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CHAPTER I

Introduction

The cornerstone of all therapeutic, experimental and clinical work in the field of psychology is the examiner. It is apparent from the literature that research in the area of examiner influence is of extreme importance since both theoretical and practical considerations refute the position that the E is a standardized non-personal stimulus, and in most practical situations it is not possible to eliminate the E from either the experimental, therapeutic or testing situation.

Thus, it becomes necessary to explore and define E variables in these situations in order to control them, make allowances for them in the interpretations of our results, or, as in the case of some psychodiagnostic testing, to utilize these variables in a dynamic, therapeutic manner (Leventhal, Slepian, Gluck, & Rosenblat, 1962).

In recent years, more and more religious women are entering the field of psychology. With them they bring their roles and the various stereotypes that accompany these roles. Since these women will increasingly be placed in testing situations, it appears necessary to assess their stimulus value as nuns as it is perceived by the subject. In other words, in a testing situation, will a
nun obtain results which are significantly different from those obtained by a laywoman?

Thus, the focus of this thesis is an investigation of the nun \( E \) versus the laywoman \( E \) as a stimulus variable in the testing situation utilizing verbal responses to a paper and pencil personality measurement.

Since the use of religious as examiners is relatively new, there have been no studies done on the effects of the religious as an \( E \), though there has been a recent study concerned with the effects of the clergyman as \( E \) (Walker & Firetto, 1964). Thus, the survey of the literature will be confined primarily to those writings and studies in areas which are tangential to the main purpose of this thesis but which, in their findings and conclusions, suggest trends in the realm of examiner influence and indicate the importance of further research along these lines.
CHAPTER II

Survey of Literature

In general, the literature can be arbitrarily divided into the following topics: psychological tests, interviews, experimental research, and therapy. These divisions will provide the organizational basis for the following discussions of the literature. Psychologists have accepted the fact that the examiner and examinee in the testing situation dynamically interact on an overt and covert level. Schachtel (1945), Schafer (1962), and Sarason (1954) have written extensively about the examinee's subjective definition of the testing situation, the often unconscious and subtle emission of cues by both the E and S, and the deep and varied motivations which are in operation determining and influencing the behavior of both.

Such E variables as race (Rankin & Campbell, 1955); sex (Alden & Benton, 1953; Binder, McConnell & Sjoholm, 1957; Ferguson & Buss, 1960; Sarason, 1962; Stevenson, 1961; Stevenson & Allen, 1964; Walker, Farrell, McCarthy & Baur, 1965; Winkel & Sarason, 1964); anxiety (Mattsson, 1960; Sanders & Cleveland, 1953; Winkel & Sarason, 1964); hostility (Sanders & Cleveland, 1953; Sarason, 1962; Turner & Coleman, 1962); physical characteristics (Binder et al, 1957; Masling, 1960; Rosenthal, 1963); prestige and status (Ekman, 1960; Prince, 1962);
adjustment (Young, 1959); and religion (Robinson & Rhode, 1946) have all been subject to investigation. Although some of the results are inconclusive, the investigators, almost without exception, indicated the need for further research in this area.

Of personality tests, the Rorschach has been the subject of the largest amount of research (Appelbaum, 1959; Berger, 1952; Campbell & Fiddlemann, 1959; Curtis, 1951; Gibby, 1952; Gross, 1959; Magnussen, 1960; Meyer, 1960; Miller, Sanders & Cleveland, 1950; Partipillo, 1961; Sanders & Cleveland, 1953; Simkins, 1960; Tobias, 1960; and Zax, Stricker & Weiss, 1960). One of these studies was concerned with the effects of an altered psychological atmosphere which the examiner produces by creating a more relaxed situation (Appelbaum, 1959). Others have investigated the status of \( E \) upon Rorschach performance (Campbell & Fiddlemann, 1959); the sex of \( E \) and sex responses (Curtis & Wolf, 1951); the variance found among psychiatric and non-psychiatric protocols as a function of different \( E \)s (Gibby, Miller & Walker, 1952); the effects of verbal and non-verbal reinforcement (Gross, 1959; Magnussen, 1960; Simkins, 1960; Tobias, 1960); and the personality of the \( E \) in relation to Rorschach responses (Miller, Sanders & Cleveland, 1950; Berger, 1954; Partipillo, 1961). Masling (1960) and Zax, Stricker & Weiss (1960) have written comprehensive survey articles on the research with projective techniques.
The examiner as an inhibiting factor on oral and written TAT stories was the subject for a study done by Bernstein (1956). Sumerwell, Campbell & Sarason (1958) studied the effects of four kinds of instructions and two different examiners on emotional tone and outcome of TAT stories. More recently (Turner & Coleman, 1962), the E traits of dominance, warmth, hostility, and shyness were assessed in an attempt to delineate examiner characteristics and their relation to Ss TAT responses. In all three investigations, particular E influences were discovered in studies with children which indicated the necessity for further research.

Stevenson (1961) found interactions between chronological age, sex of E and sex of S in the performance of a simple game, while Gordon and Durea (1948) demonstrated that E discouragement affected Stanford-Binet performance; and Sacks (1952) found that familiarity with the tester also is an important variable in Stanford-Binet testing situations. Littell (1960) in his article reviewing a decade of research with the WISC writes: "The possible effects of differences in the examiner's technique of administration is another problem area which has not received the attention it merits, as is the whole field of possibilities arising from the relation between the examiner and the child in the circumstances of the examination. This is surprising, as the importance of these variables appears to be generally assumed."

The same state of affairs is generally true of research with the Wechsler-
Bellevue for adults. Guertin, Frank and Rabin (1956) mention only one study done by Cohen in which he studied samples of W-B records obtained from 13 Es and found evidence of Es' biases which would serve to reduce reliability. The authors point to the possibility that Es' variables are the source of much of the variability of subtests.

Phares and Rotter (1956) write, "Many failures to duplicate test results both in clinical work and in experimental investigations have been ascribed to unreliability in the subjects to test instructions rather than to differences in the testing situation." Thus, they conducted a study, the results of which suggest that physical setting and the subject's characterization of the E do affect test results.

Regardless of the fact that these studies have recognized the importance of the E variable in the testing situation and have strongly urged other investigations in this area, it is quite dismaying to review the literature. One discovers a relative paucity of material. The same studies are continuously referred to as evidence, most of which have not been replicated. This is discouraging in the light of the widespread agreement, at least theoretically, on the influence of the E.

Interviewers, too, have been concerned about the Es' biases and characteristics affecting poll results. Rosenthal (1963b) offers the concept of "modeling effects," defined as "the extent to which a given experimenter's own performance of an experimental task determines his subject's performance of the
same task..." and discusses this idea, presenting evidence for its validity. A
study by Blankenship (1940) supports Rosenthal's findings in that he found that the
attitudes of the interviewers are correlated with the results they obtained.
Freiberg, Vaughan and Evans (1946), from preliminary results, feel that
interviewer bias can be reduced when many interviewers, each making a small
number of interviews, are utilized. Robinson and Rhode (1946) found considerable
evidence to support the hypothesis that different types of interviewers influence
the degree of anti-Semitism expressed in an anti-Semitism poll. Again in the
area of interviewing, the $E$ variable appears to be an important source of
influence.

Although it may not have been the subject for empirical investigation,
the clinician has always emphasized the $E$'s influence, while the experimentalist
has not. McGuigan (1963) writes, "While we have traditionally recognized that
the characteristics of an experimenter may indeed influence behavior, it is
important to observe that we have not seriously attempted to study him as an
independent variable." He further suggests that it is important to contribute to
the general fund of knowledge of the $E$ variables, since it is small at this time.
Rosenthal (1963a) concurs and adds that researchers have been slow to examine
$E$'s effects on $S$ in an experimental task, which he considers to be an important
source of response error variance. Rosenthal (1964a; 1964b) reviews and presents
evidence that an E's orientation toward the results of his research with humans and animals may partly determine his results. He discusses this idea of self-fulfilling prophesy as it is found in everyday life, clinical practice, survey research, and experimental research (1964a). He conducted research in the experimental lab, one study using the Rorschach, the other using a straightforward experimental task. The results of both experiments support his contention (1964a). He also has demonstrated and discussed the finding that subtle cues emitted by the E to both animal and human Ss may influence the data obtained (1964b).

The majority of experimentally oriented studies focus on verbal conditioning situations. Krasner (1958) reviews 31 articles reporting studies employing conditioning of verbal behavior in terms of: setting, verbal responses, reinforcing stimuli, population controls, length of therapy sessions, relationship to personality variables, results and "awareness" on the part of the S. He writes that "The majority of studies report positive results with the use of generalized conditioned reinforcers such as 'good' and 'mmm-hmm.'" Generally, the articles reviewed indicate the power behind the conditioning of verbal behavior. Such conditioning controls behavior with the most simple and yet most subtle of behavioral cues. Although we have realized that people control others by being the type of person they are, by word, gesture, and smile, these personal variables are now coming under scientific scrutiny in the experimental research,
diagnostic testing and psychotherapeutic situations (Krasner, 1950). Binder, McConnell, and Sjoholm's (1957) study using two Es of different sex, appearance and personality in a verbal conditioning situation supports Krasner's conclusions, as do Reece and Whitman's (1962) investigation of expressive movement, warmth and verbal reinforcement, and Prince's (1962) and Ekman's (1960) studies of verbal conditioning and status. Thus, our knowledge in the area of verbal conditioning appears more extensive than that in any other relevant area.

It is most apparent in the writings of Freud, the neo-Freudians (especially Sullivan), Rogers and other psychotherapists that the basis of therapy or counseling is the unique interpersonal situation involving the therapist and client. Until recently, studies which attempted to objectify or make clear what transpires in a therapy session have been scarce. Rogers has taken the lead in taping and transcribing sessions with our modern electronic equipment, such as recorders, films, etc. In their book Clinical Psychology, Sundberg and Tyler (1962) give many examples of the research. Illustrative is the study of Feidler (1950) who attempted to ascertain the differences between psychoanalysis, non-directive and Adlerian therapy through the use of recording and the Q sort. He found that therapists of different schools do not differ in their concept of the ideal therapeutic relationship. Sundberg and Tyler (1962) evaluate other attempts to do research in the area of psychotherapy, which indicate growing interest in this aspect of
psychology. At any rate, the E's influence and vital importance in this relationship is generally acknowledged. What remains is for investigators to devise methods for a careful and empirical analysis of the interaction between $S$ and $E$.

More directly related to the present thesis is a study by Walker and Fretto (1964) where the clergyman as a variable was under investigation. The purpose was to discover differences in $S$'s answers to the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, the MMPI K Scale and the MMPI L Scale. It was hypothesized that $S$s tested by a clergyman would obtain significantly higher anxiety scores and significantly lower $K$ and $L$ scores than $S$s tested by a layman. Twenty-nine male and twenty female undergraduate $S$s were used. The results partially confirmed the hypothesis with $S$s tested by the clergyman obtaining significantly higher MAS and lower $L$ score ($p<.05$). While the difference of the groups on the $K$ scale did not reach an acceptable level of significance, the difference obtained was in the predicted direction. Thus, from the literature there is some basis for expecting differences between a nun and laywoman $E$. 
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CHAPTER III

Method

Experimenters -- The two Es were graduate students in clinical psychology, one a 23-year-old Roman Catholic single laywoman and the other a 33-year-old Roman Catholic nun. The age differential was not a critical variable, as it would appear, inasmuch as the particular nun was judged by others as being considerably younger than her actual chronological age. As laywomen, the Es were dressed as graduate students, i.e., make-up, skirts and blouses or sweaters, dresses, heels. As nuns, both Es wore complete and authentic habits and were referred to as Sister.

Subjects -- The Ss in this experiment were 160 Roman Catholic undergraduate students enrolled in a general psychology course, 80 male and 80 female. They were randomly assigned to four independent groups. Both Es (a nun and a laywoman) tested 40 male and 40 female Ss; each tested 20 male and 20 female Ss as a nun and the same number as a laywoman.

Materials -- All Ss took the PRS (Walker and Nicolay, 1963) anxiety test as a group four to six weeks previous to participation in this experiment. Scores on this test, which has been demonstrated to correlate highly (r:70) with the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (Taylor, 1953), were used to match the Ss on anxiety before
they were exposed to the independent variables in this study. Someone other than
the Es administered the PRS and told the Ss that he was collecting normative data
for research purposes. The Es used a 95-item version of Taylor's Biographical
Inventory (Taylor, 1953). It consisted of a 50-item Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale
or MAS, the 30-item MMPI K Scale, and the 15-item MMPI L Scale (Hathaway and
McKinley, 1951).

Procedure -- Each S was tested individually by one of the Es in a testing
booth at Loyola University. The E introduced herself as a student in clinical
psychology working for her Ph. D. These instructions were read to the S: "I have
here a set of statements which represent experiences, ways of doing things,
beliefs or preferences that are true of some people but not true of others. I am
going to read them to you one at a time, and what I would like to have you do is
decide whether or not each is true with respect to yourself. For example, if the
statement is true or true of you most of the time, answer true; if it is not true or
not true most of the time, answer false. Answer the statements as carefully and
as honestly as you can. There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested
in the way you work and in the things you believe. Do you understand?" When the
S acknowledged comprehension of the instructions, the E proceeded to read each
item from the Inventory and recorded each T or F answer on an IBM sheet. The
E answered any questions in an unstructured manner, e.g., "interpret it any way
you like" or by referring to the introductory instructions. The E did not enter into discussion with the S during the testing. When testing was completed, the E read to S: "What I have just administered to you is a widely used paper and pencil instrument that has been given by psychologists to thousands of people across the country as a test of emotional reactions. However, the test has been typically administered on a group basis; that is, most of the time the test is taken by large groups of people sitting in a room together. Now we are beginning to do research on how people respond to this test when it is administered by a psychologist in a one-to-one relationship or a face-to-face situation, such as the one in which you have just participated. When the data are analyzed, the results will be discussed in your psychology class; and you will have an opportunity to ask any questions about this research then." The E then thanked S for his cooperation and time.

**Statistical Analysis** -- The data obtained were each subject's scores on the Taylor MAS, the MMPI K Scale, and the MMPI L Scale. Analysis of variance for a 2x2x2 factorial experiment (Edwards, 1963) was used to analyze the data obtained on each of the three scales.
CHAPTER IV

Results

Table I presents the summary of the analysis of variance of the anxiety scores.

Table I

Analysis of Variance for Sex, Examiner and Dress on Anxiety Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examiner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.599</td>
<td>.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.025</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner x Dress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.227</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.001</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner x Dress x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.023</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>63.269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error term</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>65.132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the Fs reaches a required level of significance. None of the groups under the various conditions of examiner and dress manifested differences in anxiety level. The means and standard deviations of the anxiety scores are presented
in Table 2.

**Table 2**

**Means and Standard Deviations for Anxiety Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th></th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laywoman - Nonhabit</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nun - Nonhabit</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nun - Habit</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analysis of variance of the K scores are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3**

**Analysis of Variance for Sex, Examiner and Dress on K Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examiner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.225</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.025</td>
<td>4.929*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96.099</td>
<td>5.092*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner x Dress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.025</td>
<td>2.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.601</td>
<td>3.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner x Dress x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.599</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>19.935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error term</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>18.870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(p < .05)*
Inspection of the table indicates that two of the conditions (sex of subject and dress of the examiner) reach the .05 level of significance. First of all, it was found that in this testing situation males tended to be less defensive than females ($F=5.092 \quad p<.05$); secondly, the college students in this study were more defensive to an examiner wearing a habit than to one without habit ($F=4.929 \quad p<.05$). Table 4 gives the means and standard deviations for the K scores.

**Table 4**

**Means and Standard Deviations for K Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laywoman - Nonhabit</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laywoman - Habit</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nun - Nonhabit</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nun - Habit</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analysis of variance of the L scores are given in Table 5.

**Table 5**

**Analysis of Variance of Sex, Examiner and Dress on L Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examiner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.806</td>
<td>1.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.806</td>
<td>1.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.056</td>
<td>8.626*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner x Dress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.557</td>
<td>2.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.507</td>
<td>2.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner x Dress x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.365</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>5.287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error term</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4.991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(p < .01)*
Only one interaction reached the level of significance. It was found that males lied significantly less than females in this testing situation ($F=8.626 \quad p<.01$). Table 6 presents the means and standard deviations for the $L$ scores.

**Table 6**

Means and Standard Deviations for $L$ Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th></th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laywoman - Nonhabit</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laywoman - Habit</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nun - Nonhabit</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nun - Habit</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some differences, while not reaching an acceptable level of significance, do approach such a level and suggest possibilities for future research; but only future empirical investigations can establish the reality of such trends.
CHAPTER V

Discussion

The data did not reveal significant differences between the groups on the MAS. Such findings support those of the Walker-Firetto study (1965). However, the studies are not directly comparable. There were such differences as sex of the E, size of the groups, and sex composition of the groups themselves.

The finding most pertinent to the present investigation was that college students are more defensive to E's wearing a habit. It may be that students need to cover up personal defects and troubles and feel they must appear more socially desirable to a nun because of her religious-moral or authoritarian connotations associated with the habit. It may also be that the habit makes the E seem more distant to the S, thus encouraging a more defensive response. The preceding are just speculations which must await further investigation to become more definitive.

In the study it was also found that males are less defensive than females in the testing situation. This sex difference is not to be expected on the basis of the scale itself. Dahlstrom and Welsh (1960) write, concerning the K scale, "There seems to be little need for separate norms for men and women." Why such a difference should reveal itself is unknown. It would be interesting to see if one
finds such a difference when males and females are tested by male examiners. Are males generally less defensive in a testing situation, are they less defensive only to female Es, or is this result due to the conditions of this particular study?

While Walker and Firetto (1965) found that Ss lied less to the priest E than to the lay E, the differences on the lie scale in the present study do not reflect findings similar to the previous study. Instead, differences here are based on sex of the S, with males lying less than females, regardless of the E and her attire. Dahlstrom and Welsh (1960), in discussing sex differences on the L scale, state, "There is a slight difference between the sexes which is not large enough to affect the T-score values." The difference mentioned was in the direction of those found in the present study. Perhaps testing in a one-to-one situation versus the group testing of the MMPI intensified trends and has resulted in significant differences here. As with the findings of less male defensiveness in this test situation, the reasons for this last difference remain unknown.
CHAPTER V

Summary

Eighty Ss, 40 male and 40 female, were tested by a nun in the roles of nun and laywoman, and 80 Ss, 40 male and 40 female, were tested by a laywoman in the roles of nun and laywoman. No differences were found on the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. Significant differences (p < .05) were found on the K scale: males were less defensive than females in the testing situation, and both males and females were more defensive to E's wearing a habit (p < .05). On the L scale males lied less than females in the testing situation (p < .01).
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