated "almost perfectly" with scores obtained by the sigma method in various studies, so the simplified scoring method was adopted. It may be pointed out that it makes no essential difference to which extreme the One end is assigned so long as it is done consistently for each of the statements in the scale.

Several objective checks were used to find out if the numerical values were properly assigned and if the statements were "differentiating." One method was that of correlating each statement with the battery of statements. If there was negative correlation, the 1-5 values were reversed. If there was zero or very low correlation, the statement was undifferentiating. Another and simpler check was the use of the "criterion of internal consistency." This consists of comparing the scores of the ten percent of the subjects in one

46 Ibid., p. 48.
extreme with the scores of ten percent of the subjects in the opposite extreme. If the high group does not score "ap­ preciably" higher than the low group on a particular state­ ment, that statement is undifferentiating, i. e., it does not discriminate between the two extreme groups.47

Reliability coefficients were calculated both by the split-halves method and by the test-retest method. Reliability coefficients by the split-halves method ranging from .80 to .92 (corrected) are reported. Two groups of subjects were given the Thurstone-Droba War Scale as well as Likert's Survey of Opinions and as high a reliability was obtained by the Likert technique as with the Thurstone-Droba scale, but with only half as many items.48 The Likert method of scoring was also used on the Thurstone-Droba scale with the exception of four statements in each form and a higher coefficient of reliability was obtained. A high coefficient of correlation was also obtained between Likert's scales and Thurstone's scales when scored by the Likert technique, in fact, in a special study made for the purpose of establishing the validity of the Likert technique, coefficients of correlation clustering around .80 were found between certain Thurstone

47 Ibid., p. 51.
48 Ibid., p. 33.
scales and Likert's scales. 49

Since there is a high correlation between Likert's scales and Thurstone's the same validity may be claimed for one as the other, or at least, a higher validity can not be claimed for Thurstone's scales than for Likert's. On the other hand, it is actually claimed that Likert's technique yields a more valid scale, and certainly a more reliable scale than Thurstone's technique. This claim is made on the basis of experimental studies in which higher coefficients of reliability were found when Likert's method of scoring was used on Thurstone scales than when Thurstone's original method was used. 50 Besides the higher reliability claimed for Likert's technique, several other advantages are cited. It does away with judges and errors arising therefrom. 51 A scale constructed on Likert's technique is easily adapted to avoid its becoming obsolete. 52 Finally, it is repeatedly emphasized that construction of attitude scales by Likert's method is


50 Ibid., p. 229 ff.


far less laborious than by Thurstone's method. At least three objections have been made to Likert's method. Criticism is voiced regarding the assumption that attitudes are "normally distributed." It is also pointed out that this method really didn't do away with the need for, or use of judges, since Likert used scales constructed by the Thurstone method, which uses judges, as proof of his method's higher reliability. A third objection is that an instrument based on this technique is really not a "scale," whereas Thurstone's attitude tests are "scales."

The above described techniques of attitude measurement are the three most widely known and important ones. A dogmatic statement can not be made as to which of the three is best, since each has its proponents. It appears that at the present time, the Likert technique is the most popular of the three.

53 Likert, Loc. cit.
56 Loc. cit.
One important question that is raised concerning all of these techniques is the question of validity. Can tests that have not been validated in terms of behavior be valid? Do attitudes so measured represent any more than paper-and-pencil behavior with reference to verbal stimuli? Thurstone admits that an attitude scale can only measure a subject's attitude as expressed by the acceptance or rejection of opinions and that this is not a guarantee that he will act in agreement with his test score, nor is it an infallible guide to his actual attitude, but it is the best indice available. It must also be remembered that overt actions aren't inherently more "valid" than words. Some acts are designed to conceal one's true attitude. Then, too, social and other pressures modify behavior. On the other hand, it is argued that if it is remembered that the subject may hide his true attitude and if everything possible is done to minimize the conditions that prevent truthfulness such as guaranteeing secrecy and anonymity, then "fairly" accurate indices to attitudes should be possible. Not only so, but

in everyday life a man's agreement to, or disagreement with rather strongly stated opinions is regarded as a "significant" part of his behavior. 60

---

60 Murphy, Loc. cit.
CHAPTER IV

THE METHODS OF THE STUDY

Since the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between racial prejudice and personality maladjustment, it was decided to administer one of the better, structured tests of personality and a sufficiently valid racial attitude scale to a group of about 100 subjects. Largely because of the time element involved, group tests were necessary. It was felt that either an anti-Semitism scale or a Negro attitude scale would serve as an indicator of racial prejudice. Because most, if not all, of the previous investigations along this line used college students as subjects and it was desired to see what the findings would be if other than students served as subjects, the plan was to use adults from the general population as subjects. These subjects were to be as homogeneous as possible with regard to age-grouping, educational level, religion, race, culture, and economic status. This was felt desirable to avoid possible controversy as to whether or not these factors were important variables in an experiment on attitudes.
The measure of personality finally selected for use in this investigation was the group form of *The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory*. This test was selected primarily because it was believed to be one of the better structured personality tests available. Other factors that commended its use are: it is standardized on a normal population very much like that used in this study; it is relatively easy to administer and score; it is a multiphasic measure of personality and yields scores on not one, but many trait constellations; it reports sufficiently high reliability and validity to favor its use; coefficients of reliability for scales in final form range from .71 to .83. With regard to validity it is stated that:

A high score on a scale has been found to predict positively the corresponding final clinical diagnosis or estimate in more than 60 per cent of new psychiatric admissions. This percentage is derived from differentiation among clinic cases, which is considerably more difficult than differentiation of abnormal from normal groups. Even in cases in which a high score is not followed by a

---

1 Starke R. Hathaway, and J. C. McKinley, *The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory* (New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1943).

corresponding diagnosis, the pressure of the trait to an abnormal degree in the symptomatic picture will nearly always be noted. 3

An authority in the field of personality testing states that about half of the studies dealing with the MMPI over a period of three years gave evidence of positive validity although the other half tended to indicate weak validity. 4 Another authority concludes from clinical experimentation on the validity of the MMPI that it is at present a "promising" diagnostic instrument and that further critical analysis should enhance its diagnostic value. 5 The widespread professional use of the test would seem to indicate that it certainly has some validity. 6 Because of all of the above factors, and because there was not another structured personality test that had a proven validity as high, or sufficiently higher than the MMPI to urge its use, the MMPI was selected for use in this study. 7

3 Loc. cit.
4 Albert Ellis, "Personality Questionnaires," REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, XVII (February, 1947), 54.
7 See Appendix for a copy of the test.
A Negro attitude scale entitled, "Attitude Toward the Negro," constructed by Helen J. Crossen in connection with her Doctor's dissertation at the University of Chicago was selected as the measure of racial prejudice for this study.\(^8\) Several factors commended this scale. It was constructed on the Likert technique. All of the items were selected with extreme care and under the advice of several authorities. The test was originally designed for junior high school pupils and it was therefore felt that the language would certainly be suitable to the level of experience and understanding of the persons used for this investigation. All of the statements were prepared to avoid stereotyped responses and designed to reflect the present status of events. The test is of recent construction and is standardized on subjects from the Chicago area, the same area from which the subjects for this study were taken. It was also felt that the scale was not too long for use with the rather long, tedious MMPI. Finally, a high reliability and validity commended the use of this scale.

A coefficient of reliability of .86, which became .93 when stepped-up by the Spearman-Brown formula, was found by correlating odd-even scores for 100 cases selected at random.\(^9\) This is a sufficiently high reliability for such a test as far as reliability coefficients go. It must be noted that a reliability coefficient actually tells little by itself, but when it is remembered that the group on which calculations were based was fairly homogeneous and that the range of talent was rather large, a coefficient of .86 to .93 is probably a very high coefficient of reliability.\(^10\)

There are several evidences for the validity of the scale. While it does not constitute proof, the apparent clarity of the statements argues for validity of the scale. All of the statements were carefully checked for direction and clarity by the pupils at the age level at which the scale was used as well as by adults.\(^11\) Another evidence of validity was a comparison of pupil's scores on the scale with their own judgment about their attitudes toward the

---


\(^11\) Crossen, Loc. cit.
Negro. Pupils to whom the scale was administered indicated their own attitudes on the last page by encircling one of five choices. These self-estimates were compared with the scores on the scale and found to correspond in a "large measure" with the scale scores.\textsuperscript{12} A third evidence of validity was a comparison of scale scores with teacher and pupil judgment, and with previously written comments. Scores of tenth grade pupils were compared with their own previously written estimates of their attitudes toward the Negro and with the teacher's estimate of their attitudes. Scale scores were also compared with previously written original comments on the Negro problem. There was in these comparisons a very high correspondence.\textsuperscript{13} These validity studies were done by the author of the scale.

One other validity study was done in connection with this investigation. The scale was administered to 74 white college students from Loyola University who were simply asked to co-operate in a study of attitudes that was being conducted by one of the graduate students in Psychology. No identification of any sort was asked. Each paper was scored and those scores in each extreme 10 per cent were used for

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., p. 64.

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p. 65.
calculations of the Criterion of Internal Consistency. The Mean score on every item for each extreme group was calculated and compared with that of the other extreme group. With the possible exceptions of items 16, 23, and 30, there was an appreciable difference between the extreme groups in scores for each item. Table I on a following page presents the exact differences in these Mean scores. It can thus be seen that the items are differentiating. While this is no proof of validity, it constitutes a factor in the validity of the scale and certainly, if the items were not differentiating, the scale could have little validity.

The scale itself consists of 34 statements about the Negro. Subjects indicate any one of five degrees of feeling in response to each statement as follows: (a) agreement with the statement indicated by a plus mark, (b) strong agreement indicated by an encircled plus mark, (c) disagreement with the statement, indicated by a minus sign, (d) strong disagreement, indicated by an encircled minus sign, and (e) uncertainty, indicated by a question mark. Numerical values of from 1 to 5 are assigned to the responses so that a strongly favorable response, whether it indicates strong

14 See Appendix for copy of the scale as administered in this study.
### TABLE I

CRITERION OF INTERNAL CONSISTENCY FOR NEGRO ATTITUDE SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Mean Score of unfavorable group</th>
<th>Mean Score of favorable group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Range for high extreme group was, 170-99; M = 125. Range for low extreme group was, 48-35; M = 41. N = 7 for each group.
agreement to a favorable state, or strong disagreement to an unfavorable state, receives a score of 1. In the same way a favorable response receives a score of 2; undecided, 3; unfavorable, 4; strongly unfavorable, 5. The highest possible score would then be 170, and the lowest possible score would be 34. Thus, a score of 170 would indicate a very strong attitude against the Negro.

Subjects for this test were recruited from various protestant churches of the same denomination from the Chicago area. There were 101 male and female adults tested, but calculations were based upon only 89 subjects since 12 tests were invalid for various reasons. Different groups were tested throughout the months of May and June of 1948. These ranged in size from 5 to 30, but most were near 12 in number. All volunteered to serve as subjects. There was no compulsion nor reward except that of helping one's fellow man and adding to one's experience and general education. Testing was done under as nearly classroom conditions as possible.

Before the actual testing began, the subjects were told that a study was being made to try and determine what people were thinking about various questions. They were also told that they were asked to serve as subjects because it was the purpose of the study to find the opinions of the average person rather than just the college student. It was stressed
that in order for the study to be valid, complete honesty was required and, therefore, their anonymity would be guaranteed. The only identification required was sex and age, although there was an informational questionnaire which was given which they could fill in if they so desired. It was explained that this questionnaire would aid in the interpretation of results and all but two filled it in. The subjects were asked not to discuss answers with anyone else. They were also informed that each set of tests had a number in the upper left-hand corner which was there to facilitate compilation of results. It was also explained that if they so wished, they could copy that number and at a later date results on at least one of the tests would be presented using those numbers as a means for their own identification. Signatures were not required in the interest of validity.\footnote{Stephen M. Corey, "Signed Versus Unsigned Attitude Questionnaires," \textit{Journal of Educational Psychology}, XXVII (February, 1937), 148, Concluded on the basis of experimental study that perhaps the invalidating effects of a signature on attitude questionnaires may be exaggerated, but it can not be said that, no matter what the circumstances, signed questionnaires are as valid as unsigned. R. P. Fischer, "Signed Versus Unsigned Personal Questionnaires," \textit{Journal of Applied Psychology}, XXX (June, 1946), 224, Concluded on the basis of an experimental study that the use of signatures on personal questionnaires might have a relative inhibitory effect on the honesty and frankness of the}
After these preliminary instructions, the Negro attitude scale was distributed and the instructions printed thereon were read and explained to the subjects. As they finished the attitude scale, they exchanged them for the MMPI answer sheet bearing the same number as the attitude scale in the upper left-hand corner. This was carefully supervised and all papers were checked to insure accuracy. When all of the subjects had their MMPI answer sheets, the MMPI test booklets were distributed and the instructions printed thereon were read and explained to them. Upon finishing this test, each subject exchanged the answer sheet for a one page informational questionnaire bearing the same number as before.\textsuperscript{16} This later questionnaire was designed for this study simply to furnish some knowledge and information about the subject that might prove helpful in interpreting the results. These informational questionnaires were then collected, the subjects were thanked for their co-operation and usually refreshments were served.

\textsuperscript{16} See appendix for a copy of the informational questionnaire.
CHAPTER V
FINDINGS

The findings of this study are based upon the results obtained from 89 subjects. A total of 101 subjects was tested as was previously stated, but 12 results were invalid because of the following reasons: age, one subject was too young; invalid MMPI scores because of incompleteness; incomplete attitude scales. Pertinent and interesting data about the group was obtained from the informational questionnaires. Every subject except two answered some of the questions on this questionnaire and most answered all of them. All of the group were from the Chicago area and were born in Northern States. They were all of the same Protestant denomination and had relatively the same socio-economic background. More complete data about the group is presented in Tables II, III, IV, and V.

First, the attitude scales were scored. It was found that the scores ranged from a high of 132, to a low of 44. The Mean score of the group was 81.47, and the S.D. was 16.50. This would seem to indicate that the group as a whole tends to be favorable to the Negro. Every factor on the MMPI was
TABLE II
DATA ON AGE, SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF EIGHTY-NINE SUBJECTS
FROM WHICH FINDINGS OF STUDY WERE DERIVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>MARITAL STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range, 18-46</td>
<td>38 Males</td>
<td>61 Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age, 28.5</td>
<td>51 Females</td>
<td>28 Single</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III

**DATA ON EDUCATION OF EIGHTY-NINE SUBJECTS FROM WHICH FINDINGS OF STUDY WERE DERIVED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed eighth grade and 1-3 yrs. high school</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school and 1-3 yrs. college</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed 4 yrs. college</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed 6-8 yrs. college</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV

LIST OF OCCUPATIONS REPRESENTED BY EIGHTY-NINE SUBJECTS
FROM WHICH FINDINGS OF STUDY WERE DERIVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountant</th>
<th>Housewife</th>
<th>Salesman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank Teller</td>
<td>Oil Refinery Worker</td>
<td>Steel Mill Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td>Office Worker</td>
<td>Stenographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Artist</td>
<td>Photographer</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Operator</td>
<td>Postal Worker</td>
<td>Telephone Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draftsman</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>Truck Driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Private Secretary</td>
<td>Welder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Religious Worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE V

DATA REGARDING CONTACT WITH NEGROES OF GROUP OF EIGHTY-NINE SUBJECTS FROM WHICH FINDINGS OF STUDY WERE DERIVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just in every day affairs</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived among</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to school with</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scored and profiles were plotted, although it was planned to use only three scales for purposes of study. It was reasoned that the Hs (Hypochondriasis) Scale might show some relation to prejudice since much worry predisposes toward fear which tends toward hostility. Depression often accompanies worry, so it was felt that the D (Depression) Scale should be used in the study. The Pa (Paranoia) Scale was also included in this group because it was believed that suspicion may tend to generate prejudice. Therefore, the scores of the group on each of these scales were correlated by the Pearson Product-Moment method of correlation with the scores on the Negro attitude scale. A relatively recent investigation involving correlation between scores on the MMPI and an interest finder made use of the T-scores on the MMPI for purposes of correlations and this study followed that suggestion. The coefficient of correlation thus obtained were as follows: the coefficient of correlation between the scores on the attitude scale and the Hs Scale was .11 with the stan-


standard error of $r$ at .11; the coefficient of correlation between attitude scores and $D$ was -.02 with the standard error of $r$ at .11; the correlation between $P_a$ and attitude was -.11 with the standard error of $r$ at .11. None of these results is statistically significant for a sample of 89 subjects.\(^3\)

It was then decided to correlate all of the other scales of the MMPI except the $M_f$ Scale with attitude scale scores to find whether or not there was any significant relationship present. The $M_f$ Scale was not used because it is too indefinite. The results of these correlations were: attitude and $H_y$ yielded an $r$ of .10 with the standard error of $r$ at .11; attitude and $P_d$ yielded an $r$ of -.13 with the standard error of $r$ at .10; an $r$ of -.06 with a standard error of $r$ at .11 was found between attitude and $P_t$; $S_c$ and attitude yielded an $r$ of -.08 and the standard error of $r$ at .11; an $r$ of -.08 and the standard error of $r$ of .11 was also found between $M_a$ and attitude scores. None of these findings is statistically significant. Table VI presents these findings more concisely.

Besides the correlational method, other methods of analysis of data were also used. One method used was a comparison of extreme groups on the attitude scale. The 10 percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients of Correlation Between Attitude Scores And:</th>
<th>Standard Error of $r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hs, .11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, -.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hy, .10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd, -.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa, -.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt, -.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc, -.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, -.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
having the highest scores on the attitude test were selected for more detailed study, but it was found that there were four ties at the score of 100, so those having a score of 100 or above on the attitude test were selected as the extremely unfavorable or prejudiced group. This yielded a group of 13 rather than a group of 9, 10 per cent of the entire group. A group of like size of low extreme scores was also selected. It so happened that there were 13 low scores with no ties at the thirteenth position. This was the extremely favorable or non-prejudiced group. The range of attitude test scores for the prejudiced group was 100-132, and for the non-prejudiced group scores ranged from 44-64. A comparison was then made of the personality scale scores of both of these groups, the underlying hypothesis being that if there is a relationship between personality maladjustment and prejudice, then the personality test scores of the prejudiced group should be appreciably different than the scores of the non-prejudiced group. The Mean score of the high extreme group was compared with the Mean score of the low extreme group on each of the MMPI scales except Mf. These comparisons are shown on Table VII. It can be seen that there is no statistically significant difference between the personality scale scores of these two extreme groups, not is any definite trend apparent.
TABLE VII

A COMPARISON OF MEAN MMPI SCORES BETWEEN
A PREJUDICED AND A NON-PREJUDICED GROUP
OF THIRTEEN SUBJECTS EACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Att.</th>
<th>Hs</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Hy</th>
<th>Pd</th>
<th>Pa</th>
<th>Pt</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>Ma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prej. Group</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Prej. Group</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>-.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.R. or t</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The differences expressed as negatives merely indicate that the non-prejudiced group had a higher Mean score than the prejudiced group by the amount shown. The Mean scores on each MMPI scale for both groups are within the normal range and the differences are not large enough to be significant as is evidenced by the low C.R. for each difference. None of the C.R.'s is significant even at the .50 level of confidence.
Another method of analysis employed was a comparison of extreme groups on the MMPI. Those MMPI profiles which showed T-scores on three or more scales (not including Mr) of above 70 were selected for comparison with a group whose MMPI profiles were quite normal. The number of subjects whose profiles indicated at least three scores of over 70, was 10. This was designated as the abnormal group. Ten profiles were then selected on which no score was above 57 and below 37. The ideal would have been to select profiles containing all the scores of within five of 50, but few such profiles were found, therefore, the ten approaching nearest to this ideal were selected. This group was designated as the normal group. The Mean scores on the attitude scale were then calculated and compared for these two extreme groups on the basis of the hypothesis that if there is a relationship between personality maladjustment and prejudice, then the abnormal group should have significantly different attitude scale scores than the normal group. No statistically significant difference was found. The Mean score on the attitude scale for the abnormal group was found to be 76.5 with a range of scores from 44 to 108, whereas the Mean score on the attitude scale for the normal group was found to be 72.5 with a range of scores from 50 to 100. The Critical Ratio or t of the differences between the two Means was .25. There is no significant differ-
ence here, nor is there any apparent trend. It is interesting to note that the difference in the Mean attitude scores between the two groups is much less than the difference of scores within each group.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A brief summary is now in order. An investigation was made into the relationship between racial, specifically, Negro prejudice and personality maladjustment. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the Scale of Attitudes Toward the Negro by Helen Crossen were administered to 101 adult male and female subjects as nearly homogeneous as possible with regard to various factors as religion, cultural background, etc., which may influence attitude. Subjects were not required to give any identifying information aside from sex and age, but a general informational questionnaire was provided which subjects were asked to fill in if they so desired. Findings were based on a group of 89 out of the original 101 subjects because 12 tests were invalid.

The scores on the various MMPI scales with the exception of the Mc scale were correlated with attitude scale scores. It was found that in no case was there a coefficient of correlation higher than plus or minus .13, which is not statistically significant. A comparison was also made between the MMPI scores of an extremely prejudiced and a non-prejudiced group. No characteristic profile was noted for either group.
Finally, the MMPI profiles were examined and those profiles showing three or more scores in the abnormal range were selected to form an "abnormal" or "maladjusted" group. A like-sized group of "normal" profiles was also selected as the "normal" or "adjusted" group. The attitude scale scores for these two groups were then compared. No particular trend of scores or characteristic tendency toward prejudice was noted for either group.

The general conclusion that may validly be drawn from these findings is that there is no statistically significant relationship, nor apparent trend toward a relationship between personality and racial prejudice as these are measured by the instruments used in this investigation. If there actually is some relationship between personality and prejudice, this investigation has failed to uncover it. It may also be concluded that there is no personality profile characteristic of the prejudiced person, nor is the maladjusted person more prejudiced than the normal person. The range of attitude scores of maladjusted persons is not appreciably different from the range of attitude scores for normal persons. It must be remembered, however, that criticism has been leveled against the validity of personality questionnaires like that used herein. Criticism may perhaps be leveled
against the validity of the attitude scale employed in this study, or other objections may perhaps be raised against the validity of the entire study. Therefore, no flat, dogmatic assertion is made stating that there is no relationship at all between prejudice and personality, but only that there is none as measured by the tests used in this investigation.

This does not mean that the study was a failure, since it was never the purpose of the study to prove or disprove anything, but simply to investigate and report findings. Future studies employing larger samples, different subjects, more valid instruments, better methods, etc., may or may not report findings in agreement with those of this study, but whatever the results of further studies, it is hoped that this investigation will be of some aid in the ever onward search for knowledge in the field of psychological research.
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A study is being made of what people think about several current questions. Below you will find some statements about the Negro. If you agree with the statement, make a plus mark (+) in the space provided in front of the statement. If you strongly agree with the statement, make an encircled plus mark (⊕) in front of the statement. If you disagree with the statement, make a minus mark (-) in front of the statement. If you strongly disagree with the statement, make an encircled minus mark (⊖) in front of the statement. If you are undecided about the statement, place a question mark (?) in front of the statement.

This is not an examination and there are no right or wrong answers. This is merely an attempt to find out what people are thinking about these statements. BE SURE TO MARK EVERY STATEMENT. Work quickly, but carefully.

REMEMBER:

agree (+) disagree (-) strongly agree (⊕) strongly disagree (⊖) undecided (?)

1. Negroes should have a better chance for education.

2. Some Negroes should not vote.

3. A Negro should have the right to hold any job for which he is qualified.

4. Most Negroes do not need an education beyond the eighth grade.

5. Some types of jobs should not be open to Negroes.

6. A Negro should have the same educational opportunities as the white person.

7. The same wage for equal work should be paid the Negro and the white man.

8. The Negro ought to be given the kinds of work the white people do not care to do.

9. The Negro should be allowed to work in any occupation.
10. The Negro is not worth being educated.

11. If Negroes were given a chance, they would change completely in a few generations.

12. The Negro is entitled to more consideration than he now receives.

13. I don't believe the Negro has made many contributions to civilization.

14. I think the Negroes are as good as white people.

15. Many Negroes have a pleasing appearance.

16. Negroes are naturally inclined to be criminals.

17. Give the Negro half a chance and he will not be inferior.

18. I think the Negro is by nature inferior to the white man.

19. The Negro is just as intelligent as the white person.

20. I think the Negro's appearance shows him to be in a lower stage of evolution than the white man.

21. Many Negroes are very intelligent.

22. The Negro is not inferior.

23. A Negro child has the ability to learn just as the white child has.

24. The Negro gets angry too fast.

25. I would invite a Negro friend to go swimming with me.

26. Although I like my Negro friends very much, I would not invite them to my house.

27. Negroes should not be made to sit on the back seat in the bus.

28. I certainly wouldn't want to dance with a Negro at a party.

29. At public meetings Negroes should be allowed to sit where they choose.
30. Donations of Negro blood for general use should not be accepted by the Red Cross.

31. I think the Negro and the white should live together more; it would help both races.

32. Negroes should be allowed to live anywhere they choose.

33. Negroes should not live as neighbors to white people.

34. Public beaches and parks should not have separate spaces for colored people.

Look back over your work. HAVE YOU MARKED EVERY STATEMENT?
GENERAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Some information is asked for below which will aid greatly in the interpretation of the results of this study. Your sincere response will be appreciated.

1. Place of birth

2. Male___ Female___

3. Age___

4. Education (check grouping which best applies to you)
   ___ Completed less than 8th grade
   ___ Completed 8th grade
   ___ Completed high school
   ___ Years of college completed

5. Type of occupation

6. Income (check grouping which best applies to you)
   ___ Less than $2,000 annually
   ___ $2,000 to $4,000 annually
   ___ More than $4,000 annually

7. Married ___ Single ___

8. My contact with Negroes has been:
   Lived among them ___ Went to school with them ___
   Worked with them ___ Just contact in course of every day affairs ___

9. Please draw a circle around the answer which most closely describes your own feeling about the Negro.
   Strongly favorable ___ Strongly unfavorable ___ Favorable ___
   Unfavorable ___ Undecided ___
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This inventory consists of numbered statements. Read each statement and decide whether it is true as applied to you or false as applied to you.

You are to mark your answers on the answer sheet you have. Look at the example of the answer sheet shown at the right. If a statement is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE, as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed T. (See A at the right.) If a statement is FALSE or NOT USUALLY TRUE, as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed F. (See B at the right.) If a statement does not apply to you or if it is something that you don't know about, make no mark on the answer sheet.
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Remember, try to make some answer to every statement.
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1. I like mechanics magazines.
2. I have a good appetite.
3. I wake up fresh and rested most mornings.
4. I think I would like the work of a librarian.
5. I am easily awakened by noise.
6. I like to read newspaper articles on crime.
7. My hands and feet are usually warm enough.
8. My daily life is full of things that keep me interested.
9. I am about as able to work as I ever was.
10. There seems to be a lump in my throat much of the time.
11. A person should try to understand his dreams and be guided by or take warning from them.
12. I enjoy detective or mystery stories.
13. I work under a great deal of tension.
14. I have diarrhea once a month or more.
15. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.
16. I am sure I get a raw deal from life.
17. My father was a good man.
18. I am very seldom troubled by constipation.
19. When I take a new job, I like to be tipped off on who should be gotten next to.
20. My sex life is satisfactory.
21. At times I have very much wanted to leave home.
22. At times I have fits of laughing and crying that I cannot control.
23. I am troubled by attacks of nausea and vomiting.
24. No one seems to understand me.
25. I would like to be a singer.
26. I feel that it is certainly best to keep my mouth shut when I'm in trouble.
27. Evil spirits possess me at times.
28. When someone does me a wrong I feel I should pay him back if I can, just for the principle of the thing.
29. I am bothered by acid stomach several times a week.
30. At times I feel like swearing.
31. I have nightmares every few nights.
32. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job.
33. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences.
34. I have a cough most of the time.
35. If people had not had it in for me I would have been much more successful.
36. I seldom worry about my health.
37. I have never been in trouble because of my sex behavior.
38. During one period when I was a youngster I engaged in petty thievery.
39. At times I feel like smashing things.
40. Most any time I would rather sit and daydream than to do anything else.
41. I have had periods of days, weeks, or months when I couldn't take care of things because I couldn't "get going."
42. My family does not like the work I have chosen (or the work I intend to choose for my life work).
43. My sleep is fitful and disturbed.
44. Much of the time my head seems to hurt all over.
45. I do not always tell the truth.
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46. My judgment is better than it ever was.
47. Once a week or oftener I feel suddenly hot all over, without apparent cause.
48. When I am with people I am bothered by hearing very queer things.
49. I am in just as good physical health as most of my friends.
50. I prefer to pass by school friends, or people I know but have not seen for a long time, unless they speak to me first.
51. I am liked by most people who know me.
52. A minister can cure disease by praying and putting his hand on your head.
53. I am almost never bothered by pains over the heart or in my chest.
54. I enjoy reading love stories.
55. I am a good mixer.
56. As a youngster I was suspended from school one or more times for cutting up.
57. I see things or animals or people around me that others do not see.
58. Everything is turning out just like the prophets of the Bible said it would.
59. I have often wished I were a girl.
60. I believe I am being plotted against.
61. I have not lived the right kind of life.
62. Parts of my body often have feelings like burning, tingling, crawling, or like "going to sleep."
63. I feel as though I have given up hope of amounting to something.
64. I have had no difficulty in starting or holding my bowel movement.
65. I sometimes keep on at a thing until others lose their patience with me.
66. I have been unable to make up my mind about something.
67. I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be.
68. I hardly ever feel pain in the back of the neck.
69. I am very strongly attracted by members of my own sex.
70. I used to like drop-the-handkerchief.
71. I think a great many people exaggerate their misfortunes in order to gain the sympathy and help of others.
72. I am troubled by discomfort in the pit of my stomach every few days or oftener.
73. I am an important person.
74. I have often wished I were a girl. (Or if you are a girl) I have never been sorry that I am a girl.
75. I get angry sometimes.
76. Most of the time I feel blue.
77. I enjoy reading love stories.
78. I like poetry.
79. My feelings are not easily hurt.
80. I sometimes tease animals.
81. I think I would like the kind of work a nurse does.
82. I am easily drowned in an argument.
83. Any man who is able and willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding.
84. These days I find it hard not to give up hope of amounting to something.
85. Sometimes I am strongly attracted by the personal articles of others such as shoes, gloves, etc., so that I want to handle or steal them, though I have no use for them.
86. I am certainly lacking in self-confidence.
87. I would like to be a florist.
88. I usually feel that life is worth while.
89. It takes a lot of argument to convince most people of the truth.
90. Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
91. I do not mind being made fun of.
92. I would like to be a nurse.
93. I think most people would lie to get ahead.
94. I do many things which I regret afterwards (I regret things more or more often than others seem to).
95. I go to church almost every week.
96. I have very few quarrels with members of my family.
97. At times I have a strong urge to do something harmful or shocking.
98. I believe in the second coming of Christ.
99. I like to go to parties and other affairs where there is lots of loud fun.
100. I have met problems so full of possibilities that I have been unable to make up my mind about them.
101. I believe women ought to have as much sexual freedom as men.
102. My hardest battles are with myself.
103. I have little or no trouble with my muscles twitching or jumping.
104. I don't seem to care what happens to me.
105. Sometimes when I am not feeling well I am cross.
106. Much of the time I feel as if I have done something wrong or evil.
107. I am happy most of the time.
108. There seems to be a fullness in my head or nose most of the time.
109. I have never done anything dangerous for the thrill of it.
110. I frequently find it necessary to stand up for what I think is right.
111. I believe in law enforcement.
112. Often I feel as if there were a tight band about my head.
113. I believe in law enforcement.
114. I enjoy a race or game better when I bet on it.
115. I am happy most of the time.
116. Most people are honest chiefly through fear of being caught.
117. In school I was sometimes sent to the principal for cutting up.
118. My speech is the same as always (not faster or slower, or slurring; no hoarseness).
119. My table manners are not quite as good at home as when I am out in company.
120. I believe I am being followed.
121. I seem to be about as capable and smart as most others around me.
122. I believe I am being followed.
123. Most people will use somewhat unfair means to gain profit or an advantage rather than to lose it.
124. I believe in law enforcement.
125. I have a great deal of stomach trouble.
126. I am happy most of the time.
127. I like dramatics.
128. I know who is responsible for most of my troubles.
129. The sight of blood neither frightens me nor makes me sick.
130. I am being followed.
131. I do not worry about catching diseases.
I. I like collecting flowers or growing house plants.

132. Most nights I go to sleep without thoughts or ideas bothering me.

133. I have never indulged in any unusual sex practices.

134. Have never had a fit or convulsion.

135. I have had periods in which I carried on activities without knowing later what I had been doing.

136. I am afraid of losing my mind.

137. I have common wonder what hidden reason of those about me.

138. Criticism or scolding hurts me terribly.

139. My conduct is largely controlled by the customs of those about me.

140. Criticism or scolding hurts me terribly.

141. I like to collect flowers or growing house plants.

142. I feel as if I must injure either my­

143. I am not afraid to handle money.

144. I resent having anyone take me in so

145. I have often lost out on things because I

146. I feel that I have often been punished without cause.

147. At times I feel like picking a fist fight with

148. It makes me uncomfortable to put on a

149. I used to keep a diary.

150. I feel that I have often been punished without cause.

151. I frequently notice my hand shakes when I try

152. I have never had a fainting spell.

153. I would rather win than lose in a game.

154. I have never had a fit or convulsion.

155. I am neither gaining nor losing weight.

156. I have the wanderlust and am roaming or traveling about.

157. Sometimes, when embarrassed, I break out in

158. My hearing is apparently as good as that of most people.

159. It makes me feel important.

160. I am afraid of losing my mind.

161. The top of my head sometimes feels tender.

162. I do not tire quickly.

163. My mother was a good woman.

164. I like to study and read about things that I

165. If I were a reporter I would very much like to

166. My hands have not become clumsy or awk­

167. I am afraid when I look down from a

168. I do not tire quickly.

169. I am not afraid to handle money.

170. Everything tastes the same.

171. It would not make me nervous if any member of my family got into trouble with the law.

172. I frequently find myself worrying about some­

173. I like school.

174. I have never had a fainting spell.

175. I like to flirt.

176. I do not have a great fear of snakes.

177. I am worried about sex matters.

178. I think I would like the work of a building contractor.

179. My hands have not become clumsy or awk­

180. I feel weak all over much of the time.

181. I am afraid to carry money or other­

182. I am afraid of losing my mind.

183. I like to cook.

184. I commonly hear voices without knowing where they come from.

185. I wish I were not so shy.

186. I frequently notice my hand shakes when I try
to do something.

187. I have very few headaches.

188. I believe my sins are unpardonable.

189. I am afraid to carry money or other­

190. I am very religious (more than most people).

191. At times it has been impossible for me to keep

192. I have had attacks in which I could not control

193. I do not like everyone I know.

194. I feel weak all over much of the time.

195. Children should be taught all the main facts of sex.

196. I frequently have to fight against showing that I am bashful.

197. I do not have a great fear of snakes.

198. I resent having anyone take me in so

199. I resent having anyone take me in so

200. I wish I were not so shy.

201. I frequently have to fight against showing that I am bashful.

202. I do not have a great fear of snakes.

203. I am afraid of losing my mind.

204. I resent having anyone take me in so

205. I am very religious (more than most people).

206. I do not like everyone I know.

207. I frequently have to fight against showing that I am bashful.

208. I resent having anyone take me in so

209. I resent having anyone take me in so
220. I loved my mother.
221. I like science.
222. It is not hard for me to ask help from my friends even though I cannot return the favor.
223. I very much like hunting.
224. My parents have often objected to the kind of people I went around with.
225. I gossip a little at times.
226. Some of my family have habits that bother and annoy me very much.
227. I have been told that I walk during sleep.
228. At times I feel that I can make up my mind on duty which I were trying to do something, not because it was important to me.
229. I should like to belong to several clubs or lodges.
230. I have been quite independent and free from family rule.
231. I like to talk about sex.
232. I have been inspired to a program of life based on duty which I have since carefully followed.
233. I have at times stood in the way of people who were trying to do something, not because it amounted to much but because of the principle of the thing.
234. I get mad easily and then get over it soon.
235. I have been quite independent and free from family rule.
236. I brood a great deal.
237. My relatives are nearly all in sympathy with me.
238. I have periods of such great restlessness that I cannot sit long in a chair.
239. I have been disappointed in love.
240. I never worry about my looks.
241. I dream frequently about things that are best kept to myself.
242. I believe I am no more nervous than most others.
243. I have few or no pains.
244. My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others.
245. My parents and family find more fault with me than they should.
246. My neck spots with red often.
247. I have reason for feeling jealous of one or more members of my family.
248. Sometimes without any reason or even when things are going wrong I feel excitedly happy, "on top of the world."
249. I believe there is a Devil and a Hell in afterlife.
250. I don't blame anyone for trying to grab everything he can get in this world.
251. I have had blank spells in which my activities were interrupted and I did not know what was going on around me.
252. No one cares much what happens to you.
253. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong.
254. I like to be with a crowd who play jokes on one another.
255. Sometimes at elections I vote for men about whom I know nothing. I have been so entertained by the cleverness of a crook that I hoped he would get by with it.
256. The only interesting part of newspapers is the "funnies."
257. I usually expect to succeed in things I do.
258. I believe there is a God.
259. I have difficulty in starting to do things.
260. I was a slow learner in school.
261. If I were an artist I would like to draw flowers.
262. It does not bother me that I am not better looking.
263. I sweat very easily even on cool days.
264. I am entirely self-confident.
265. It is safer to trust nobody.
266. Once a week or oftener I become very excited.
267. When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.
268. Something exciting will almost always pull me out of it when I am feeling low.
269. I can easily make other people afraid of me, and sometimes do for the fun of it.
270. When I leave home I do not worry about whether the door is locked and the windows closed.
271. I do not blame a person for taking advantage of someone who lays himself open to it.
272. At times I am all full of energy.
273. I have numbness in one or more regions of my skin.
274. My eyesight is as good as it has been for years.
275. Someone has control over my mind.
276. I enjoy children.
277. At times I have been so entertained by the cleverness of a crook that I hoped he would get by with it.
278. I have often felt that strangers were looking at me critically.
279. I drink an unusually large amount of water every day.
280. Most people make friends because friends are likely to be useful to them.
281. I do not often notice my ears ringing or buzzing.
282. Once in a while I feel hate toward members of my family whom I usually love.
283. If I were a lawyer I would like to draw flowers.
284. I am sure I am being talked about.
285. Once in a while I laugh at a dirty joke.
286. I am never happier than when alone.
287. I have very few fears compared to my friends.
288. I am troubled by attacks of nausea and vomiting.
289. I am always disgusted with the law when a criminal is freed through the arguments of a smart lawyer.
290. I work under a great deal of tension.
291. At one or more times in my life I felt that someone was making me do things by hypnotizing me.
292. I am likely not to speak to people until they speak to me.
293. Someone has been trying to influence my mind.
294. I have never been in trouble with the law.
295. I liked "Alice in Wonderland" by Lewis Carroll.
296. I have periods in which I feel unusually cheerful without any special reason.
297. I wish I were not bothered by thoughts about sex.
298. If several people find themselves in trouble, the best thing for them to do is to agree upon a story and stick to it.
299. I think that I feel more intensely than most people do.
300. There never was a time in my life when I liked to play with dolls.
301. Life is a strain for me much of the time.
302. I have never been in trouble because of my sex behavior.
303. I am so touchy on some subjects that I can't talk about them.
304. In school I found it very hard to talk before the class.
305. Even when I am with people I feel lonely much of the time.
306. I get all the sympathy I should.
307. I refuse to play some games because I am not good at them.
308. At times I have very much wanted to leave home.
309. I seem to make friends about as quickly as others do.
310. My sex life is satisfactory.
311. During one period when I was a youngster I engaged in petty thievery.
312. The man who provides temptation by leaving valuable property unprotected is about as much to blame for its theft as the one who steals it.
313. My mother or father often made me obey home.
314. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.
315. I am sure I get a raw deal from life.
316. I think nearly anyone would tell a lie to keep out of trouble.
317. I am more sensitive than most other people.
318. My daily life is full of things that keep me interested.
319. Most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people.
320. Many of my dreams are about sex matters.
321. I am easily embarrassed.
322. I worry over money and business.
323. I have never been in love with anyone.
324. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences.
325. The things that some of my family have done have frightened me.
326. At times I have fits of laughing and crying out of trouble.
327. My sex life is satisfactory.
328. I find it hard to keep my mind on one thing for a long time.
329. I almost never dream.
330. I have never been paralyzed or had any unusual weakness of any of my muscles.
331. If people had not had it in for me I would have been much more successful.
332. Sometimes my voice leaves me or changes even though I have no cold.
333. No one seems to understand me.
334. Peculiar odors come to me at times.
335. I cannot keep my mind on one thing.
336. I easily become impatient with people.
337. I feel anxiety about something or someone almost all the time.
338. I have certainly had more than my share of things to worry about.
339. Most of the time I wish I were dead.
340. Sometimes I become so excited that I find it hard to get to sleep.
341. At times I hear so well it bothers me.
342. I forget right away what people say to me.
343. I usually have to stop and think before I act even in trifling matters.
344. Often I cross the street in order not to meet someone I see.
345. I often feel as if things were not real.
346. I have a habit of counting things that are not important such as bulbs on electric signs, and so forth.
347. I have no enemies who really wish to harm me.
348. I tend to be on my guard with people who are somewhat more friendly than I had expected.
349. I have strange and peculiar thoughts.
350. I hear strange things when I am alone.
351. I get anxious and upset when I have to make a short trip away from home.
352. I have been afraid of things or people that I knew could not hurt me.
353. I have no dread of going into a room by myself where other people have already gathered and are talking.
354. I am afraid of using a knife or anything very sharp or pointed.
355. Sometimes I enjoy hurting persons I love.
356. I have more trouble concentrating than others seem to have.
357. I have several times given up doing a thing because I thought too little of my ability.
358. Bad words, often terrible words, come into my mind and I cannot get rid of them.
359. Sometimes some unimportant thought will run through my mind and bother me for days.
360. Almost every day something happens to frighten me.
361. I am inclined to take things hard.
362. I am more sensitive than most other people.
363. At times I have enjoyed being hurt by someone I loved.
364. People say insulting and vulgar things about me.
365. I feel uneasy indoors.
366. Even when I am with people I feel lonely much of the time.
367. I am not afraid of fire.
368. I have sometimes stayed away from another person because I feared doing or saying something that I might regret afterwards.
369. Religion gives me no worry.
370. I hate to have to rush when working.
371. I am not unusually self-conscious.
372. I tend to be interested in several different hobbies rather than to stick to one of them for a long time.
373. I feel sure that there is only one true religion.
374. At periods my mind seems to work more slowly than usual.
375. When I am feeling very happy and active, someone who is blue or low will spoil it all.
376. Policemen are usually honest.
377. At parties I am more likely to sit by myself or with just one other person than to join in with the crowd.
378. I do not like to see women smoke.
379. I very seldom have spells of the blues.
380. When someone says silly or ignorant things about something I know about, I try to set him right.
381. I am often said to be hotheaded.
382. I wish I could get over worrying about things I have said that may have injured other people's feelings.
383. People often disappoint me.
384. I feel unable to tell anyone all about myself.
385. Lightning is one of my fears.
386. I like to keep people guessing what I'm going to do next.
387. The only miracles I know of are simply tricks that people play on one another.
388. I am afraid to be alone in the dark.
389. My plans have frequently seemed so full of difficulties that I have had to give them up.
390. I have often felt badly over being misunderstood when trying to keep someone from making a mistake.
391. I love to go to dances.
392. A windstorm terrifies me.
393. Horses that don't pull should be beaten or kicked.
394. I frequently ask people for advice.
395. The future is too uncertain for a person to make serious plans.

396. Often, even though everything is going fine for me, I feel that I don't care about anything.

397. I have sometimes felt that difficulties were piling up so high that I could not overcome them.

398. I often think, "I wish I were a child again."

399. I am not easily angered.

400. If given the chance I could do some things that would be of great benefit to the world.

401. I have no fear of water.

402. I am apt to hide my feelings in some things, to undertakings, even for a short time.

403. It is great to be living in these times when so much is going on.

404. People have often misunderstood my intentions when I was trying to put them right and be helpful.

405. I have no trouble swallowing.

406. I have often met people who were supposed to be experts who were no better than I.

407. I am usually calm and not easily upset.

408. I am apt to hide my feelings in some things, to the point that people may hurt me without their knowing about it.

409. My worries seem to disappear when I get into a crowd of lively friends.

410. It makes me feel like a failure when I hear of serious plans.

411. It is all right to get around the law if you don't actually break it.

412. I am often inclined to go out of my way to win a point with someone who has opposed me.

413. I am inwardly pleased when they see positioning.

414. I am often sorry because I am so cross with a crowd or gang.

415. If given the chance I would make a good leader of people.

416. It bores me to have someone watch me at work even though I know I can do it well.

417. I am often so annoyed when someone tries to get ahead of me in a line of people that I speak to him about it.

418. At times I think I am no good at all.

419. I played hookey from school quite often as a youngster.

420. I have had some very unusual religious experiences.

421. One or more members of my family is very nervous.

422. I have felt embarrassed over the type of work that one or more members of my family have done.

423. I like or have liked fishing very much.

424. I feel hungry almost all the time.

425. I dream frequently.

426. I have at times had to be rough with people who were rude or annoying.

427. I am embarrassed by dirty stories.

428. I like to read newspaper editorials.

429. I like to attend lectures on serious subjects.

430. I am attracted by members of the opposite sex.

431. I worry quite a bit over possible misfortunes.

432. I have strong political opinions.

433. I used to have imaginary companions.

434. I would like to be an auto racer.

435. Usually I would prefer to work with men.

436. People generally demand more respect for their own rights than they are willing to allow for others.

437. There are certain people whom I dislike so much that I am inwardly pleased when they are catching it for something they have done.

438. It makes me nervous to have to wait.

439. I try to remember good stories to pass them on to other people.

440. I like tall women.

441. I have had periods in which I lost sleep over worry.

442. I do not try to correct people who express an ignorant belief.

443. I am apt to pass up something I want to do because others feel that I am not going about it in the right way.

444. I was fond of excitement when I was young (or in childhood).

445. I enjoy gambling for small stakes.

446. I enjoy social gatherings just to be with people.

447. I am often inclined to go out of my way to win a point with someone who has opposed me.

448. I enjoy the excitement of a crowd.

449. My worries seem to disappear when I get into a crowd of lively friends.

450. I like to poke fun at people.

451. Sexual things disgust me.

452. In school my marks in deportment were quite unreasonable.

453. Whatever possible I avoid being in a crowd.

454. I have stata no more often than others.

455. When I am cornered I tell that portion of the truth which is not likely to hurt me.

456. I have strong political opinions.

457. The man who had most to do with me when I was a child (such as my father, stepfather, etc.) was very strict with me.

458. I have one or more bad habits which are so strong that it is no use in fighting against them.

459. I have used alcohol moderately (or not at all).

460. I have no fear of water.

461. I would certainly enjoy beating a crook at his own game.

462. I often think, "I wish I were a child again."

463. I am often sorry because I am so cross and grouchy.

464. I have been no difficulty starting or holding my urine.

465. I have often misunderstood my intentions when I was trying to put them right and be helpful.

466. I often memorize numbers that are not important (such as automobile licenses, etc.).

467. I am often sorry because I am so cross and grouchy.

468. I have often found people jealous of my good ideas, just because they had not thought of them first.

469. I enjoy the excitement of a crowd.

470. I am inwardly pleased when they see positioning.

471. In school my marks in deportment were quite regularly bad.

472. I am often sorry because I am so cross and grouchy.

473. I have strong political opinions.

474. I have one or more bad habits which are so strong that it is no use in fighting against them.

475. I am a special agent of God.

476. When I am cornered I tell that portion of the truth which is not likely to hurt me.

477. I am a special agent of God.

478. If I were in trouble with several friends who were equally to blame, I would rather take the whole blame than to give them away.
478. I have never been made especially nervous over trouble that any members of my family have gotten into.

479. I do not mind meeting strangers.

480. I am often afraid of the dark.

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

482. While in trains, busses, etc., I often talk to strangers.

483. Christ performed miracles such as changing water into wine.

484. I have one or more faults which are so big that it seems better to accept them and try to control them rather than to try to get rid of them.

485. When a man is with a woman he is usually thinking about things related to her sex.

486. I feel like giving up quickly when things go wrong.

487. I read in the Bible several times a week.

488. I believe my sense of smell is as good as other people's.

489. I must admit that I have at times been worried beyond reason over something that really did not matter.

490. I do not try to cover up my poor opinion or pity for a person so that he won't know how I feel.

491. I have no patience with people who believe that I am trying to correct or improve.

492. I enjoy stories of adventure.

493. I prefer work which requires close attention, to work which allows me to be careless.

494. I have never been made especially nervous over trouble that any members of my family have gotten into.

495. I usually work things out for myself rather than get someone to show me how.

496. I have never seen things doubled (that is, an object never looks like two objects to me without my being able to make it look like one object).

497. It is always a good thing to be frank.

498. I readily become one hundred per cent sold on a good idea.

499. I have at times been frank.

500. I strongly defend my own opinions as a rule.

501. I have had periods when I felt so full of pep that sleep did not seem necessary for days at a time.

502. I am a high-strung person.

503. It is unusual for me to express strong approval or disapproval of the actions of others.

504. I do not mind meeting strangers.

505. I have no fear of spiders.

506. I feel sympathetic towards people who tend to hang on to their griefs and troubles.

507. I have frequently worked under people who seem to have things arranged so that they get credit for good work but are able to pass off mistakes onto those under them.

508. I believe my sense of smell is as good as other people's.

509. I sometimes find it hard to stick up for my rights because I am so reserved.

510. I am often afraid of the dark.

511. I have a daydream life about which I do not tell other people.

512. Dirt frightens or disgusts me.

513. I dislike to take a bath.

514. I like manic women.

515. In my home we have always had the ordinary necessities (such as enough food, clothing, etc.).

516. Some of my family have quick tempers.

517. I cannot do anything well.

518. I have often felt guilty because I have pretended to feel more sorry about something than I really was.

519. There is something wrong with my sex organs.

520. I am afraid of being alone in a wide-open place.

521. I am often afraid of the dark.

522. I practically never blush.

523. I am afraid of being alone in a wide-open place.

524. I have no fear of spiders.

525. I am made nervous by certain animals.

526. The members of my family and my close relatives get along quite well.

527. The future seems hopeless to me.

528. I am often afraid of the dark.

529. I would like to wear expensive clothes.

530. I am often afraid of the dark.

531. People can pretty easily change me even though I thought that my mind was already made up on a subject.

532. I can stand as much pain as others can.

533. I am not bothered by a great deal of belching of gas from my stomach.

534. Several times I have been the last to give up trying to do a thing.

535. My mouth feels dry almost all the time.

536. It makes me angry to have people hurry me.

537. I would like to hunt lions in Africa.

538. I think I would like the work of a dressmaker.

539. I am not afraid of mice.

540. My face has never been paralyzed.

541. My skin seems to be unusually sensitive to touch.

542. I have never had any black, tarry-looking bowel movements.

543. Several times a week I feel as if something dreadful is about to happen.

544. I feel tired a good deal of the time.

545. Sometimes I have the same dream over and over.

546. I like to read about history.

547. I like parties and socials.

548. I never attend a sexy show if I can avoid it.

549. I shrink from facing a crisis or difficulty.

550. I am often afraid of the dark.

551. I sometime feel that I am about to go to pieces.

552. I am afraid of being alone in a wide-open place.

553. I would like to hunt lions in Africa.

554. If I were an artist I would like to draw children.

555. I sometimes feel that I am about to go to pieces.
556. I am very careful about my manner of dress.

557. I would like to be a private secretary.

558. A large number of people are guilty of bad sexual conduct.

559. I have often been frightened in the middle of the night.

560. I am greatly bothered by forgetting where I put things.

561. I very much like horseback riding.

562. The one to whom I was most attached and whom I most admired as a child was a woman. (Mother, sister, aunt, or other woman.)

563. I like adventure stories better than romantic stories.

564. I am apt to pass up something I want to do when others feel that it isn't worth doing.

565. I feel like jumping off when I am on a high place.

566. I like movie love scenes.