Negative microfilm
received from university

64–8159

FALK, Ruth Loewe, 1933–
SOME PERSONALITY DETERMINANTS OF SYMPATHY.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1963
Psychology, clinical

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

SOME PERSONALITY DETERMINANTS OF SYMPATHY

by

Ruth Falk

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Michigan
1963

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Joseph Veroff, Chairman
Professor Daniel Katz
Professor William Morse
Doctor Marguerite Smith

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank all the members of my committee for their help. Professor Joseph Veroff, in particular, was the ideal critic: patient, encouraging, generous with his time and with solutions to problems of method and content.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I. 1. Definition and Analysis of the Concept of Sympathy 1

2. Historical Review of Approaches to the Problem of Sympathy. 4

Chapter II. 1. Understanding and Separation 12

2. Affective and/or Conative Response 32

Chapter III. 1. Personality Determinants of Sympathy 35

2. The Nature of the Object as a Determinant of Sympathy. 43

Chapter IV. 1. Hypotheses 45

2. Procedure. 47

3. Measures 53

Chapter V. Results and Discussion 62

A. Interrelationships between the independent variables, i.e., the personality determinants of sympathy 64

B. Clarification of the dependent variable, sympathy 68

C. (a) Interaction between the independent variables, psychic distance and sympathy. 70

(b) Interaction between the independent variables, psychic distance and the components of sympathy. 83

Summary. 100

APPENDICES 104

BIBLIOGRAPHY 152

LIST OF TABLES

I. Coder reliabilities for tolerance of faults questions..... 56

II. Relation between tolerance of faults questions..... 57

III. Component scores of sympathy types..... 60

IV. Interrelationships among the independent variables..... 65

V. Need affiliation and tolerance of faults..... 66

VI. Defense against sex and defense against guilt..... 67

VII. Interrelationships among components of sympathy..... 69

VIII. Helping and liking..... 69

IX. Understanding and separation..... 70

X. Partition of X^2: interaction between need affiliation, psychic distance and sympathy..... 71

XI. Need affiliation and sympathy in the tape group..... 73

XII. Need affiliation and psychic distance among the type of Low sympathisers..... 74

XIII. Sympathy and need affiliation..... 75

XIV. Partition of X^2: interaction between defense against sex, psychic distance and sympathy..... 76

XV. Partition of X^2: interaction between defense against guilt, psychic distance and sympathy..... 79

XVI. Partition of X^2: interaction between complexity of interpersonal perception, psychic distance and sympathy... 80

XVII. Partition of X^2: interaction between tolerance of faults, psychic distance and sympathy..... 82

XVIII. Partition of X^2: interaction between need affiliation, psychic distance and the components of sympathy..... 85

XIX. Need affiliation and separation..... 86

XX. Need affiliation and separation among subjects exposed to greater psychic closeness (tape)..... 88

XXI. Need affiliation and helping among subjects exposed to greater or less psychic distance..... 89

XXII. Need affiliation and psychic distance among those unwilling to help..... 91

XXIII. Understanding and psychic distance..... 92

XXIV. Psychic distance and separation..... 94

XXV. Complexity of interpersonal perception and separation..... 95

XXVI. Partition of X^2: interaction between defense against sex, psychic distance and the components of sympathy..... 96

XXVII. Defense against sex and liking..... 98

XXVIII. Defense against sex and separation among those exposed to greater psychic closeness (tape)..... 99

XXIX. Interrelationships among independent variables..... 149

XXX. Interrelationships among the components of sympathy..... 151

APPENDICES

Appendix

I.	The interview with Carol	105
II.	Introduction and instructions for the personality tests	113
III.	Introduction and instructions for the interview	115
IV.	Explanatory handout to subjects	118
V.	The test of need affiliation	120
VI.	The sex defense preference test	126
VII.	Defenses represented by the captions in the sex defense preference test	128
VIII.	The method of coping with guilt test	129
IX.	Defenses represented by the captions in the method of coping with guilt test	131
X.	The complexity of interpersonal perception test	132
XI.	Code for scoring the complexity of interpersonal complexity test and questions 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the tolerance of faults test	133
XII.	The tolerance of faults test	134
XIII.	Interrelationship among "tolerance of faults" questions	135
XIV.	The personal data sheet	136
XV.	The test of separation	137
XVI.	Code for the test of separation	139
XVII.	The understanding test	140
XVIII.	The willingness to help test	143
XIX.	The liking test	144

XX. The warm-up interview with Mary Ann..... 145

XXI. The liking and understanding tests for the interview with Mary Ann..... 147

XXII. Tables of distributions for interrelationships among the independent variables..... 149

XXIII. Tables of distributions for interrelationships among the components of sympathy..... 151

CHAPTER I

1. DEFINITION AND ANALYSIS OF THE CONCEPT OF SYMPATHY

> Aus der Ferne denkt man übel voneinander. Aber zwei Menschen beisammen - wie sollten sie sich nicht wohlwollen!
>
> Nietzsche, Die Unschuld des Werdens

While there have been those who believe that goodwill between men would automatically flourish if they could meet each other nakedly face to face, others, and clinical psychologists among them, have been more cautious. More than mere confrontation of one human being with another is required for fellow-feeling to flourish. Much depends on intimate and deep-rooted desires and aversions which we awake in each other, and on habits of behaving towards each other which cut across the various ways in which we may be initially tempted to respond. Moral habits may further or hamper goodwill and fellow-feeling. The network of concepts encompassing "sympathy" overlaps with, but is not coextensive with the network of concepts called "morality". The main advantage of confining myself to sympathy lies in the relative simplicity of the concept vis a vis morality and thus the greater ease of reaching a definition agreeable to most people.

The analysis of the concept of sympathy to be adopted in this study is that of Max Scheler (56). He distinguishes three components which must be present in any response which can be properly called

sympathetic. First, it is necessary that there be a perceived separation between the sympathizer and the person sympathized with, to mark off this concept from identification and mere contagion. Second, the sympathizer must adequately comprehend the circumstances, feelings and wishes of the object of sympathy. And, third, there must be some appropriate affective and/or conative response in the sympathetic person.

The accuracy of this definition is grounded on an examination of the way the word "sympathy" is used in ordinary discourse. Sympathy has to date no place in a system of theoretical constructs which, taken together, yield the defining characteristics of the members of the system. Its meaning cannot be deduced but can only be demonstrated by an appeal to ordinary usage, by seeing whether one would necessarily call behavior which lacks one or more of the three components sympathetic. This procedure must not be confused with proposing a definition de novo for the purpose of delimiting, or merely limiting the kinds of behaviors which shall be investigated, where the only criterion for the fitness of the definition is in its usefulness for some other purpose. I am using Scheler's definition because it seems to accord best with the manner in which the word is actually used in ordinary discourse. The reasoning which leads one to distinguish three conditions for calling a response sympathetic is as follows, namely, that if one or two only were present, it would not necessarily in normal discourse be called sympathy, but something else. Separation of and by itself is clearly not called sympathy, nor is understanding alone or in combination with separation. A torturer or a novelist may well have both, as may a canny politician conning his opponent's probable tactics. Separation

and an appropriate affective and/or conative response present together leaves open whether the response might not have been caused by something quite extraneous to the situation of the unfortunate: desire for fame, habit, bribery, etc. Understanding together with an appropriate response, but without the sense that one is separate from the other does not qualify, because it does not rest on the belief that it is the pain of the <u>other</u> which needs alleviating. The explicit distinction between self and other and the feeling that it is the other who is in pain are axiomatic if one wishes to speak of sympathy <u>with</u> another.

Ordinary usage has a wider and a narrow sense of the word "sympathy": it is applied in situations where the three conditions are present, but it is also used to describe the affective component of the third condition by itself, the feelings of pity or sadness. That the word "sympathy" may be used in two ways should not obscure the difference between the two areas of human experience being denoted. To avoid confusion, the third element will be called "affective and/or conative response" for the purposes of this study, but it is acknowledged that this is synonymous with a perfectly good, narrower use.

I am assuming that the term sympathy as explicated above does in fact refer to an area of human experience; that the three components do in nature sometimes occur in conjunction and that sympathy is not an artificial aggregate of parts which exist, but only by themselves or in combination of not more than two, as described above. The contention is that individuals have in fact emphathized with another in distress, without losing the sense that this is a person separate from themselves, and have allowed what they have learned to influence their feelings and

actions in the sense of becoming imbued with loving-kindness for that other person.

2. HISTORICAL REVIEW OF APPROACHES TO THE PROBLEM OF SYMPATHY

It should be clear from the complexity of the mental operations necessary for sympathy that one cannot here speak of a simple instinct of benevolence, love, altruism or the like, present in all individuals; nor would the denial that such an instinct exists cast doubt on the fact of sympathy. A better formulation would be to say that individuals are born with a capacity to learn to distinguish between themselves and others, to learn to find out about others' feelings states in a spirit of friendly enquiry and to be moved by what they learn. Thus acquisition by learning and endowment both play a part in the development over time of the ability to be sympathetic.

There are writers who do not admit sympathy into the pantheon of human motivations. They usually rest their case on the contention that it is one's own misfortune which one is in imagination alleviating when it appears that sympathy is present. Aristotle described pity as displeasure at a threatened evil or pain which might befall oneself or a member of one's family. Nietzsche wrote that "it is only our own suffering of which we want to get rid through active pity".

The writer who has been held to be the modern originator of the egoistic theory of human motivation, Hobbes, said that . . . "pity ariseth from the imagination that the like calamity may befall himself" (32). Locke (42) and Hume (34) after him had little theoretical use for altruistic concerns, and among the European thinkers Helvetius (31),

and Feuerbach (16) held similar views.

A clear and elegant statement of the position of some eighteenth century English philosophers and divines was made by Pope (52). He enunciates the maxim that

"Self-love and reason to one end aspire,
Pain their aversion, pleasure their desire;"

and derives from this the ratio essendi of morality in general, and altruistic concerns in particular, thus,

"The same self-love, in all, becomes the cause
Of what restrains him, government and laws.
For, what one likes, if others like as well,
What serves one will, when many wills rebel?
How shall he keep, what, sleeping or awake,
A weaker may surprise, a stronger take?
His safety must his liberty restrain:
All join to guard what each desires to gain.
Forced into virtue, thus, by self-defense,
Even kings learn'd justice and benevolence:
Self-love forsook the path it first pursued,
And found the private in the public good. . . . "

"Man, like the generous vine, supported lives;
The strength he gains is from the embrace he gives."

The question may be raised; what would lead a man to doubt that there is such an intrinsic motive as altruistic sympathy? Inspection of the names listed above reveals that these are thinkers who might be placed on the tough-minded end of the continuum, in the sense that their theories may, in the main, be described as empiricist. The association of this term with "experimental" and "realistic" should not obscure the real connection which is between a certain theory of perception and an egoistic theory of human motivation. Man is conceived as essentially passive, in Locke's case, a tabula rasa, making no contribution from inside to the perception of the world which

impinges on him through his senses. Man cannot and does not seek out sensory experiences in any way, nor does he contribute to their organization. He is a totally and constitutionally disinterested subject of the objective world which alone is the source of ideas and sensations. A detailed analysis of the relation between such a theory of perception and the theories of social organization and the place of man in the world held by these thinkers is outside the scope of the present work. Not until Kant does one see a swinging away both from the view that man is essentially passive vis à vis his perceptual world and from the egoistic theory of human motivation.

In recent physiology, too, there has been recognition of the role which endogenous cortical processes play in our apprehension of the external world and our response to it. Hebb (29) considers that the brain has been too much regarded as a passive receptor, and there is an abundance of researches which substantiate his claim and remedy the disorder. For instance, Granit (26), following Ramon y Cajal, stresses the part played by cortical centrifugal fibres in energizing the visual projection areas, via the reticular formation, by producing spontaneous firing of retinal neurones, especially in the absence of stimulation from outside. So all stimuli reach an active rather than a passive surface. More generally, the work done on the effects of sensory deprivation is of interest here.

This general trend in psychology has its most explicit culmination in the writing of Schachtel (56). He distinguishes two attitudes with which one can approach both the world of objects and of persons: the need-dominated approach which sees only "objects of use" and allocen-

tric interest, or autonomous object interest, which springs from man's need to relate to the world around him, to find out about and affirm the being of objects and persons.

This theory holds that it is within man's power to bring a certain attitude to bear on one's encounter with the world of objects and persons, a willingness to participate in their mode of being. This attitude demands a studied passivity which is very different from the passivity of the empiricist approach. Schachtel describes it thus: "The allocentric turning toward the object presupposes the readiness to expose oneself (author's italics) with all one's sensibilities to its presence without shielding oneself by any of the numerous protective devices which man has at his disposal." The contention that man will be disposed to loving-kindness on a proper understanding of another person's unhappiness as a psychological necessity, a contention so problematical to the empiricist in perceptual theory, becomes more understandable on this view, since the object or person is approached from the beginning in a spirit of friendly acknowledgement, with a sense of kinship.

An account of the origins of the capacity for sympathy in its narrower affective/conative sense has been proposed by Holmes (33). Following Aristotle, he claims that altruism derives from parental care for one's young in the service of group survival, which is an instinct coeval with self-preservation. All life is concerned with the realization of two ends, the preservation of the individual and the perpetuation of the race. Egoism and altruism have their roots in these two life activities. In a similar vein, West (69) speaks of two primary

instincts in man, the aggressive and the social, of which the latter nearly always triumphs! James (35) had also found the roots of altruism in the instinct of mother love. MacDougall (45) too bases sympathy in this sense on a parental or protective instinct. He says, "It is no exaggeration to say that this one instinct is the mother of both Intellect and Morality. For, without it, Intellect could not have been evolved; and its impulse is the only truly altruistic element in Nature; and, though many philosophers have ignored the fact, the moral tradition, by which all our moral character is shaped, could never have been built without this altruistic factor". Schopenhauer (58), less sanguine about its origins, but just as convinced of its central place in ethics, spoke of sympathy or pity as "baffling and mysterious, the great mystery of ethics, its archphenomenon and the boundary stone beyond which only metaphysical speculation would dare to step".

I think that a note on the theories of Piaget (50) is called for, since one might imagine that an account of the development of the moral judgement of the child would contain a discussion of what others have thought to be the corner-stone of morality, namely, sympathy or, at least, empathy. However, his adoption of the Kantian position that an action has moral worth only insofar as it is done from a sense of duty leads him, while accepting the presence, to neglect the importance of an analysis of sympathy in social interaction.

MacDougall's concept of sympathy adds the element of awareness of the feelings of the other but lacks that of separation, according to Scheler's definition. Helping behavior is based on awareness of the feeling state of the other, through the mechanism of primitive passive

sympathy which may be found in the behavior of most of the animal species:

> "This liability or capacity, so widespread among gregarious animals, the liability to be stirred to that kind of instinctive behavior whose signs are displayed by other members of the species, I have proposed to call primitive passive sympathy. For subjectively it involves the sharing of the emotional excitements that accompany instinctive behavior. It seems to be very general in the human species; that is to say, most of the human instincts have this lock or specific adjustment on the receptive side. It is the source of many of the phenomena of crowd behavior, such as panic, the frenzied applause and frenzied anger of the mob. And it is the essential basis of the higher forms of sympathy . . . and is the basis of all higher developments of sociability".

The "lock or specific adjustment" is such that "each of several of the instincts seems to be specially adapted on the receptive side, in such a way as to be played upon by the expressions of the same instinct in other members of the species", e.g., yaps of dogs arouse the impulse of pursuit in other dogs, and, moreover, a human mother may "sympathize" with a frustrated animal mother. For MacDougall, the higher forms of sympathy then depend on contagion rather than understanding, and he nowhere lays down separation as a necessary requirement for calling a response sympathetic. His definition contains, in place of differentiated understanding of a person felt to be other than oneself, a recreation in oneself of the feeling state of the other by means of contagion.

In psychoanalytic terminology this comes to narcissistic identification, and has been described by Jekels (37). He contrasts two forms which pity may take. On the one hand he sees a masochistic feminine identification, in which the observer acquieses in the suffering of the other, which suffering is unconsciously conceived by both parties as a

punishment for forbidden impulses, usually genital ones, and also as a regressive substitute for those gratifications (cf. beating fantasies, Freud (19). No attempt is made to abolish the existent identification by separating oneself. It is this form of pity which lends itself to condemnation as a melting and resolving agent that paralyses (Montaigne) and of which one must be purged periodically (Aristotle), as one is in secret agreement with what is happening to the other (Nietzsche), and is therefore not moved to eradicate his suffering. Jekels contrasts this with a "masculine" reaction in which identification has not taken the place of object relations, and in which an attempt at separation in Scheler's sense is made in an effort to demonstrate that the one who pities refuses to participate in the object's regression and rejects the concommitant feelings of guilt and the punishment. Further, the observer feels an urge to actively help the sufferer in order to do away with the situation which tempts him to a regressive masochistic identification. The castration anxiety which underlies this second form of sympathy is, according to Jekels, the antagonist of the beating fantasy of the first form, and is a tenacious clinging to the genital stage. I would offer the following objection to Jekels' formulation. On his view, it is impossible for nonneurotic women ever to evince sympathy of the second form, as castration fears have no place in a genuinely genital libidinal organization in the female. This fear belongs to the foregoing phallic stage characterized by penis envy, and "masculine" sympathy would have to be conceived, in the woman, as an effort at denial of the absence of the male organ. There seems, therefore, to be no healthy feminine analogue to the good, active, virtuous and helpful male sympathetic reaction.

So far, then, a definition of sympathy has been stated and defended; a short account has been given of the history of thinking about sympathy, with a suggestion why the existence of this human capacity was denied by some thinkers; a general trend running through recent psychology, physiology and philosophy has been described, namely, the trend towards placing more explanatory weight for human behaviour in general and sympathy in particular on factors operating inside the person; and, lastly, one important psychoanalytic account of sympathy was stated and criticised.

CHAPTER II

1. UNDERSTANDING AND SEPARATION

The foregoing discussion was intended to round out, albeit in a schematic form, the three elements alluded to in Scheler's definition. An attempt will now be made to analyze each of these elements more closely. Ideally, each element should be treated by itself. However, since "understanding" and "separation" function to a large extent in the same conceptual network, discussion of these two will overlap to a large extent. Why this should be so is fairly obvious. The idea of understanding of another immediately raises the question of the relation, in cognitive terms, of that other to oneself. And, conversely, separation implies the existence of two persons, where a certain psychic distance obtains between subject and object. Discussion of this phenomenon cannot get off the ground unless one specifies what is or is not separated. The matter becomes even more confused when one remembers that the separation relevant to this topic is not between two persons seen as physical objects, nor between psychic attributes of these physical objects, but between two sets of psychic phenomena in the mind of the subject: ideas, feelings, etc., pertaining to himself, and those pertaining to the object, the other person.

In recent literature understanding has been studied under the heading of "empathy" and the two terms will be considered synonymous. The writer had tried to break down the discussion into two parts, first, a review of the characteristics of the phenomenon considered as a develop-

mental end-product, and second, an account of the psychogenesis of the ability to perform an empathic act. But this has proved to be impossible, as writers, in describing the mental operations which constitute an empathic act, constantly refer to earlier kinds of perceptual organizations to which the individual regresses, either voluntarily or involuntarily. A mature empathic or aesthetic apprehension is achieved by allowing oneself to regress to preconscious and more primitive modes of mental functioning in those areas which are relevant to what is to be understood, and then returning to more conscious rational thought for purposes of checking on what has been learnt and conceptualizing it in ways which can be understood by others. The second step is quite as important as the first and the distinction between a successful mature instance of empathy and an unsuccessful, immature one is seen to lie in the presence in the former of this added ingredient, and not in a radically different way of going about things from the very beginning. This is true of most theoreticians except Schachtel, where the opposite applies.

Olden (49) following classical analytic theory posits as the initial developmental stage a psychic state in the small baby in which his own feelings and those of his mother remain undifferentiated in the sense that contagion brings about the presence in the baby of the mother's feeling states. Most formulations of what happens (for instance, Sullivan's (64) description of the prototaxic mode) imply that the small baby fails to achieve separation in Scheler's sense, that is, fails in some way to distinguish inner from outer reality. But it is difficult to state in what sense this may be meant. Several models spring to mind which might serve in understanding the contention.

a) Contagion of emotion in the adult, in the sense of MacDougall's "primitive passive sympathy": the baby becomes anxious, angry or content when the mother has these feelings in the way an adult may become happy or anxious when surrounded by persons of like feelings. The distinction which is here not made may be said to lie in not seeing that one has no sufficient independent reason for feeling in this way oneself, or else, in the absence of a sufficient independent reason for feeling happy one may seek out the contagious effect, the illusion that one has such a reason.

b) Mistaking the physical source of a sensation or perception: one may be in doubt about whether the ringing in one's ears is caused by a buzzer or whether it comes from inside one's head; one may be momentarily in doubt whether a tweak of pain comes from a muscle cramp or from some sharp object. The test consists in changing one's physical locus and seeing whether the sensation persists: sensations with an internal origin cannot be got rid of in this way. In the same way, the child may not have learned to locate the cause of its feelings in the presence of the mother, to project the source of his feelings of anxiety, happiness, etc. outward and understand that the feelings he is experiencing have the same quality as those of the present object, his mother, and come from her through contagion.

c) Extending the boundaries of the self to include other objects: Lundholm (43) describes conditions in which a person's subjectively experienced self may not be coextensive with his self as experienced by others. The "O+" effect takes place when successful felt effort is

exerted in control of certain means to an end, e.g., when a crowbar is used successfully to lever a weight, the crowbar is felt to belong to the self. It is felt to be a part of the fundamental, i.e., striving, self. In the "O-" effect, which is conditioned by relaxation, certain parts of the body may be experienced as belonging to the world around. The body part may be felt to be real, or, in the case of hysteria, unreal. Chein (7) has proposed a formula by which one can demarcate the boundaries of the self at any given time, as follows: the self is that which is located between what is felt to be "in front", "behind", "to the left", "to the right", "above", and "below". That is to say, the self is that which serves as the origin of the system of fundamental spatial coordinates. This model of a vacillating body or self image does not seem appropriate for <u>understanding</u> what may be meant by failing to differentiate between one's own <u>feelings</u>, <u>emotions</u>, etc., and those of another, in the sense that those feelings adjudged to be one's own are felt to be part of one's "self". It may encourage one to draw diagrams of what may or may not be included at any one time among the furniture of the self, but it in no way clarifies the nature of the relationship between the various items.

It is unnecessary for the present purpose to analyze further what might be meant by saying that the child fails to distinguish its feelings from those of its mother. Suffice it to say that the baby's <u>earliest</u> failure may be to remain unaware of the presence of any psychic states beyond its own, to lack a "receiving power" analogous to the lack of "sending power" sometimes ascribed to children with a later schizophrenic history who were called "different" or "uninterested" by their mothers in early infancy.

It will be seen that if one takes "being aware of the feeling states of another" in the sense of paradigms a) and b), this can best describe the grossest, global states, such as fear, anxiety, anger, sadness, and perhaps some positive states like contentment, joy or elation (cf. the infectiousness of laughter). (The case of c), and the O+ effect in particular, has been the model on which theoreticians base the child's ascription of the mother's breast to its own body when feeding proceeds smoothly and successfully.)

Most recent accounts of empathy take their departure from Kris' "regression in the service of the ego" (40). Schafer (55) in his paper on generative empathy draws an explicit parallel between the therapist's attempts to understand what is going on in his patient and the aesthetic experience of someone viewing a work of art. He mentions five respects in which the two experiences are similar.

> "First, there is no uncontrollable call to action or participation as a means of discharging one's own tensions. There is no imperative need to do something to, for, or with the other person. Rather, empathy is an experience in the mind of a particular kind, a form of experimental internal action. Optimally the subject remains to a degree above his observations though not aloof from them. That the fruits of empathy may serve the needs of action is another matter. Second, a subtle and relatively conflict-free interplay of introjective and projective mechanisms occurs, enhancing the object of contemplation as well as the subject's experience; thus the relationship between the two. Preconscious or conscious experimental fantasies concerning the object and the relationship express this interplay of mechanisms. Third, the boundaries of awareness are enlarged through discovery of new forms of experience as well as recovery and clarification of past experiences. By new forms of experience I refer to new differentiations and syntheses, new distributions of intensities, and new criteria of relevance. Fourth, controlling functions of the empathizer's ego are strengthened; the process renews and advances internal mastery. A new balance of the forces active in the personal relationship is achieved on a higher level of organization than has so far been the case, and increased energy becomes available to the ego. Fifth, at least potentially, communication with the object is enhanced."

This process involves comprehension, with its cognitive and affective aspects. It involves experiencing in some fashion the feelings of another person, and it requires the "free availability of memories supplemented by the sensing or judging of similarities that make past personal experience relevant to the current situation". But, further, the therapist achieves and maintains the ensuing hypercathected internal image of the patient as a separate entity within his own ego, and not merged with it.

This description of how the therapist goes about understanding the psychic life of another person contains all the factors usually mentioned when delineating the process by which any individual learns about mental lives other than its own. Not all of the five aspects of empathy in the analyst are equally relevant and characteristic of empathy in ordinary life. The third and fourth, refering as they do to reflexive side effects of the first and second on the ego of the observer, do not concern us here.

However, Stewart (62, 63) also emphasizes the "beneficial" effects on the individual of the empathic act performed by him in attempting to understand another, and Schachtel does the same. One might regard these consequences for the observer as a candidate for an intrinsic motive for taking the trouble to understand others. A correlative line of thinking about possible intrinsic motivations for being a sympathetic person in the broader sense as defined by Scheler is suggested by Szasz (66). He makes much of a distinction, already implicit in Fenichel (15) and adumbrated by later theorists, between explicit pleasure seeking in the sense of tension reduction and an effort by the

ego at mastery of reality. In the former, which is characteristic of the infantile ego and which appears only rarely in the mature ego and then under conditions of deprivation, the pleasure is a signal of satisfaction of a primary need, and objects and persons are regarded as need-satisfiers, objects of use. In the latter, one might put it that the pleasurable sense of mastery is a signal of the fulfillment of an ego need, namely, the need for a cognitively adequate apprehension of reality and the making of a response which is adequate to this stimulus. It constitutes a reaffirmation of the ego's power to comprehend reality and to bring about an inner adjustment to what has been taken in through the senses. It does not seem farfetched to maintain that a person wants to see clearly, hear distinctly and feel and taste discriminatingly not merely because he might mistake a hawk for a handsaw, overhear the dinner bell or confuse chalk with cheese, calamities which once befell him in the past, but for the sense of being in touch with what is going on. And if this seems true of such uncomplicated, purely perceptual ego functions, it would seem just as true of the more difficult and differentiated activities associated with sympathy. Szasz restricts the motivating power of the sense of mastery to those situations which were once anxiety arousing for an individual. But this assumption does not seem a necessary one.

What would serve here as the motive in the sphere of social relationships would be analagous to the effectance motivation posited by White (70) to explain the pleasure of competence in dealing with one's physical environment. White's position rests on the same distinction now current in the literature between motives which have

tension reduction as their aim and those which subserve growth or mastery, a distinction made explicitly by Szasz (66), Maslow (46) and Goldstein (25). In the former, the pleasure is a signal of satisfaction of a primary need, Maslow's "deficiency motivation". In the latter, as I mentioned previously, one might put it that the pleasurable sense of mastery is a signal of the fulfillment of an ego need, namely, the need for a cognitively adequate apprehension of reality, both physical and social, and the making of a response which is adequate to this apprehension, Maslow's "growth motivation", or Goldstein's need for self-actualisation.

The foregoing analysis makes clear that the pleasure of Einfuhlung in the required sense is not, as Kovacs (39) suggests, simply the pleasure of abrogating the ego/nonego distinction. He sees expansion of the psychic content of what is felt to be ego ("Ichausdehnung") in hysteria as the paradigm for Einfühlung, and contrasts this phenomenon with paranoia. He says, "Beide verschieben die Ich-Grenze - nur im gegensätzlichen Sinne: die Paranoia, indem sie gewisse Gefühle der Welt, dem Nicht-Ich, zuschreibt, die Hysterie, indem sie Vorgänge der Aussenwelt in den eigenen Gefühlskreis einbezieht". The allusion is perhaps to a feature of empathy stressed by Lipps (41), namely, that the fundamental self is the striving self, the self of volitions, and affects, and that in empathy as in hysteria the wishes and feelings of another are felt to be one's own. The pleasure would thus accrue from the success of this expansion as a defensive or psychopathological manoevre, much as other analytic thinkers have considered the pleasure of sympathy to lie in its success as a reaction formation against

agression, e. g., "Even today the social feelings arise in the individual as a superstructure founded upon impulses of jealousy and rivalry against his brothers and sisters. Since the enmity cannot be gratified there develops an identification with the former rival (21).

Schafer's first aspect corresponds to Scheler's "separation": the object's problems do not become the personal problems of the observer and psychic distance is maintained between them. Bullough (5) has described this attitude. "Distance . . . is obtained by separating the object and its appeal from one's own self, by putting it out of gear with practical needs and ends . . . But it does not mean that the relation between the self and the object is broken to the extent of becoming 'impersonal' . . On the contrary, it describes a personal relation."

The second of Schafer's aspects describes the "understanding" component and it is with this process in the adult and with the first, "separation", aspect that the following discussion will deal. It must be remembered, however, that communication of gross feeling states has its place in adult understanding too, although in most cases the content of what is to be understood about the psychic state of another when the occasion calls for sympathy in Scheler's sense is fairly complicated when compared with these gross feeling states. And the mental operations required are correspondingly complicated, as a reading of Schafer's description makes clear. It will be seen how an adult learning about an intricate network of feelings in another may fail to achieve and maintain separation, as an infant learning about the gross feeling states of another may fail.

Schafer speaks of "a subtle and relatively conflict-free interplay of introjective and projective mechanisms, enhancing the object of contemplation" by means of "experimental fantasies" or "experimental internal action". What is required, then, is an understanding in excess of knowing the meaning of the words which the other person is uttering. Obviously in some cases this real understanding (to be contrasted with mere notional understanding) will be easier to come by than in others, not by virtue of any special skill in the observer but because of the nature of what is to be understood, its general familiarity or its simplicity. It is easier to understand how someone feels who has lost a glove than if he had lost a child by death, easier to understand how it feels to want to see the Mona Lisa than that mixture of fascination for and repulsion against viewing the corpses which Socrates described (52). On the other side, characteristics of the observer also facilitate or hinder real understanding. Whether the reformed alcoholic, as described by Stewart, will be able to understand how the new member of AA feels when he wants a drink will depend on how much at peace he is with his own desire to drink, and how that peace was made. Moreover, the degree of immediacy of the situation to the observer is also relevant (cf. reading the statistics about casualties in a bombing raid to hearing a first-hand report from a survivor).

Schafer's second aspect, real understanding, has been elaborated by Fliess (17) (18). He describes a non-regressive identification which, as empathy, represents a particular phase of the analyst's work. He calls it a "transient trial identification" which "enables the analyst to employ introspection on an object which, although external, has for a moment become internal". He performs for a small fraction

of time "trial acting out with smallest quantities of cathexes" and produces in himself smallest quantities of affective processes. Stewart, following Freud, terms the acting out with smallest amounts of cathexes "imitation". This activity may be compared to what an actor does when he loses himself in his role. Sarbin (53) deals in role terms with a phenomenon not unlike that described in intrapsychic detail by Fliess. He orders various manifestations according to the degree to which role and self are differentiated, as follows: 1) states of ecstasy, mystical experiences, where role and self are undifferentiated, 2) hysterias, 3) hypnosis, 4) "heated" acting, 5) technical acting where role and self are differentiated. Disregarding hypnosis, one might postulate that the more complex or unfamiliar the feelings of the other, the lower in the hierarchy delineated above must one begin when trying to understand the other's feelings, and the task is then to retrace one's steps to the psychic distance represented by 5). Sarbin points out that "the actor's self-concept and his perception of the part to which he is assigned must be congruent; if it is not, then his performance is unconvincing or he pays a terrific psychological price". In other words, if the feelings to be understood are ego-dystonic, then the observer will either fail to understand, because defenses are set in motion which prevent the recreation of the feelings in question through trial acting out, or he will experience intense displeasure, which in turn may lead to a wish to remove the upsetting condition of the other (Jekels masculine pity and Scheler's third component, an appropriate affective-conative response) or to actually break off contact with the other person (Baron Rothschild's classic remark: Throw the Schnorrer out - he's breaking my heart).

Fliess and Schafer both discuss the altered position of the super-ego in the successful empathic act. The object's separateness and individuality is maintained. This is made possible by a sublimated parental attitude on the part of the therapist, and it is the altruistic component of this counter-transference which alleviates the guilt which would be otherwise felt "while taking these otherwise prohibited libidinal and aggressive liberties in affect, fantasy and verbal interaction" (55). Schafer therefore takes the same position as Schachtel and Stewart, who posits an initial attitude of "good-will", on the question of how real understanding leads to helping behavior. There is no puzzle because the orientation is of necessity friendly from the start, or real understanding of the whole person cannot take place, but mere notional understanding or understanding of only part of the other person's feelings, wishes, circumstances, etc.

One might schematize the order of psychic events in the following fashion. An initial attitude of good will, altruism, respect for the individuality of the other; obtaining information about the other; in the form of words, as one might read or hear a script in a play, and by motor manifestations (Ehrenwald (14), Fenichel (15)); introjection, that is, acting out within the mind what is suggested by the information, introspection on the introjected and enriched object, and reprojection onto the idea of the other person. It will then be that attitude which the observing part of the ego takes to the fantasy elaboration and thence to the introjected object which will be the attitude taken towards the other's feelings, etc. In a footnote in Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego (21) Freud has said, "A path leads from identifica-

tion by way of imitation to empathy, that is, to the comprehension of the mechanism by means of which we are enabled to take up any attitude at all towards another mental life". The masochist will acquiese in the sufferings of the other because he has acquiesed in the imaginative internal enactment of that suffering. And the hypothetical case of the "pure" sadist, i.e., the person who enjoys making others suffer not because it makes him feel powerful, or masculine, or for any other consequence, but for its own sake, would also be the case of the "pure" masochist.

Examination of the steps undertaken in understanding shows that one may fail at each of the stages. One may not approach the other with a friendly desire to see him whole and as an individual, but may regard him as an object-of-need or in Kant's term, as a means and not as an end. This has as its consequence that one will only seek out certain kinds of information about him. One has a "rigid dependence on the object continuing to be in one psychological position in order to continue to be a source of (vicarious, unconscious) gratification" (Schafer, 55). Even if all the relevant information is available, one may not take account of all of it, that is, not hear or see what one does not want to perceive. Even if one does get a notional understanding of all the relevant information, one may not internally elaborate it, or only certain parts of it, and even if one does adequately clothe the bare bones of words with affective flesh and blood, one may not perform the last step, and reproject, realize that these feelings properly belong to the other.

The observer must maintain the feeling that he is separate from the other person. He must neither fail to affix the feelings elaborated in fantasy onto the image of the other person, nor attribute to him feelings of his own which have not been substantiated by checking back to the reality of the other person. These two confusions may be crudely summed up by saying that the observer must not identify with the other person, he must not feel that the other person's problems are his own nor that his own problems are really those of the other person, he must not assume an identity between his and the other person's feelings, wishes, circumstances.

The "separateness" component of the tri-partite division of sympathy is represented in past research by the multitude of studies using assumed similarity between judge and subject as a variable (e.g., studies of identification with parents). This phenomenon is not to be confused with "social distance"(Bogardus (2)), although the latter can also pave the way for projection of unrecognized undesirable qualities of the self onto members of a socially distant group and hence lead to judgements of greater dissimilarity. The notion of perceived dissimilarity does not really get at the heart of the separateness concept, however. That is to say, judgements of similarity of subject to judge are neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for lack of separateness. True separateness can be present both under conditions of perceived similarity and dissimilarity, assuming, of course, that the judgements are veridical. Where a judgement of similarity is not veridical and distorts the facts of the case, one can assume that there is a lack of separateness, but if the judgements are

veridical it is still an open question whether separateness is present.

The best set of conditions for assuming separation would, however, appear to be those where a veridical judgement of dissimilarity is made. It is hard to say why this seems to be so. It may be that under the special conditions of trying to understand how another is feeling the pull would be towards assuming similarity, and one would feel more ready to credit someone who did not assume it, where this is appropriate, with having maintained his separateness, and still question, in the case of an appropriate judgement of similarity, whether the coincidence was not fortuitous.

The case of an assumed dissimilarity which is nonveridical is particularly interesting. Experience tells one that among the factors which contribute to it are differences in colour, class, geographical distance, age differences, and perhaps sex difference. Assumed dissimilarity on essential matters seems to undercut all attempts at understanding, whether it is a result of the projection of nonacceptable traits or of an inability to overcome the barriers of class, colour, age or sex. That is, it produces the conviction that elaboration in fantasy of how one would oneself feel in similar circumstances is irrelevant in trying to understand how the other must feel, and fosters an exaggerated and inappropriate feeling of separateness. The separateness is so extreme that the necessary step of partially undoing it and setting up within the ego an image of the other person becomes impossible.

Whether a judgement of similarity or dissimilarity is veridical or not assumes a different aspect, depending on whether the objective evidence actually given is against the judgement or whether no relevant

evidence is to be had. It is also important whether the judgement is about capacities, feelings, sensations, etc., integral to the picture one has about what it is like to be a human being or even a higher living organism, or about peripheral and less deeply rooted preferences, wishes, etc. A person who did not assume that Negroes feel pain when cut would be feeling a far more radical sense of difference from them than somebody who thought that they "sing and dance incessantly and have a natural sense of rhythm. They ignore the clock and are everlasting, tumescent" (70).

Scheler's second component, understanding or an imaginative internal enactment of how one would oneself feel under similar circumstances, must issue in a grasp of how the other person is feeling and what he is thinking. He must give cash value to the words describing his internal states, both in the sense that he elaborates imaginatively on what he has learned, and that he fills the gaps in information by using his imagination tempered with reality checks. And this amounts to more than being able to predict how that other person will behave, what he will do, how he would respond on the MMPI, what he would say if asked questions. It is doubtful whether understanding and the ability to predict correctly to his future behaviour must necessarily go together, in the sense that understanding facilitates correct prediction. Gage (24), for instance, found that accuracy of prediction dropped after acquaintance with the subject, a circumstance which should increase understanding.

Most studies of empathy make use of an accuracy score which reflects the subject's ability to predict responses of various kinds

made by others. Dymond (13) required judges to make ratings on each of six five-point bipolar personality trait scales under four different conditions: self-rating by the judge, rating of subject, the prediction of the subject's self-rating and the judge's prediction of how he would be rated by the subject; and the empathic ability score was an aggregate of accuracy in all these predictions. However, if the accuracy scores consist of the summed errors of prediction of several subjects by a judge, a low score might reflect the ability to judge the modal pattern of response for the group, i.e., a sensitivity to the generalized other, to typical responses, community attitudes, etc. Bruner and Taguiri (4) also offer a criticism of criteria of accuracy where these are of a consensual kind, i.e., agreement with others about a person's characteristics. Given a systemmatic bias of judgement, a high accuracy score may mean that a particular judge shares the most common bias among his fellow judges. A similar criticism has been made by Taft (67). He considers that high correlations between accuracy, i.e., empathy and leadership, popularity, etc. are artefactual. Since judges assume similarity, the best judges are those who are similar to the group being judged.

The judgements which Dymond required judges to make point up the two streams of thought which have met to produce the plethora of studies of empathy. As Bronfenbrenner (3) points out, emphasis on recognition by the individual of other people's feelings towards him, with subsequent incorporation into the self-image as stressed by Cooley (9), Mead (47), MacDougall (45) and Freud has joined with interest in the general capacity for Einfuhlung of thinkers such as Klages (38), Lipps (41) and Scheler (57).

Mead's statement that "It is as he takes the attitude of the other that the individual is able to realize himself as a self", refering as it does to one of James' empirical selves, namely, the social self, has a direct ancestor in Hegel's "Das Selbstbewusstsein ist an und für sich, indem und dadurch, dass es für ein Anderes an und für sich ist; das heisst, es ist nur ein Anerkanntes" (30). The European line of succession proceeds to Satre (54) who said "the way to interiority passes through the other person". In The Reprieve he has Daniel say the following: "I then understood that one could not reach oneself except through another's judgement . . . Without me you would be that same unsubstantial entity that I am for myself. It is by my agency that you can at times get an occasional and doubtless rather exasperating glimpse of yourself - as you really are . . . " and ". . . he who sees me, causes me to be; I am as he sees me . . . ". This is also the theme of L'Huit Clos.

Empathic ability has been divided into sensitivity to the generalized other and sensitivity to individual differences or interpersonal sensitivity. To have one is not to have both. Another subdivision of empathy is into first-person, second-person and third-person sensitivity. First-person sensitivity is the ability to predict how others see oneself. In Bronfenbrenner's study (3) it was expressed by the correlation between the ratings received by a judge and his estimates of how the raters would rate him. Second-person sensitivity is the ability to predict subjects' self-ratings, third-person sensitivity the prediction of how one person would rate another.

That the utilization of accuracy scores must be corrected for the effects of projection in future research has been pointed out by Hastorf and Bender (27), when the method involves judges' predictions of a subject's responses. They developed a "refined empathy score" which was an empathy score corrected for similarity. And the Bronfenbrenner study claimed to have developed a pure measure of interpersonal sensitivity. These measures would furnish a corrective to studies such as that of Cowden (10), who found that empathy and projection co-exist, and that males were more empathic, i.e., were more accurate predictors of their wives' responses on a personality inventory and that they projected or assumed similarity more in that they obtained higher correlation between their own responses and their predictions.

It is not my intention to further review the literature on interpersonal perception, as the issues have been excellently covered in crucial papers by Cronbach (11), Gage (24), and Taft (67). Taft, however, makes a useful division of studies in interpersonal perception according to the methods used. He suggests five headings under which studies may be grouped, as follows: a) perception of emotional expression in photos, etc., b) rating and ranking traits, c) personality descriptions, d) personality matchings, and e) prediction of behavior and life history data. The studies mentioned so far fall into categories b) and e). Steingart (61) used a different method. He tried to assess the relationship between empathic ability and the ability to regress in Kris' sense. Regression in form and content of thoughts was measured by a dream completion test and he also used performance on finger painting as an index of regressive ability. His assessment of empathy

is of special interest. He had subjects choose among three possible interpretations of each picture of a 30 picture empathy novel. Interpretations of 24 of the drawings were consensually validated.

Mention should be made of overt role-playing as an activity which facilitates understanding. Moreno's psychodrama (48) was intended to promote catharsis and free association, but also, by the use of a role-reversal technique, to explore and correct distortions in perception of others. The more different and distant the members of the psychodrama group are, the more they are encouraged to reverse roles with each other. Culbertson (12) applied the technique to see whether role playing can change an emotionally loaded attitude, in this case, attitudes to Negros and housing integration. The finding was that it can, and that a participitant position in a role-playing session is more likely to result in change than an observer position.

I mentioned earlier that more than correct prediction of future responses is required before one can say that someone has really understood how another is feeling, and it has been seen how projection and prediction of the modal group response can complicate interpretation of accuracy scores. Another criterion for whether one has understood another's feelings, thoughts, circumstances, etc., is the kind of language one uses in describing his psychic states. Accounts can range all the way from the over-intense and hysterical (inviting the disclaimer, "Come, come, it's not as bad as all <u>that</u>"), through the cool and remote to the punitive or positively "unfeeling", such as: "What's so terrible about being blind? You can still get about, can't you?" or "I almost want to say it serves him right being totally paralyzed. What else can

he expect, speeding like that?" The positions taken here parallel the attitudes one might take to one's own misfortunes, except that a more usual first-person counterpart to the punitive is the strenuous denial that the calamity is a just punishment for some offense. "What did I do to deserve this?", however, is a remark made within a set of assumptions about the origins of misfortunes in one's own depredations. Job's complaints to God all spring from his outraged sense of justice. Therapists are familiar with distanced, intellectualized self-descriptions, as they are with the over dramatized and/or self-pitying accounts of their feelings given by those with a narcissistic hypersensitivity to psychic pain.

It is easier to make clear the characteristics of an account which a person with understanding would give of another's feelings, wishes and circumstances by saying what it is not. It is not over-intense, not intellectualized and not punitive. Even though the very same items of information may be mentioned in all four types of account, as the French say, "c'est le ton qui fait la musique".

2. AFFECTIVE AND/OR CONATIVE RESPONSE

The tone of the report about another's feelings, etc., provides a clue to the presence of Scheler's third component, namely, that the observer must have an appropriate affective and/or conative response to the other person. "Appropriate" refers to the intensity of the feeling of pity or sympathy in its narrower sense and the kind of helping behavior instituted, where this is called for. The response is considered to be a resultant of the understanding produced by the elaboration in fantasy of how the other person feels, etc. and is an

analogue of one's attitude to how one would oneself react in similar circumstances.

Feelings along this dimension can range from warmth and a sense of kinship and closeness through indifference to outright rejection and a wish to hear no more about it, as far as a punitive joy in the other's discomfiture. Likewise, the urge to help may be more or less intense, not only with respect to how <u>much</u> one is willing to put oneself out for the other, but in the <u>kinds</u> of help which one is willing to give. One may be willing to help in any way the sufferer desires, that is, having maintained a proper separation, one may want to further him in <u>his</u> chosen way out of his trouble. One's helpfulness may extend no further than aiding the person in doing what one would oneself do, or once did, in a similar situation. Or one may wish to impose a solution of a certain type on him, for instance, one may offer a pursued thief a ride to the police station to give himself up, but not a ride across state boundaries to freedom. One may be positively unhelpful, or even more of a hindrance than a help. St. Francis' licking of the lepers' sores may not have harmed them, but it was certainly not a well thought-out attempt at first aid. Again, variations here will be determined by intrapsychic factors already mentioned.

It is the presence of this "call to action" where appropriate, and this feeling of warmth and closeness which distinguishes sympathy from generative empathy in the treatment situation as described by Schafer, where the therapist has to reject all wish to be helpful except in the very special sense of making helpful interpretations. Not to feel touched by the other's unhappiness, not to feel an urge to do something

to help would indicate a kind of aesthetic distance from one's fellows, a lack of involvement with them (sometimes despite a real understanding), the assumption of a spectator position vis à vis others more appropriate to a novelist or therapist than to a civilian in human affairs.

In summary, then, certain complexes of feelings or actions may be harder to understand than others, it may be more difficult to circumvent our own guilt about the wishes being described and thus to respond warmly and helpfully, and the invitation to merge our identity with that of the speaker may need more or less resistance on our part. On the other hand, sometimes what is being conveyed comes home to us immediately; we can respond almost automatically with offers of help and feelings of pity or sadness; and a strong sense of personal identity or barriers of age, sex, nationality race or circumstance may ensure a proper separation. At any one moment in the encounter one's task relative to the three components may be hard or easy and it may be so in various combinations of tasks and degrees of difficulty.

Success or failure at each of the three component tasks may have an effect on the conduct and outcome of attempts at performing the others. For example, a feeling of warmth and a wish to help set up early in the encounter may increase one's willingness to make an effort to understand what comes next, failure to understand may lead to impatience and irritation, and overly great separation at some moment, to lack of understanding. Thus, while a cross section of status in the three components at any moment in time may show varying combinations of success and failure, the status of each of the components, singly or in combination, may interact with what the other person conveys next, to determine the configuration of the following moments in time.

CHAPTER III

1. PERSONALITY DETERMINANTS OF SYMPATHY

Among the circumstances which make it that a person will or will not feel sympathy towards another in the required sense are personality factors in the observer. The internal factors which make it that a person will react with sympathy or fail to do so when one might expect that he would are, of course, complicated and numerous if one inspects the list of possible ways one might fail at each step of the empathic process and its conative/affective sequelae. The five singled out for study are:

1) need affiliation,
2) preferred defense in the observer against the specific impulse presumed to have been active in the object of sympathy,
3) preferred method of coping with the guilt aroused by that impulse in the observer,
4) the observer's ability to see his fellows with some degree of cognitive complexity,
5) whether the observer's self-percept is weighted towards the negative or positive side, and, in general, his ability to confront weakness in himself.

1) Need affiliation, as defined by Veroff, is the need to be with and receive unconditional liking from persons whom one judges to be like oneself, on the basis of intimacy and knowledge about those persons.

This need is seen to be an intrinsic motive, to be sought for its own sake, and not as a means to the gratification of some other need. "It is the essential assumption of the theory of affiliative incentive that affiliative gratification stems from knowing that someone likes you for no specific characteristic . . . Affiliative incentives reassure the person that he is an acceptable person and that his existence is attractive to someone . . . There has to be enough shared assumptions about the world and the way it is put together for the person to know that the affiliation that the other person offers is based on legitimate conditions . . . Affiliative incentives . . . are relatively permanent and cannot be easily disrupted or manipulated by environmental shifts" (67). One might suggest that persons with a high need affiliation will feel less investment in humanity at large.

2) preferred defense in the observer against the specific impulse presumed to have been active in the object of sympathy. People differ in their capacity to make statistics bleed, as they differ in their ability to tolerate unpleasant realities in the flesh. This means that some persons use primarily defenses which shield the ego from confrontation with impulse or impulse-relevant objects, while others admit these impulses as ideas and the objects as perceptions and the defense is directed against their drive or affect concommitants. Thus the former flee from realities either internally or in fact, whereas the latter find it hard to respond appropriately and fully to perceived reality. The choice of type of defense should have some bearing on the arousal of sympathy under different conditions.

Defenses of the first type will be called "avoidance" defenses and among their number are phobic reactions, denial, regression, repression and identification with parental prohibitions. The second kind of defense will be called "mastery" defenses; examples of this defense type are projection, counterphobic reactions, intellectualization, rationalization, fantasy formation.

Operation of these various defenses should affect the chain of events outlined previously by weakening or breaking different links along the way, the severity of the impediment being determined not simply by the strength of the defense but by the psychic distance of the arousing material from the observer.

The two defense types, avoiders and masterers, correspond very roughly to a classification used by Gordon (23), who distinguished repressors from sensitizers. He found that sensitizers assumed similarity less frequently than repressors when predicting responses for a class, and differences between the two groups increased when predicting for particular individuals, a finding which corroborates Sears (59) classic finding that lack of insight is correlated with assumed similarity for that same trait, whether it was a positive or a negative trait. The Gordon study investigates as a global whole the activity which I have broken down into sequential operations, so that it is difficult to determine from this research just where the defense is having its effect. Gordon's findings were repeated by Altrocchi (1). Moreover, Cohen (8) found that avoidance defenders were rated high on self-esteem and were resistant to changes in attitude. He attributes their rigidity to the effects of the habit of

not seeing evidence which is dissonant with an ideal picture of themselves.

Defensiveness will affect not only the purely cognitive recognition of impulse-relevant and important nonimpulse-relevant features about another person, but also the elaboration in fantasy of a replica of those impulses in oneself, the degree to which these fantasies are accompanied by felt drive, the attitude which the observing ego takes to the fantasy and drive replicas and the ease with which this complex of ideas, feelings and sensations is reconnected with the idea of the other person. A few worked examples will make this clear. Phobic reactions will concentrate attention on impulse relevant features to the exclusion of others, and will make the fantasy elaboration difficult. Denial will hinder recognition of impulse-relevant features and self-arousal in fantasy. Identification with parental prohibitions will likewise hamper fantasy and certainly affect the reaction of the observing ego. Counterphobic reactions will, like phobic ones, focus attention on impulse-relevant features, make the elaboration of important nonimpulse-relevant features difficult and affect the attitude of the observing ego. Intellectualization will inhibit the arousal of the drive and affect concommitants of cognitive fantasy elements. Fantasy formation, i.e., substitution of a safe unreal substitute for the present object, should result in the addition of unrelated features to the fantasy elaboration, which would make reprojection of the fantasy complex unrealistic or difficult.

Where the problem lies in not being able to feel what one knows, psychic closeness to the material should help put meat on the bare bones

of the words. Where the danger lies in merely confronting impulse-charged material and the defense lies in not "seeing" it, the more highly charged, i.e., nearer the material, the more these defenses should come into play.

3) Preferred method of coping with the guilt aroused by that impulse in the observer. What has been said so far about interferences with the psychic events which go into sympathy has pertained mainly to the recognition and elaboration of impulse-relevant material. What has been discussed is what determines whether the internal image is elaborated and what the nature of this elaborated internal image is likely to be. Scheler's third element, an appropriate affective and/or conative response, has been shown to correspond intraphysically to the attitude which the observing ego takes to the elaborated internal image, which attitude, in turn, is determined by the guilt aroused by the impulse and the method of coping with that guilt. Fenichel (15) lists several such defenses against guilt feelings: by repression, sometimes with the help of rationalizations that the deed was necessary, projection (someone else has done it, not I), sharing the guilt (a quasi-projection), appeals for forgiveness from other people onto whom one has projected superego prohibitions, isolation and delay, reaction formations, regression as in moral masochism where conscience is sexualized again. As before, it seems that there is a group of defenses where the idea of guilt is admitted and the person is not overwhelmed by it, and a group where there is some internal flight from the idea and the feelings, or where the person is overwhelmed by affect.

The former reflects a certain tolerance for guilt feelings, the latter an intolerance.

It would seem that an inability to tolerate guilt feelings would reflect itself in rejection of the guilt-arousing internal image of the other person, in hatred for it, in a wish to be as separated from it as possible, in a disinclination to help mitigate its sufferings, i.e., in a lack of Scheler's third element.

4) The observer's ability to see his fellows with some degree of cognitive complexity. The threat of heightened anxiety may make one fail to take in certain aspects of people or situations. However, it seems that people may differ also in the general ability to see others in the round. Some never seem to get past external physical appearances, some see only how people function in social relationships with them or with others, some are so hypersensitive to others' moods and feelings that they never notice appearances or ordinary, everyday facts about their abilities, hobbies, jobs. If one is to correctly recreate in oneself the present feeling state of another person, it must be within the matrix of all that is true of that person. The same experience may affect different people quite differently. It seems unnecessary to elaborate on this obvious point, so one example will suffice. Trying to recreate the feelings behind "I'm pregnant", will require a knowledge of things like: is she married? is she happily married? has she got 10 children already? does she have a job she would hate to give up? does she like babies? is she afraid of ruining her figure? was she about to enter for the Olympic try-outs in high diving? has she got a kidney ailment? Not being able to see that there are many

aspects to a person which might be relevant may pose a bar to ever being able to work out correctly how she must feel, for it is this person in all her complexity on whom events of a certain kind are having an effect.

There is some research to back up the contention that needs affect interperson perception. Chance and Meaders (6) found that good judges, i.e., those with high predictive accuracy, scored lower on the TAT - derived needs of aggression, succorance, intraception, higher on affiliation and dominance. Persons who assumed a high similarity between themselves and others scored lower on exhibitionism, autonomy, and dominance than persons with low assumed similarity scores, but higher on deference, affiliation, succorance and order. The authors conclude: "the picture of the judge who assumes a great deal of similarity between himself and others is one of a person with a highly developed need for social interactions, although strongly tinged with dependence upon and conformity to the constraints that others impose" whereas "low AS judges . . . appear not to reject feeling different from others, but rather to value a self-picture including a number of slight deviations from behavioral norms widely accepted in this culture". This seems to boil down to: if you want to be different, you will see yourself as different, and if you don't want to, you won't! The moral for this discussion is that the wish to conform may express itself in a concentration on those aspects of people which are salient for the positive reference group.

Certain defense-drive constellations will facilitate or hamper seeing others in the round. Paranoid tendencies may make one oversensitive to others' feelings, intentions, desires, etc. relative to all that there is to know about them.

A latency age child, a boy in particular, will be almost solely interested in what others can do. The interperson perception of some oral characters seems to be completely exhausted by seeing whether people are gratifying or rejecting in their personal relations. Freud described the erotic type "whose main interest - the relatively largest amount of their libido - is focused on love . . . They are governed by the dread of loss of love" (22). Freud's narcissistic type, who has more or less preserved his primary narcissism and omnipotence and who has "succeeded in subjectively remaining independent of the external world by simply not caring"(Fenichel, 15), would seem to have in permanent form what Lundy (44) reproduced as a transitional set. He found that when a subject focused attention on himself while talking with another person he had a higher assumed similarity score and lower predictive accuracy than when he was asked to attend to his partner. The effect of such an Einstellung as character would be to lower sensitivity to all characteristics of others which did not duplicate one's own.

5) Whether the observer has the ability to confront weaknesses in himself, and, in general, whether his self-percept is weighted towards the positive or negative side. This factor was included because of the overwhelming support in the literature for the notion that self-acceptance is related to a high degree of assumed similarity of others to oneself, low self-acceptance or self-esteem to assumed dissimilarity or low assumed similarity. Conversely, Spanner (60) found that the self-favourability of a person has a significant effect on the similarity assumed by the subject. Another relevant study is

that of Halpern (28), who found that empathy was related to similarity and to the judge's satisfaction with his own behavior in the area of prediction. Assuming similarity is a device which must be used in moderation for best effect. Without some assumed similarity fantasy elaboration of how one would feel oneself under certain conditions would be otiose in trying to understand others, but too much of it may interfere with the checks and balances which refering back to the reality of the other person provides.

The completely general assumption was also made that an ability to see weaknesses in oneself connects in some way with the attitude one takes to the errors which others make and the consequences which they must then bear. How could one otherwise imaginatively rehearse what it is like to have come a cropper through one's own fault, the anger at oneself, the frustrating realization that one can blame no one but oneself? However, much will depend on whether admission to weakness goes with chronically lowered self-esteem, with chronic self-hatred or not. If it does, then the attitude of the observing ego to what has been reprojected onto the idea of the other person will duplicate the attitude to the imaginative rehearsal of one's own behavior and feelings in a similar situation, i.e., the person will feel rejection, even hatred for the unfortunate.

2. THE NATURE OF THE OBJECT AS A DETERMINANT OF SYMPATHY

The discussion so far will have made it clear that features of the person to be sympathized with can facilitate or hinder the emergence of sympathy in the observer, in ways already described. It is enough to reiterate at this point that the nature of the object may make the task

of imaginative rehearsal more difficult and the appropriate affective and/or conative response more problemmatical. Among factors which may play a part here are the kinds of impulses relevant to the feelings of the object, the familiarity or unfamiliarity of the kind of person he is and the circumstances in which he finds himself, and the degree of psychic closeness of the actual presentation of his problem to the person whose task it is to be sympathetic. Having a person in trouble actually before one poses problems for understanding, responding and keeping oneself separate different from the problems one faces when reading a report.

CHAPTER IV

1. HYPOTHESES

In summary, then, among the circumstances which make it that a person will or will not feel sympathy towards another in the required sense are:

1. internal personality factors in the observer,
2. characteristics of the person to be sympathized with (the nature of his predicament and his own reaction to it),
3. the degree of immediacy of the situation to the observer.

It has been shown how the three factors above may each exert an independent effect on the emergence of sympathy and also how they may do so in interaction with one another. This seems to be true especially for the interaction between defense type (avoidance or mastery) and degree of immediacy of the situation.

Hypothesis 1

Avoidance defenders will be more sympathetic with less immediate than with more immediate cues. It is assumed that greater defensiveness will lead to less sympathy and that the more immediate cues will call forth defensiveness in these subjects. Conversely,

Hypothesis 2

Mastery defenders will be more sympathetic with more immediate than with less immediate cues, since their problem is to clothe the verbal skeleton with affective flesh and blood.

B) The need for affiliation seems to express itself in a concern with closeness to persons in the immediate environment, with less investment in humanity at large.

Hypothesis 3a

Subjects with low need affiliation will show more sympathy under less immediate conditions than persons with high need affiliation.

Moreover,

Hypothesis 3b

Subjects with high need affiliation will do better under more immediate cues than they will do under less immediate ones.

C) Since it seems, intuitively, easier to condemn others when we read about their behavior than when we are actually faced with the pain and agitation which their actions have plunged them into, and under the assumption that an ability to see one's own faults makes for greater tolerance of the faults of others,

Hypothesis 4

Subjects with a high tolerance for faults in themselves will show more sympathy under less immediate conditions than those with a low tolerance.

In this study the experimental variable manipulated is the degree of immediacy of the situation to the observer. It is assumed that more psychic distance obtains between a person and another in trouble if he merely reads an account of what has happened and the object's feelings, than if he hears that person describing his situation and reactions to it. The object of sympathy in this study is a college girl who has become pregnant by a fellow student.

A playlet was written which purported to be a veridical interview of this student by an impartial, nondirective interviewer in a counselling setting. The playlet was acted by a dramatic arts student and an experienced clinical psychologist, who respectively took the parts of the girl and the interviewer. Listening to a tape recording of this playlet furnished the experimental condition of "nearness of psychic distance". Greater psychic distance was assumed to obtain in an accurate transcript copy of the playlet as acted, with a minimum of cues to the emotional state of the girl (e.g., a few times it was indicated that the girl was crying). A warm-up interview was also prepared in the two forms which dealt with a neutral subject, namely, a student's doubts about whether to major in education in order to be able sooner to help her husband financially, or take her preferred major, history.

The girl in the interview is in trouble because of the expression of sexual impulses. She is unhappy, anxious and distrait, and the time is spent in rehearsing possible solutions to her problems, and how other people, her family, the boy, her roommates will react when they find out. A counsellor at the Student Mental Health Clinic was consulted for typical reactions in girls who have actually become pregnant in these circumstances. (See Appendix I.)

2. PROCEDURE

Subjects

Subjects were 83 female psychology students assigned to this project from the student pool. 100 students were originally assigned and were sent cards informing them of the time and place of the experiment. There

was one volunteer. The total number of subjects was therefore 84. It was decided to use girls only as the subject matter of the enquiry did not lend itself to a mixed group.

Method

The testing was conducted in two parts and by different experimenters.

Part 1 - After a short introductory statement, the personality tests, which will be described later, were given in the following order:

1. the personal data sheet
2. the sex defense preference inventory
3. the coping with guilt inventory
4. the cognitive complexity of interpersonal perception test
5. the admission to faults test
6. the test of need affiliation

A full replica of the introductory statement, test instructions and final remarks may be found in Appendix II.

Part 2 - Subjects had previously been divided randomly into two experimental groups. The students who were to receive the typewritten account of the interview with the girl, i.e., who were to be subject to the experimental variable of greater distance, went to another room. For both groups a new set of experimenters was used. The order of administration of the tests was the same for both groups, following an introductory statement.

1. exposure to the warm-up interview (Appendix XX).
2. a set of questions similar to the questions described for the Carol interview (see Appendix XXI).
3. exposure to the Carol interview (Appendix I).

4. reactions to the Carol interview, first the separation test, then the affective/conative response test and, last, the understanding test.
5. a mopping-up statement which cleared up the deception involved in presenting the interview as veridical and presented in outline the aims and methods of the experimental session.
6. a handout was passed out which explained the purpose of the experiment in more detail.

A full replica of the introductory statement, test instructions and final remarks may be found in Appendix III, a copy of the explanatory hand-out in Appendix IV.

Much thought was given to the best order of presentation of the personality measures and the experimental material, i.e., the interview and questions. The following considerations had to be balanced:

(a) Administration of the two parts of the separation test

The personal data sheet, which served as the base line for measuring separation, had to be given as far away in time as possible from the set of similar questions about the girl in the interview. Although there were "filler" questions in both cases, they were not salient enough to affect the gestalt of either questionnaire sufficiently to remove any connection between them in the subjects' minds. The farthest possible distance in time was obtained by giving the personal data sheet first, and the questions about the girl towards the end. Of course, it might be argued that, since it would be psychologically less easy to falsify or distort facts about oneself than conjectures

about another, the personal data sheet should have been given last, and the questions about the girl right after presentation of the material about her. But there were reasons, which seemed decisive, for presenting the personality measures in the first half of the testing session.

(b) Resentment

A minor consideration was that the subjects were draftees and were probably resentful about having to give time to the study. They would be in a hurry to get home, and unless the last few tests really commanded their attention and involvement, they might skimp on answers. Personal data sheets are not the most gripping things to fill out. It was felt that the interview would carry them through to the end, with an interest that the personality measures, with their many pages of ratings and the physical labour of writing the description of their best friend, could not command. As a matter of fact, groans and sighs were heard even though the personality measures came first.

(c) Arousal

It was important that some of the tests be taken in a state of arousal of the subjects. These were the defense against sex and method of coping with guilt inventories and, of course, the measures of sympathy. For other of the tests, namely, complexity of interpersonal perception, need affiliation and tolerance to faults in oneself, it was decided to use the "resting level", and this for several reasons. If one had wanted to administer them in a state of arousal, what would one have had to arouse? In the interpersonal perception case it makes very little sense to speak of arousal at all. One can think of conditions that might hamper complexity, anxiety perhaps (which could be allayed to

produce higher complexity), or an artifically induced set to attend only to certain aspects of other people, but it is hard to see what, apart from training, might raise the optimum resting level. One could have aroused need affiliation, although whether one's method was valid would have to be the subject of a separate study. But situations where sympathy would be in place are not ipso facto situations which call forth more need affiliation or interpersonal complexity.

It was decided in this case to avoid complication and use methods which would not give rise to questions about what might have affected the three personality vectors, whether anxiety or arousal of impulse or the nature of the situation. As a matter of fact, as the three measures were taken after the tests assessing defense against sexual impulses and method of coping with guilt, there may already be some contamination of the resting level owing to the arousal of impulse and anxiety.

Observation of the behaviour of the subjects suggested that subjects were keyed up, excited and were elaborating the word "petting" used by the experimenter while giving instructions. Had these pictures and ratings of captions been presented after the interview, which dealt not just with petting, but with the story of an affair up to and including intercourse, subjects might have "gone all the way", consciously or unconsciously, when giving cash value to the word "petting". The disadvantages here would have been two-fold. First, what was being measured were the subjects' ways of coping with sexual impulses and sex-specific guilt, and not their reactions to intercourse.

Second, the implicit invitation, engendered by the picture and the "set", to elaborate on the idea of two people having intercourse, would probably have disrupted the whole session, by causing intolerable anxiety and guilt. Thus reasons of expediency and moral reasons combined to force the decision to present the personality measures first.

It was difficult to decide in which order the measures of the dependent variable should be administered. In real life encounters we seem to be constantly shifting our emphasis between trying to understand the other by means of trial acting out, with smallest amounts of cathexes, of the emotions and thoughts of the other, testing out our own responses to what has been learned, and checking back to the reality of the other person to maintain a proper separation. While there may be a gross shift of the relative amount of attention devoted to each of these enterprises as the encounter proceeds, there is surely no pure progression from one to the other.

Since there are these complex and subtle shifts, it was not possible to recapitulate the order of psychic events in the order of presentation of the measures, nor to draw any conclusions from the final scores on each of the measures about successes or failures during the presentation of the interview.

In part, reasons of expediency dictated the order of presentation. The more demanding measures were presented first and the least demanding last, i.e., making up answers out of one's imagination needs more thought and energy than reading through four paragraphs and rank-ordering them, which, in turn, is more difficult than checking alternatives.

In retrospect, then, the order of presentation of parts of the experiment and the order within the first part could have been changed with profit in only one respect, namely, the measures of need affiliation, interpersonal complexity and tolerance to faults could have been presented before the sex-defense preference and the method of coping with guilt tests.

3. MEASURES

A description of the measures will follow in this order:

A. Independent variables - personality factors in the observer
   (1) need affiliation
   (2) preferred defense in the observer against the specific impulse presumed to have been active in the object of sympathy, i.e., sex
   (3) preferred method of coping with the guilt aroused by that impulse in the observer
   (4) the observer's ability to see his fellows with some degree of cognitive complexity
   (5) admission to weakness or faults

B. Dependent variables - the three components of sympathy and a composite score based on a combination of scores for the three components.
   (1) separation, or the extent of identification with the object of sympathy
   (2) understanding of the object's feelings, wishes and circumstances

(3) affective and/or conative response

(4) the composite sympathy score

A. Independent variables

1) Need affiliation

Subjects were asked to make a "list of the ten living people I know best". They were asked to rate each of these people on 14 variables using a 7-point scale, and then to rate themselves on these variables. The summed scores of the discrepancy between self-rating and other-person rating on each of the variables formed the similarity to self score for that person. The ten persons were then rank ordered along the continuum of judged similarity to self using the similarity to self scores. This rank ordering was then compared with the ranking obtained from the Desert Island Questionnaire. Subjects were asked to rank order the ten individuals in terms of how much they would like to be with them "if you and only one other person were stranded on a desert island together where there was plenty of things to eat and no real dangers to contend with". A rank order correlation was computed from the Σd^2. Subjects with a low r were considered to be high in need affiliation since they want to be with persons whom they judge to be like them. (See Appendix V)

2) Preferred defense in the observer against the specific impulse presumed to have been active in the object of sympathy.

A picture of the amorously juxtaposed heads of two young people, male and female, was shown and subjects were given a list of 12 captions which might fit the picture. To make them acquainted with the captions they were asked to rate each caption on a 6-point scale from "extremely suitable" to "extremely unsuitable". They were then asked to rank order the captions along the dimension of suitability. Six of the captions represented avoidance defenses, six mastery defenses. Subjects were also asked to contribute captions of their own. (See Appendix VI)

The sum of the ranks for the mastery defense items was computed. A low score meant that the subject showed preference for mastery defenses, a high score meant preference for avoidance defenses. This score represents the subjects' defense preference against sexual impulses. The defense types represented by each caption may be found in Appendix VII.

3) Preferred method of coping with the guilt aroused by that impulse in the observer.

The method of assessment again utilized a picture and captions. The picture showed the worried face of a girl and subjects were told that this was the girl of the previous picture right after the petting.

The 12 captions, six mastery or tolerance, six avoidance or intolerance to guilt, expressed thoughts she might be having and subjects were asked to do with them what they had done with the captions to the first picture. (See Appendix VIII) Again, the ranks for the mastery-tolerance items were summed and a method-of-coping-score thus derived. The defense types represented by each caption may be found in Appendix IX.

4) The observer's ability to see his fellows with some degree of cognitive complexity.

Subjects were asked to write a description of their best friend which would help someone completely unfamiliar with humans, say, a man from a far-off planet, to get a good picture of a particular human being (See Appendix X).

A code was devised comprising four categories (see Appendix XI), and each item of information given by the subjects was assigned to one or other of the categories. The categories divided information into items concerned with physical appearance, with other objective characteristics, with interpersonal traits and with noninterpersonal traits and preferences. Coder reliabilities were as follows:

	% AGREEMENT
Category I	95.7
Category II	93.9
Category III	98.2
Category IV	98.5

Percent agreement for each category was calculated with the following formula:

$$\% \text{ Agreement} = \frac{2\,(\#\text{ agreements})}{\#\text{ times judge 1 scored the category} + \#\text{ times judge 2 scored the category}}$$

A subject's complexity score was arrived at as follows: a mean expected frequency for each category was found by dividing the total number of items given by four. Deviations of the observed frequency in each category from the expected frequency were squared and the total was divided by the expected frequency. If each category was used an almost equal number of times, no especial weight being put on one or other of the categories, the subject's score would be low and his complexity high. Low complexity, i.e., overemphasis on one or two categories would raise the subject's score. The last step, namely, dividing the Σd^2 by the expected frequency, was performed in order to weight the scores favourably for a larger total R. It was felt that otherwise a subject who uses three categories from seven to ten times and the fourth only twice would be unreasonably "penalized" in comparison with a subject using two categories once and two not at all.

5) Admission to weakness.

Subjects were asked four questions:

(i) How are you different from most other people?

(ii) How would you like a child of yours to be different from you?

(iii) What are your own strong points?

(iv) What are your weak points, your faults?

Question (iii) was intended as an anxiety reducing counter to Question (iv). (See Appendix XII)

Each of the questions was scored separately. The same code was used for scoring questions (ii), (iii) and (iv) as for the question assessing cognitive complexity. (See Appendix XI) Coder reliabilities were as follows, using the same formula as for the cognitive complexity question.

TABLE I. CODER RELIABILITIES FOR ADMISSION TO WEAKNESS QUESTIONS

Category No.	% Agreement		
	Question (ii)	Question (iii)	Question (iv)
Category I	87.0	85.7	88.9
Category II	92.0	98.1	98.5
Category III	96.8	99.2	97.9
Category IV	97.6	96.1	99.0

Question (i) was coded according to whether the qualities mentioned were positive or negative, in the sense of casting favourable or unfavourable light on the subject. Coder reliabilities for the two categories were as follows:

Positive	98.1
Negative	92.7

It was felt that a real ability to admit weakness or fault would mean that a subject can admit weaknesses which would be coded in categories III and IV of the code, i.e., faults in interpersonal relations and faults of character. An ability merely to admit to oneself that one has straight instead of curly hair or can't play tennis would not be

enough, although the inability to face up to these defects would also be of interest. Consequently, a scoring system for each question was devised which took into account the type of categories used, the relative preponderance of objective vs. interpersonal and "character" items mentioned, and which divided the subjects into two more or less equal groups. A subject was given a positive score for a question if the ratio of items in categories III and IV to categories I and II exceeded 1:1 and if the total number of items over all categories exceeded 2. Subjects were scored Yes or No according to the scoring system on each question, and also on Question (i), where a subject had only to mention an unfavourable aspect in which he differed from others to receive a score of Yes. Subjects received a score of 0, 1, 2 or 3, depending on how many times they scored in the right direction on questions (i), (ii) and (iv).

TABLE II. RELATION BETWEEN ADMISSION TO WEAKNESS QUESTIONS

	2	3	5
2		$X^2 = 4.28$ df = 1 $p < .05$	$X^2 = 6.38$ df = 1 $p < .025$
3			$X^2 = 3.00$ df = 1 $p < .1$
5			

Tables of distributions may be found in Appendix XIII.

The finding that the three measures of an ability to admit weaknesses in oneself are related deserves some comment. It seems that subjects who mentioned a negative aspect in which they differ from other people are also those who select a preponderance of "psychological" inter-and intra-personal over "objective" features about themselves when asked how they would like a child of theirs to be different from themselves; and these are also the subjects whose answers to the question: "What are your own weak points?" have the same character. Why the relation between the latter two questions should be weaker remains unexplained, especially since the criteria for a positive score here were similar, whereas the criterion for a positive score on the second question was, as will be remembered, the mere mentioning of any negative feature. It was mentioned earlier that one of the criteria for a positive score on questions three and five, alongside the ratio of items in the two types of category, was a numerical one, namely, that the total number of items across categories should exceed a

certain number. Perhaps, then, this second quantitative criterion, and not only the qualitative one, made a major contribution to the observed relations. In other words it could be true that, while subjects who mentioned any negative aspect in which they differ from others also mentioned the required number having the right ratio in their answers to questions three and five, it is not true that subjects who mentioned the required number (with the right ratio) to question three did so to question five. Inspection of the raw data, however, disproves this latter contention.

At any rate, since the three questions tapped the same area of experience and the relation between the three questions was of the order presented in Table III, there was sufficient justification for regarding positive scores on each of the three questions as equal in nature and therefore as additive. Subjects could thus be placed in the two categories of High Tolerance and Low Tolerance according to whether they had a total score of two or three or a score of nought or one, respectively.

B. Dependent variables

1) Separation

Subjects were asked early in the experimental session to fill out a Personal Data Sheet (see Appendix XIV) containing questions about socio-economic status, physical appearance, siblings, national origin, choice of major, etc. After exposure to the interview, subjects were asked to predict or make up out of their imagination answers to similar questions about Carol, the girl in the interview (see Appendix XV). A code was devised for the answers to the two questionnaires such that answers were compared on the basis of the similarity of the characteristics assigned to Carol to those of the subject herself (see Appendix XVI). The questions had to do with facts for which there was no evidence in the interview. A subject who scored high, i.e., where there was a great deal of similarity between characteristics assigned to Carol and characteristics of the subject herself, was considered to lack separation.

This method of assessing separation was devised for several reasons. "No evidence" questions were chosen in order to eliminate memory as a complicating factor, and neutral facts were chosen so that there would be no pull towards assumed similarity or dissimilarity stemming from the content of the questions, rather than from factors under investigation.

2) Understanding

Four accounts of what went on in the interview were written and presented to five judges, all trained clinical psychologists, who were asked to write a short characterization of each account and also to rank order them along the dimension of understanding. The dimensions

involved in these judgements were not clarified nor specified. The four accounts may be found in Appendix XVII. The opinion of four out of five judges was as follows:

ACCOUNT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	JUDGES' IDEAL RANK ORDER POSITION
1	over-involved, "hysterical", over-intense	2
2	intellectualizing, remote	3
3	punitive, moralizing	4
4	understanding without over-involvement	1

Subjects were asked to rank order the accounts according to how well they described what went on in the interview. A subject's first choice places her in one or other of the categories above.

A pre-test using free descriptions by the subjects was considered unsatisfactory, as there was very little variation in the kinds of descriptive words and phrases used. Moreover, memory and verbal ability would enter in as complicating factors.

3) Affective and/or conative response

a) conative response: Subjects were asked how willing they would be to help Carol under each of four conditions, namely, that she had an abortion, had the baby and gave it up for adoption, had the baby and kept it, or married the boy and had the baby. They were asked to check one of six alternatives for each question, which ran from "completely willing" to "completely unwilling" (see Appendix XVIII). Each question was given a score of from one to six and a subject's helping score was the sum of his scores for each condition. A subject who gained a total score of 24 would score high on helping.

What was assessed, therefore, was the subject's willingness to help Carol in whatever Carol decided to do.

b) affective response: A series of statements expressing possible feelings about Carol were presented to seven judges to rank order along the dimension of "warmth". Twelve statements were found on which there was unanimous agreement. These were ordered in a random fashion and presented to the subjects with the injunction that they should check the three sentences which best describe their attitude (see Appendix XIX). The statement checked by each subject which was furthest away from the "warmth" pole constituted his "liking" score. Subjects were asked to pick three, in order that negative subjects who felt awkward about their feelings could throw a sop to their consciences by picking a warm sentence and then feel freer to check a colder sentence.

Subjects with a score of three were those who exhibited the greatest degree of liking for Carol, a score of twelve reflected greatest dislike.

The sentences ranged from expressions of warmth and closeness, through indifference to outright rejection and punitiveness.

4) Composite sympathy score

A sympathy score was built from the four measures described below based on results to be presented in the next chapter. Initially it was thought that one could do this by simply assigning a point for every score above the median in the right direction on each of the four measures. Thus, a sympathy score of four would mean that the subject had scored above the median on all four measures, a score of three, three scores above the median and so on. However, this would mean that every score of three, two or one, never mind how composed, would be regarded as coequal with every other. But since the measures are of such different factors, the assumption of equal meaning is quite untenable. A typology was therefore constructed in the following fashion, using the median as a cutting point for all four measures.

TABLE III. COMPONENT SCORES OF SYMPATHY TYPES

	Low			Q			Doers		
Understanding	o	o	x	x			o	o	o
Liking	o	o	o	o			x	o	x
Helping	o	o	o	o			o	x	x
Separation	o	x	x	o			x	x	x
	n=6	n=2	n=9	n=3			n=4	n=0	n=4
	n = 17			n = 3			n = 8		
	Feelers			Exuders			High		
Understanding	o	o	o	x	x	x	x	x	x
Liking	o	x	x	x	o	x	x	o	x
Helping	x	o	x	o	x	x	o	x	x
Separation	o	o	o	o	o	o	x	x	x
	n=2	n=2	n=5	n=7	n=3	n=10	n=6	n=5	n=16
	n = 9			n = 20			n = 27		

Each of the columns within the major sub-divisions reflects an alternative way in which a grouping of scores can be assigned to that category. For instance, under Exuders are included subjects who (a) understand and like, but do not help nor maintain separation, (b) understand and help, but do not like nor maintain separation, (c) who understand, like and help but do not maintain separation.

It will be seen that what the low and Q group lacks is affective/conative involvement, the feelers have this, but lack understanding and

separation, the doers are affectively/conatively involved and maintain separation, but lack understanding, the exuders understand and are affectively/conatively involved, but lack separation, while the high scorers have all three.

It might be suggested that there is a serial order of events which takes place when most people are confronted with someone in trouble. First, there is an almost automatic feeling of sympathy or a readiness for sympathy in the narrower sense, then one tries to arrive at a balanced understanding of what it is all about by finding out about the feelings and circumstances of the other, in the manner described before, then one rearranges one's psychic boundaries to regain one's distance from the other. Ordering the types in this way, namely, low, Q, doers, feelers, exuders, high corresponds roughly to the order in which they miss out at the various stages of the way described above. It is, of course, possible that some members of the low and Q groups lack affective/conative involvement as a result of understanding, where this is present, i.e., their real understanding led them to reject this kind of involvement even though it might have been present at first.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings will be presented and discussed in the following order:

A. Interrelationships among the independent variables

B. Clarification of the dependent variable, i.e., interrelationships among the components of sympathy

C. (a) Interaction between the independent variables, psychic distance and sympathy

(b) Interaction between some of the independent variables, psychic distance and the components of sympathy

The choice of variables to be discussed in Section C (b) will be determined by outcomes of the interactions found in Section C (a). The hypotheses stated on page 45 will also be tested in Section C (a).

Statistics

All interactions will be tested using X^2, or, where appropriate, partition of X^2, according to Sutcliffe (65). The use of this statistic demands larger frequencies than were sometimes found. In these instances, caution should be applied to its use. Median splits will be used except in the following important cases:

(a) Understanding scores will be divided into four categories, corresponding to subjects' choice of the type of account which best reflected what had gone on in the interview. For details, see page 55.

(b) Liking scores will be divided into High, Medium and Low, as approximately one third of subjects chose statement number 4 or below, one third statement number 5 and one third statement number 6 or above.

(c) In Section C(a) sympathy will be categorised in two ways. (i) Strength of sympathy or a High-Low split will be used, with subjects classified as Low, Q, Doers and Feelers being considered Low in sympathy, and Exuders and High being considered High. Table III on page 70 shows that while Exuders have understanding and want to help and/or like the girl in the interview, they lack separation. All other subjects (except the Highs) either lack understanding alone or in combination with being unwilling to help and/or evincing a degree of unconcern or dislike of the girl in the interview. It was felt that the absence of a proper degree of separation, given all other elements are present, is not as crucial a failure in sympathy as a lack of understanding or affective/conative response, even given all other elements are present.

It may be asked why the Exuders were lumped together with the Highs into the category High in "strength of sympathy", since, strictly speaking, they did not evince sympathy according to Scheler's definition. The Highs are treated as a group apart in the analysis based on types of reactions to a situation calling for sympathy. When the reactions are not treated as simple categories, but as points along a scale with failure at one end and success at the other, then the break between Highs and Lows should come at a point where the grouping is least likely to be misleading. Where the defining characteristics consist of a conjunction of different attributes, the choice of a breaking point is

bound to be more or less subjective, as one is more likely to come across borderline cases here than where the criterion is unitary. For example, according to a set of very strict criteria one might not consider a goldfish to be a pet: one can't cuddle it, it does not fit itself into the routine of the household, it is not very responsive to conversation, one does not consider it bound to one with ties of affection. However, to disallow "goldfish" as an answer to "What pets do you keep?" would be misleading, as it comes closer to being one than not. Similarly, the Exuders come closer to being sympathisers than not, whereas for example, persons who understand and maintain separation, but react with hate and an urge to punish are quite out of the running as sympathisers.

(d) Classification of subjects into types of sympathisers as shown on page 60 will also be used. Further instances of breaks in the distribution other than the median split will be noted as they appear.

(e) The 10% level of significance will be adopted, due to the exploratory nature of this research. However, some meaningful trends at lower levels of significance (nothing greater than .25) will be noted and discussed, that is to say, trends which are not inconsistent with the theory and with other of the results. When significant results are found, or when trends are discussed, tables will be presented at the appropriate place in the body of the text; otherwise, the tables may be found in the appendices.

A. INTERRELATIONSHIPS AMONG THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Table IV shows that there was no interrelation at all at the 10% level among any of the independent variables, but there is no reason

a priori for supposing that need affiliation, complexity of interpersonal perception and tolerance of faults in oneself should be related either among themselves or to sex defense preference and guilt defense preference.

While conducting research in a relatively new area of investigation has its allures, the drawback which must be accepted is that many of the measures will not be independently validated. Such is the case with all measures of the independent variables. The question, therefore, of whether relationships between them are as shown in Table IV, or whether relations obtain, but the measures are insufficiently valid to show the true relationships, cannot be settled.

TABLE IV. INTERRELATIONSHIPS AMONG INDEPENDENT VARIABLES (1)

	need affiliation	defense against sex	defense against guilt	complexity of interpersonal perception	tolerance of faults
need affiliation		$X^2 = 0.47$ df = 1 NS	$X^2 = 0.2$ df = 1 NS	$X^2 = 0.89$ df = 1 NS	$X^2 = 2.48$ df = 1 $P < .25$
defense against sex			$X^2 = 2.21$ df = 1 $P < .25$	$X^2 = 0.66$ df = 1 NS	$X^2 = 0.25$ df = 1 NS
defense against guilt				$X^2 = 0.47$ df = 1 NS	$X^2 = 0.05$ df = 1 NS
complexity of interpersonal perception					$X^2 = 1.78$ df = 1 $P < .25$
tolerance of faults					

Tables of distributions may be found in Appendix

Let us examine the trends for possible speculations about the interrelation among the independent variables.

(i) Need affiliation and tolerance of faults

Table V shows that there is a slight negative relationship between these two personality factors. A picture of the need affiliator, as one who seeks to have the worth of his existence as a particular kind of person substantiated by the love and approval of others, will be outlined on page 84 below, and this trend is consistent with such a picture and is therefore highlighted here. If one is dependent on the approval of others close to one, one will seek to hide one's weak points, one's faults, not only from them, but perhaps also from oneself, so that it will be difficult to admit them even in a situation as anonymous as the testing session. Deliberately hiding one's faults from others is vastly facilitated by hiding them from oneself. Of course, it is possible that high need affiliators are really better people than others, or else people whose faults lie less in intra and interpersonal psychological characteristics and more in objective features and talents, i.e., their faults lie less in themselves than in their stars.

TABLE V. NEED AFFILIATION AND TOLERANCE OF FAULTS

		Tolerance of Faults: Hi	Tolerance of Faults: Lo
Need Affiliation	Hi	18	26
	Lo	22	14

$X^2 = 2.48$
$df = 1$
$P < .25$

It will be remembered that the criteria for a positive score on two of the questions relating to tolerance to faults were mixed: the necessary condition was quantitative, the sufficient condition, qualitative. It seems then that high need affiliators either have less faults of any kind, or are tighter about admitting them, or have primarily "objective" faults, or will admit them when they are objective and incapable of being hidden anyway, or in lieu faults of character which will do more damage to their acceptability in the eyes of others.

(ii) Defense against sex and defense against guilt

One might have expected more similarity within subjects, than is apparent from Table VI, between their manner of defending themselves against sexual impulses and their method of coping with the guilt aroused by sexual impulses, especially as the two categories of "avoidance" and "mastery" were so broadly conceived.

TABLE VI. DEFENSE AGAINST SEX AND DEFENSE AGAINST GUILT

		Defense against guilt	
	≈	Avoidance	Mastery
Defense Against Sex	Avoidance	23	15
	Mastery	17	24

$X^2 = 2.21$
$df = 1$
$P < .25$

It is possible, however, to construct in the imagination plausible cases to illustrate the thesis that there need be no such relation. The "naive" and frigid hysteric who allows herself to be seduced in an absent-minded moment, so to speak, and who afterwards heaps abuse and recrimination on her partner's head, or tears her hair, may be said to

illustrate the workings first of repression or denial of sexual feelings and then of projection of responsibility or self-reproach as a way of coping with the guilt, i.e., of an avoidance defense coupled with a tolerance for guilt reflected in an attempt to master it. Conversely, the enlightened blue-stocking may have intercourse with the firm intellectual conviction that it's a need no different from eating and drinking, or that the double standard is bunk, but be compulsively picking at her acne or feeling badly treated by her girlfriends, with no idea of why she does either.

There seems to be no reason a priori why a person must use the same defense against different impulses or affects. Why then, should one expect that the two qualitatively different experiences of sexual arousal and guilt about sexual arousal be defended against by one and the same means?

B. CLARIFICATION OF THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

In the chapter which dealt with the definition and analysis of the concept of sympathy the point was made that not all three components of what is called "sympathy" in ordinary discourse must always be present together. Examples were presented of cases where two of the three occurred in combination, and where one would not want to apply the term "sympathy" to the experience and behaviour in question. It was also suggested that the affective and conative aspects of what may be called the sympathetic response do in fact vary together. Moreover, the claim was made that sympathy as defined by Scheler is not an artificial aggregate having no counterpart in reality. The experi-

TABLE VII. INTERRELATIONSHIPS AMONG COMPONENTS OF SYMPATHY (1)

	Understanding	Helping	Liking	Separation
Understanding		$X^2 = 1.77$ df = 3 NS	$X^2 = 3.16$ df = 6 NS	$X^2 = 4.36$ df = 3 P < .25
Helping			$X^2 = 12.08$ df = 2 P < .005	$X^2 = 0.00$ df = 1 NS
Liking				$X^2 = 0.43$ df = 2 NS

(1) All tables of distribution not shown in Section B may be found in Appendix XXIII.

mental results bear out all three contentions. The three components do sometimes occur together, but not necessarily (see page 60, Table III), and there is a strong relation between a person's feeling warmth for another and wanting to help the other, as Table VIII clearly shows.

TABLE VIII. HELPING AND LIKING

		Liking		
		Hi	Med	Lo
Helping	Hi	20	15	10
	Lo	5	14	20

$X^2 = 12.08$
df = 2
P < .005

There was a trend for understanding and separation to be related. Of the three subjects who chose the "punitive" understanding account, all three were highly identified. (See Table IX)

TABLE IX. UNDERSTANDING AND SEPARATION

Understanding	Separation: Hi	Separation: Lo
Balanced	17	13
Over-involved	9	5
Intellectualised	21	15
Punitive	0	3

$X^2 = 4.36$
$df = 3$
$P < .25$

But one cannot draw any unequivocal conclusions about psychic structure from this, as the numbers are negligible and, moreover, all three cases occurred in the "tape" group. It can be seen from Table XXIV, p. 94, that the tape produced higher identification across all groups, and it may be that greater psychic closeness produced both punitiveness and higher identification, but independently of each other. The general effects of greater psychic closeness on the components of sympathy will be discussed in Section C (b).

C. (a) INTERACTION BETWEEN THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES, PSYCHIC DISTANCE AND SYMPATHY

The interactions between need affiliation, defense against sex, defense against guilt, complexity of interpersonal perception and tolerance of faults on the one hand, and psychic distance and sympathy assessed both according to strength and type on the other, are presented in the large tables below. Some of these tables can be used to test the hypotheses and these will be discussed in the appropriate places.

TABLE X. PARTITION OF X^2 INTERACTION BETWEEN NEED AFFILIATION, PSYCHIC DISTANCE AND SYMPATHY

(1) STRENGTH OF SYMPATHY

(A) Psychic Distance	(B) Need Affiliation	(C) Sympathy Strength	
		Hi	Lo
Tape	Hi	11	11
	Lo	12	6
Written	Hi	12	6
	Lo	11	11
X^2	Source	df	P
2.02	A B C	1	$<.20$
0.44	A B	1	NS
0.00	A C	1	NS
0.00	B C	1	NS

(2) TYPES OF SYMPATHY

(A) Psychic Distance	(B) Need Affiliation	(C) Sympathy Types				
		Low and Q	Doers	Feelers	Exuders	High
Tape	Hi	7	1	3	4	7
	Lo	3	1	2	9	3
Written	Hi	2	3	1	3	9
	Lo	6	3	2	4	7
X^2	Source	df	P			
4.34	A B C	4	NS			
0.44	A B	1	NS			
6.04	A C	4	$<.25$			
3.22	B C	4	NS			

(i) Need affiliation, psychic distance and sympathy

Table X on page 71 may be used to test Hypotheses 3a and b, which read:

Hypothesis 3a: Subjects with low need affiliation will show more sympathy under less immediate conditions than persons with high need affiliation.

Hypothesis 3b: Subjects with high need affiliation will show more sympathy under more immediate conditions than they will under less immediate ones.

The general contention was that high need affiliation results in a high investment and involvement in persons in one's immediate psychological circle, with less to spare for those outside this circle; so that, the psychically closer the other person, the more will a high need affiliator be interested in performing the mental operations necessary for a successful sympathetic response. Persons low in need affiliation should do neither better nor worse under conditions of psychic closeness. It does not seem, however, that need affiliation has the effect described above. If anything, it is reversed where strength of sympathy is concerned.

Neither hypothesis was confirmed using strength of sympathy or types of sympathisers. However, an interesting exploratory finding can be noted. Subjects who were very High or very Low in sympathy tended to have high need affiliations. Considering Doers, Feelers and Exuders to constitute a Median group, and comparing the high need affiliators with the low need affiliators on three strengths of sympathy within the Tape group, the X^2 was 8.94 which, with df 2,

TABLE XI. NEED AFFILIATION AND SYMPATHY IN THE TAPE GROUP

		Need Affiliation	
		Hi	Lo
Sympathy	Hi	7	3
	Med.	8	14
	Lo	7	3

$X^2 = 8.94$
df = 2
$P < .025$

yields a p value of $< .025$. (See Table XI) The element which is consistently absent in Low sympathisers and present in High sympathizers is affective/conative involvement. While separation and understanding are always present in High sympathizers, they may or may not be present in Low sympathizers. However, since affective/conative involvement is also present in all of the intermediate types, it cannot be this alone which is either augmented or reduced by high need affiliation when subjects are brought psychically close to the experimental material. The relationships must be thought of in this way, namely, that high need affiliators tend to be either emotionally uninvolved or, when they are involved, to be able simultaneously to keep their distance and understand what is going on. They often do not take the first rudimentary steps towards warming to another with whom they are not already immediately involved but when they do, they still do not "go overboard" and lose their sense of separateness or their sense of proportion about what is going on. And this effect is most pronounced when the immediacy of the circumstances forces them to take some sort of psychic

stand. The performance of high and low need affiliators on each of the components of sympathy which go to make up the various types and under each of the experimental conditions will be discussed in Section C (b).

Let us inspect the sympathisers who are Low in type, thus excluding from Table X two subjects in the group listening to the tape who were low in need affiliation, and who belonged to the Q. type. Table XII shows that it was an effect of the tape to push high need affiliators towards lack of sympathy, whereas exposure to greater psychic distance did the same for low need affiliators. A discussion of this finding will be found in Section C (b) (i).

TABLE XII. NEED AFFILIATION AND PSYCHIC DISTANCE AMONG THE TYPE OF LOW SYMPATHISERS.

		Psychic Distance	
		Tape	Written
need affiliation	Hi	7	2
	Lo	1	6

$P < .025$ according to Fisher's Exact tables.

Table XIII shows that when one compares sympathizers who are High in type with all others on their degree of need affiliation, there is a slight trend for subjects high in need affiliation to be High in sympathy. Arguments will be presented in Section C (b) (i) for the claim that, had the girl in the interview been in trouble which did not stem from her contravention of the generally accepted moral code, the relation between need affiliation and sympathy in general might have been somewhat stronger.

TABLE XIII. SYMPATHY AND NEED AFFILIATION

		Need affiliation: Hi	Need affiliation: Lo
Sympathy	High	16	10
	All Others	24	30

$X^2 = 1.44$
df = 1
$P < .25$

(ii) Defense against sex, psychic distance and sympathy

Table XIV on page 76 may be used to test Hypotheses 1 and 2, which read:

Hypothesis 1: Avoidance defenders will be more sympathetic with less immediate than with more immediate cues.

Hypothesis 2: Mastery defenders will be more sympathetic with more immediate than with less immediate cues.

The two hypotheses, one being the converse of the other, may be tested by referring to the same table. And the hypotheses are confirmed at the .05 level when subjects' sympathy is categorized according to strength, although no significant differences appeared when subjects were classified according to types of sympathizers.

It does seem as if subjects who deal with their sexual strivings by avoiding the idea and the impulse become more "threatened" when the external representations of idea and impulses are brought psychically closer and that this leads to a decrease in the combined ability to understand what is going on, to feel warm and helpful and to maintain separation. It also seems that subjects who tend to avoid the impulse

TABLE XIV. PARTITION OF X^2: INTERACTION BETWEEN DEFENSE AGAINST SEX, PSYCHIC DISTANCE AND SYMPATHY

(1) STRENGTH OF SYMPATHY

(A) Psychic Distance	(B) Defense Against Sex	(C) Sympathy Strength	
		Hi	Lo
TAPE	Sex Avoidance	10	11
	Sex Mastery	13	6
WRITTEN	Sex Avoidance	12	8
	Sex Mastery	8	12

X^2	Source	df	P
3.82	A B C	1	<.05
0.00	A B	1	NS
0.00	A C	1	NS
0.00	B C	1	NS

(2) TYPES OF SYMPATHY

(A) Psychic Distance	(B) Defense Against Sex	(C) Sympathy Types				
		Low and Q	Doers	Feelers	Exuders	High
TAPE	Sex Avoidance	8	1	2	3	7
	Sex Mastery	2	1	3	8	5
WRITTEN	Sex Avoidance	4	2	2	5	7
	Sex Mastery	6	4	2	2	6

X^2	Source	df	P
4.66	A B C	4	NS
0.00	A B	1	NS
6.04	A C	4	<.25
2.04	B C	4	NS

only, but not the "denatured" words referring to the impulse, will be helped to become understanding, warm, helpful and maintain separation by a closer confrontation with the problems of the other.

Consequently, one might speculate that the effects of certain kinds of propaganda will be different depending on the choice of defense. After the discovery of what had been done in the German concentration camps films were made which showed the mounds of corpses and the sick, emaciated bodies of those who had remained alive. It was thought that bringing these facts home to people by means of the directest possible representations would arouse sympathy and work as a deterrent. Similarly, photographs of mutilated bodies and smashed cars are displayed with the same hope of inducing careful driving. One might cast doubt on whether this method of direct confrontation works equally well with everybody. In the concentration camp case, much may depend on the way in which the viewer defends against his aggressions, fears, masochism and guilt. If they are dealt with by avoidant means, such direct confrontation may simply intensify the use of avoidant defensive manoeuvres, and lead to an increased wish to get away from, forget and have no internal commerce with the disturbing images and thoughts. People who have the words for mastering and describing their impulses may respond well to having their cognitive containers filled with experiential content. Further research might be directed at investigating whether the positive finding for Hypotheses 1 and 2 can be repeated with impulses other than the sexual one. One should note the relevance of Cohen's finding reported on page 37, that avoidance defenders were resistant to changes in attitude

owing to a rigidity born of the habit of not seeing evidence which is dissonant with an ideal picture of themselves.

(iii) Defense against guilt, psychic distance and sympathy

It remains unclear why Hypotheses 1 and 2 were not confirmed when defense type against guilt about sexual impulses was used to divide subjects into avoiders and masterers. The lack of any significant interactions in Table XV on page 79 does suggest that the hypothesis is wrong.

It may however be that the test did not validly assess the method of coping with guilt. But perhaps method of coping with guilt was not measured in a state of sufficient arousal. No "transgression" had taken place analagous to the "arousal" of impulse represented by the picture and the captions for the sex defense test. Better results may have been obtained if the guilt defense test had been administered after exposure to the experimental variable, which carried an invitation to the subjects to identify with the girl in her fall from chastity. But arguments have been given earlier why this would not have been feasible. One can assume that every time sexual impulses are aroused, however minimally, there is a concomitant upsurge of guilt, where the disposition to feel guilty exists at all. But it may be questioned whether such guilt was strong enough to be accurately reflected in the measure. Guilt may also have been mitigated by the presence of many other people in the room, who could be presumed to be sharing the secret sexual enjoyment. In theory, method of coping with guilt should have been measured with the subjects in smaller groups or in isolation and under conditions of sharper arousal.

TABLE XV. PARTITION OF X^2: DEFENSE AGAINST GUILT, PSYCHIC DISTANCE AND SYMPATHY

(1) STRENGTH OF SYMPATHY

(A) Psychic Distance	(B) Defense Against Guilt	(C) Sympathy Strength	
		Hi	Lo
TAPE	Guilt Avoidance	11	9
	Guilt Mastery	13	8
WRITTEN	Guilt Avoidance	12	9
	Guilt Mastery	10	10
X^2	Source	df	P
0.53	A B C	1	NS
0.00	A B	1	NS
0.04	A C	1	NS
0.00	B C	1	NS

(2) TYPES OF SYMPATHY

(A) Psychic Distance	(B) Defense Against Guilt	(C) Sympathy Types				
		Low and Q	Doers	Feelers	Exuders	High
TAPE	Guilt Avoidance	5	1	3	6	5
	Guilt Mastery	5	1	2	7	6
WRITTEN	Guilt Avoidance	3	3	3	4	8
	Guilt Mastery	5	4	1	3	7
X^2	Source	df	P			
0.54	A B C	4	NS			
0.00	A B	1	NS			
6.04	A C	4	$<.25$			
1.00	B C	4	NS			

TABLE XVI. PARTITION OF X^2: COMPLEXITY OF INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION, PSYCHIC DISTANCE AND SYMPATHY

(1) STRENGTH OF SYMPATHY

(A) Psychic Distance	(B) Complexity	(C) Sympathy Strength	
		Hi	Lo
TAPE	Hi	12	9
	Lo	12	8
WRITTEN	Hi	14	8
	Lo	8	11
X^2	Source	df	P
1.95	A B C	1	< .25
0.00	A B	1	NS
0.04	A C	1	NS
0.22	B C	1	NS

(2) TYPES OF SYMPATHY

(A) Psychic Distance	(B) Complexity	(C) Sympathy Types				
		Low and Q	Doers	Feelers	Exuders	High
TAPE	Hi	5	1	3	8	4
	Lo	5	1	2	5	7
WRITTEN	Hi	4	2	2	4	10
	Lo	5	4	2	3	5
X^2	Source	df	P			
3.05	A B C	4	NS			
0.00	A B	1	NS			
6.04	A C	4	< .25			
1.46	BC	4	NS			

Perhaps also, one should have used a different dimension of people's responses to guilt. Instead of finding out about subjects' method of coping with guilt feelings and using this as the basis for prediction, one might have studied their attitudes to punishment for sexual impulse and license, or, more basically, the amount of guilt called forth at all. It is probably this latter factor, acting in concert with method of coping and attitude to punishment, which helps determine whether sympathy is present or not, and in which of the three components the person falls down.

(iv) Complexity of interpersonal perception, psychic distance and sympathy.

Table XVI shows that there were no significant interactions between these variables.

(v) Tolerance of faults in oneself, psychic distance and sympathy.

Table XVII on page 82 may be used to test Hypothesis 4 which read:

Hypothesis 4: Subjects with a high tolerance of faults in themselves will show more sympathy under less immediate conditions than subjects with a low tolerance.

This hypothesis was not confirmed either. Perhaps there is no general ability to admit to faults in oneself, but only specific abilities to admit to particular kinds of faults. Admitting to faults which had no relevance to any aspect of the situation described in the interview would not then serve as a proper basis for prediction and might muddy what relationships did exist between the admission to situation-relevant faults and the occurrence of sympathy. In that case, subjects should have been questioned about actual or wished for

TABLE XVII. PARTITION OF X^2: TOLERANCE OF FAULTS, PSYCHIC DISTANCE AND SYMPATHY

(1) STRENGTH OF SYMPATHY

(A) Psychic Distance	(B) Tolerance of Faults	(C) Sympathy Strength	
		Hi	Lo
TAPE	Hi	14	11
	Lo	10	6
WRITTEN	Hi	13	7
	Lo	10	12
X^2	Source	df	P
1.12	A B C	1	NS
0.58	A B	1	NS
0.00	A C	1	NS
0.10	BC	1	NS

(2) TYPES OF SYMPATHY

(A) Psychic Distance	(B) Tolerance of Faults	(C) Sympathy Types				
		Low and Q	Doers	Feelers	Exuders	High
TAPE	Hi	7	3	1	7	7
	Lo	3	2	1	6	4
WRITTEN	Hi	3	1	3	4	9
	Lo	6	3	3	3	7
X^2	Source	df	P			
3.79	A B C	4	NS			
0.57	A B	1	NS			
6.04	A C	4	$<.25$			
0.60	B C	4	NS			

transgressions against what they felt to be the sexual mores, and they should have been asked whether the girl in the interview had offended against their own moral code. On the other hand, the ability to admit faults in a general or specific way may not be a relevant factor in determining whether a person will or will not evince sympathy for another.

The failure to confirm most of the predictions calls for explanation. The cause must lie in one or more of the following: the methodology and measurement procedures were inadequate, or the predictions were incorrect, or the predictions do not hold for the kind of problem presented to the subjects. It will be argued that the findings relating to need affiliation may have been slanted by the sexual content and moral implications of the scrape into which the girl in the interview got herself. But it is also quite clear that suspicion must rest squarely on the measures, most of which are new and unvalidated, and on the order of presentation, which was left uncontrolled.

(2) INTERACTION BETWEEN THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES, PSYCHIC DISTANCE AND THE COMPONENTS OF SYMPATHY

Responding sympathetically is an activity which calls for a team of psychological capacities. And after the game has been won or lost, the enthusiast will go back and analyse the manner in which the members of the team acquitted themselves: their success or failure to contribute to that smooth working together which makes for a paradigmatic performance. Similarly, in this section I shall deal with the members of the sympathy team (the ability to understand, maintain separation, like and help) and try to determine the effects on them individually

of the conditions under which they were functioning (the kind of problem, personality variables and psychic distance).

The discussion in the previous section of the interaction of need affiliation and defense against sex with psychic distance and sympathy suggests that there may be significant interactions between these independent variables and the components of sympathy. These two personality factors were chosen for further study both because the results so far have provided leads which can be followed up in this more precise analysis, and because theoretical speculation suggests that they may have a differential effect on understanding, helping, liking and separation under the two experimental conditions.

(i) Need affiliation, psychic distance and the components of sympathy

The results are presented in Table XVIII (a), (b), (c) and (d) on page 85. The relation of need affiliation to separation under each of the experimental conditions (sub-table (d)) and its implications for a finer analysis of need affiliation in its relation to helping (sub-table (b)) will be discussed before a general presentation on page 92 of the effects of the experimental variable alone on each of the components.

Table XIX shows that subjects high in need affiliation tend, in general, to be high in separation. Table XI on page 73, and the discussion following, showed that high need affiliators who were exposed to the tape were either very high or very low in sympathy, i.e., tended to maintain separation either alone or in combination with understanding and an appropriate affective and/or conative response.

TABLE XVIII. PARTITION OF X^2: INTERACTION BETWEEN NEED AFFILIATION, PSYCHIC DISTANCE AND THE COMPONENTS OF SYMPATHY

(a) UNDERSTANDING

(A)	(B)	(C) Understanding			
		1	2	3	4
TAPE	n.aff. Hi	7	7	5	3
	n.aff. Lo	9	3	6	0
WRITTEN	n.aff. Hi	7	1	10	0
	n.aff. Lo	6	3	13	0

X^2	Source	df	P
1.73	A B C	3	NS
0.44	A B	1	NS
12.23	A C	3	< .01
0.87	B C	3	NS

(b) HELPING

(A)	(B)	(C) Helping	
		Hi	Lo
TAPE	n.aff. Hi	12	10
	n.aff. Lo	10	8
WRITTEN	n.aff. Hi	12	5
	n.aff. Lo	9	13

X^2	Source	df	P
2.22	A B C	1	< .25
0.44	A B	1	NS
0.18	A C	1	NS
0.78	B C	1	NS

(c) LIKING

(A)	(B)	(C) Liking		
		Hi	Med	Lo
TAPE	n.aff. Hi	8	6	9
	n.aff. Lo	6	8	3
WRITTEN	n.aff. Hi	6	7	5
	n.aff. Lo	4	8	10

X^2	Source	df	P
3.22	A B C	2	< .25
0.44	A B	1	NS
0.53	A C	2	NS
1.01	B C	2	NS

(d) SEPARATION

(A)	(B)	(C) Separation	
		Hi	Lo
TAPE	n.aff. Hi	13	9
	n.aff. Lo	4	14
WRITTEN	n.aff. Hi	15	3
	n.aff. Lo	14	8

X^2	Source	df	P
4.42	A B C	1	< .05
0.44	A B	1	NS
4.82	A C	1	< .05
4.14	B C	1	< .05

This suggests that separation among high need affiliators as measured in this study may be a phenotype for two different kinds of motivations: a genuine acknowledgement of the separateness and differentness of "the other" based on respect and warm acceptance, or a defensive withdrawal from any sense of kinship with a bad girl who is in sex trouble.

What follows is intended to apply to whatever subjects were moved by defensive withdrawal to separate themselves from the girl in the interview, and may also serve as an explanation for the findings presented in Table XII, namely, that the tape tended to push some high need affiliators towards lack of sympathy.

TABLE XIX. NEED AFFILIATION AND SEPARATION

		Need Affiliation	
		Hi	Lo
Separation	Hi	28	18
	Lo	12	22

$X^2 = 4.14$

$df = 1$

$P < .05$

It seems that the optimum psychological milieu for a proportion of high need affiliators is one of disengagement, of emotional elbow-room. Certainly, this seems to be how one could sum up their behaviour in this study. Yet a caution is in order before accepting this highly contradictory and somewhat baffling finding. This is not how one intuitively pictures the high need affiliator. One sees her as a gregarious, involved, friendly, intense kind of person, one who thrives

in close, intimate relations and who tries to create them when they are absent. But perhaps she has a rigid, conforming side too, an anxious dependence on the good opinion of those around her.

Perhaps, speculating further, she is the person who in childhood created a similarity between herself and her family by internalizing their standards, interests and judgements about who is or is not a worthwhile person. Perhaps her high need affiliation is partly a continued search for ever-renewed vindication of the existence and worth of herself as a particular kind of person, a vindication which is needed to quiet guilt about impulses and opinions of hers which do not conform to what has been required of her. Another possible assumption is that a closely knit family, where much love and appreciation is shown to the children, is the best breeding ground for the high need affiliator, and that this type of family is also the one where the Oedipal conflict will be more intense and therefore subject to a more drastic resolution. Whatever the overt feelings of the parents about the expression of impulses which make up this conflict, still, the nature of the parent-child relationship will tend to foster inhibition in this area of personality. The high need affiliator will then in later life tend to seek out persons of like persuasion and wish to be accepted by them, both as a continued affirmation of what she has accepted as right and proper and as a reassurance to herself that the rewards of her childhood (approbation and love) are still hers by right of <u>what</u> she is.

The effect of the tape in general was to decrease separation. (See Table XVIII for details). The high need affiliators, however, reversed the trend, as Table XX shows.

TABLE XX. NEED AFFILIATION AND SEPARATION AMONG SUBJECTS EXPOSED TO GREATER PSYCHIC CLOSENESS (tape)

		Separation	
		Hi	Lo
Need affiliation	Hi	13	9
	Lo	4	14

$X^2 = 4.10$
$df = 1$
$P < .05$

It must be that, for them, closer confrontation with a sexual transgressor almost present in the flesh, instead of making it more difficult to disentangle the "me" from the "you", provoked an urge to disaffiliate themselves as strongly as possible. Her presence in the spirit only, via a written account, was already more threatening to them than to the low need affiliators.

Let us examine the trend for the interaction X^2 (ABC) for need affiliation, psychic distance and helping.

It should be true, in general, that persons with high need affiliation should evince a strong desire to help others, and among subjects exposed to the written version of the interview, this seems to be the case. It may not be simply because they want to help for its own sake, but because they get a kick-back of love and approval from the recipients of their good turns, and this kick-back re-affirms

their worth as human beings. If this is the case, their helping behaviour would not necessarily spring from liking, and it seems from Table XVIII (c) that there is in fact no relationship between liking and need affiliation. The motive sequence in high need affiliators then seems to be <u>not</u> "I want to help you because I like you", but "I want to help you because I want <u>you</u> to like <u>me</u>".

But let us examine the relationships separately under the two conditions of psychic distance. Table XXI shows that need affiliation is related to helping under psychic distance, but not under psychic closeness.

TABLE XXI. NEED AFFILIATION AND HELPING AMONG SUBJECTS EXPOSED TO GREATER OR LESS PSYCHIC DISTANCE

(a) WRITTEN

Need affiliation	HELPING: Hi	HELPING: Lo
Hi	12	5
Lo	9	13

$X^2 = 2.22$
df = 1
$P < .2$ (two tailed)
.1 (one tailed)

(b) TAPE

Need affiliation	HELPING: Hi	HELPING: Lo
Hi	12	10
Lo	10	8

$X^2 = 0$
df = 1
NS

What is likely to happen, then, when such a person is not just reading about, but is far more intimately confronted with someone who has violated accepted sexual codes? She will be faced with a situation where it is within her power to obtain the love and approbation of someone

who is beyond the pale, morally speaking, that is, she may get the positive regard of someone who does not thereby reaffirm some of the values that she, if she is a high need affiliator, holds and her worth in holding them. Who wants to be loved and admired by Adolf Eichmann, for whatever reason, from one's views about the equality of man to one's skill at knitting? To be loved by him would mean an insult to the whole intimate complex of self-feelings which is summed up in the word "me". Even capacities, values or qualities which are peripheral to one's experienced "Sosein", which are not among the first rank of the defining characteristics of one's self, are still seen as intimately constituting one's mode of being. And to have even any one of them affirmed by a person whose worth one repudiates awakens a wish to repudiate it in turn, as it represents for the moment some component of the mode of being of the other. When the "leader of the opposition" starts agreeing with one, one wonders whether one was right after all.

If this seems, intuitively, to be to some extent true of everyone, how much more must it be true of someone who relies heavily for her own sense of being worthwhile on the love and approbation of those who affirm her being this particular kind of person. It has been seen that closer confrontation with the girl in the interview led to greater disengagement, to a greater sense that they are different on the part of high need affiliators, in contravention of the general trend for closeness of presentation to make for closer identification. Perhaps the closer and more flagrant representation of "badness", in the sense both of sexual transgression, and of anxiety, misery and anger, provided by the tape, also lowered the willingness of the high need affiliators

to do what would bring them the love of someone whom they would not want to resemble, and whose approbation would therefore be anathema. In that case, it should be true that among those who were unwilling to help the girl in the interview, there should be more high need affiliators in the tape group than among the written group. Among the low need affiliators the trend should be in the opposite direction, as the effect of the tape by itself would be to heighten the immediate arousal of the wish to help. Table XXII confirms this hypothesis.

TABLE XXII. NEED AFFILIATION AND PSYCHIC DISTANCE AMONG THOSE UNWILLING TO HELP.

		Tape	Written
Need affiliation	Hi	10	5
	Lo	8	13

$X^2 = 1.83$

df = 1

P < .1 (one tailed)

It may be, then, that the nature of the problem of the girl in the interview and her reaction to it has slanted the relationship of need affiliation and separation; and that where the high need affiliator is confronted with someone who is not prima facie unlike him, nor an object of disapprobation, he may, as Chance and Meaders (6) found, tend to assume similarity more than the low need affiliator. The low need affiliator in this study tended to approximate characteristics of the girl in the interview to facts about herself. That is to say, either she did not mind assuming similarity with someone

like the girl in the interview, in an effort to understand her feelings, wishes and thoughts, or she felt a hidden kinship anyway with a girl in her situation. The low need affiliator's readiness to assume similarity did not, in fact, produce more understanding than the high need affiliator's reluctance to do so, as Table XVIII (a) shows. Thus the higher assumed similarity seemed to have less a purpose, namely, to get a better understanding, than a cause. The cause may be a dispositional one, in the general readiness of low need affiliators to assume similarity when faced with anyone who is free in impulse expression. It may also be that the particular impulses being expressed by the girl in the interview exerted a pull towards feeling like sisters above as well as under the skin.

(ii) Psychic distance and understanding.

The table from which the AC interaction in Table XVIII (a) was calculated shows quite transparently just where the experimental variable had its effect on the kind of understanding evinced by subjects in the two groups.

TABLE XXIII. UNDERSTANDING AND PSYCHIC DISTANCE

		Tape	Written
Understanding	Balanced	17	13
	Over-involved	11	4
	Intellectualised	11	25
	Punitive	3	0

$X^2 = 12.23$
$df = 3$
$P < .01$

The most dramatic discrepancies are in rows 2, 3 and 4. It seems that the tape made subjects over-involved and punitive, the written version encouraged intellectualization. If the kind of words and phrases one chooses to describe the feelings of another are any index to the depth and kind of understanding one has, and if it seems safe to conclude that greater psychic closeness to the material facilitates deeper understanding, then the tape did, in fact, confront the subjects more intimately with the thoughts, feelings, wishes and circumstances of the girl in the interview. The larger number of subjects in the tape group who chose the over-involved account were actually correctly reflecting a note of hysteria, which the actress portraying the girl injected into her rendition of the script.

This finding, taken together with the next, thus provides a validation of what were assumed to be the degrees of psychic closeness represented by the two experimental conditions.

(iii) Psychic distance and separation

Table XXIV shows that the tape made subjects more identified with the girl in the interview in the sense that they imagined her to be like themselves when it came to objective features about her for which there was no evidence in the interview itself. The girl became assimilated to themselves, in that they ascribed their own characteristics to her. No falsification of reality was involved: the subjects neither made nonveridical judgements about the girl nor about themselves. They merely filled in the gaps in their internal image of the girl with the stuff of self, whereas subjects who read the interview used some foreign matter.

Lest it be thought that assimilating the image of the girl to themselves led in and of itself to higher understanding, it should be noted that there was no relation between separation and understanding. This is true for the two groups regarded separately and for the group as a whole.

It remains unproved whether the tape would affect identification in equal measure in the face of evidence to the contrary, that is to say, whether psychic closeness would lead to actual falsification or distortion of given facts. It may not. It certainly did not lead to misidentification of the emotional key in which the interview was pitched, except in the case of those subjects who chose the punitive account.

TABLE XXIV. PSYCHIC DISTANCE AND SEPARATION

		Tape	Written
Separation	Hi	18	29
	Lo	24	13

$X^2 = 4.82$
df = 1
$P < .05$

(iv) Psychic distance, separation and complexity of interpersonal perception

Table XXV shows that while in the group as a whole, there is a trend for "complex" subjects to lack separation, in the tape group alone the relation is significant at the 1% level. It seems, then, that when they are asked for objective facts about the girl in the interview, the tape forced highly "complex" subjects to use information about themselves to

round out their picture of her. This reflects a real investment in objective as well as psychological features. To make the girl true to life in all respects, they used real life material closest at hand. Perhaps the tape presentation created a level of salience of psychic attributes of the girl which could best be matched on the objective side by using material with a similarly high reality-charge, i.e., material about oneself.

TABLE XXV. COMPLEXITY OF INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION AND SEPARATION

(a) WRITTEN

Separation \ Complexity	Hi	Lo
Hi	15	14
Lo	8	5

$X^2 = 0.07$
df = 1
NS

(b) TAPE

Separation \ Complexity	Hi	Lo
Hi	6	12
Lo	15	8

$X^2 = 2.89$
df = 1
$P < .1$

Among subjects with low complexity some erred either by over-emphasising psychological inter- and intra-personal attributes or by over-emphasising objective features. In the former, there is no drive to create a rounded internal image by adding objective features which cohere among themselves; and features about oneself tend to do this. It is easier to pull answers out of the hat when one doesn't particularly care what the outcome will be. In the latter, reproducing features about themselves of a type most salient to the subjects may have threatened them with too high a degree of similarity in the

TABLE XXVI. PARTITION OF X^2: INTERACTION BETWEEN DEFENSE AGAINST SEX, PSYCHIC DISTANCE AND THE COMPONENTS OF SYMPATHY

(a) UNDERSTANDING

(A)	(B)	(C) Understanding			
		1	2	3	4
TAPE	Sex Avoidance	9	3	5	2
	Sex Mastery	8	6	6	1
WRITTEN	Sex Avoidance	7	1	13	0
	Sex Mastery	5	2	11	0

X^2	Source	df	P
0.03	A B C	3	NS
0.00	A B	1	NS
12.23	A C	3	< .01
2.05	B C	3	NS

(b) HELPING

(A)	(B)	(C) Helping	
		Hi	Lo
TAPE	Sex Avoidance	9	10
	Sex Mastery	13	8
WRITTEN	Sex Avoidance	11	10
	Sex Mastery	9	9

X^2	Source	df	P
0.66	A B C	1	NS
0.00	A B	1	NS
0.18	A C	1	NS
0.09	B C	1	NS

(c) LIKING

(A)	(B)	(C) Liking		
		Hi	Med	Lo
TAPE	Sex Avoidance	3	6	10
	Sex Mastery	12	7	2
WRITTEN	Sex Avoidance	3	9	9
	Sex Mastery	7	5	6

X^2	Source	df	P
2.82	A B C	2	< .25
0.00	A B	1	NS
0.53	A C	2	NS
11.56	B C	2	< .005

(d) SEPARATION

(A)	(B)	(C) Separation	
		Hi	Lo
TAPE	Sex Avoidance	11	8
	Sex Mastery	7	14
WRITTEN	Sex Avoidance	13	8
	Sex Mastery	13	5

X^2	Source	df	P
2.39	A B C	1	< .25
0.00	A B	1	NS
4.82	A C	1	< .05
0.29	B C	1	NS

respects most important to them. Again, the nature of the girl's problem may have slanted the finding in the direction reported above.

(iv) Defense against sex, psychic distance and the components of sympathy

All interactions are tabled on page 96. Significant relationships between understanding and separation and psychic distance have already been discussed.

Table XXVII documents the finding that using avoidant defenses produces low liking for the girl in the interview. The statements high on the liking scale reflected feelings of warm involvement, the wish to participate in the girl's troubles, to be close to her. And it is precisely this awareness of kinship which the avoider is constrained to defend herself against, as it involves at least a notional recognition of the presence of like impulses in herself. Mastery defenders, by definition, can admit as an idea that they have sexual feelings, and can therefore assent verbally to statements which carry the implication that one is a bird of the same feather, instead of a horse of a different colour. Moreover, liking, wanting to be close, feeling a warm concern for someone, rests on the belief that that person is a fit object of one's friendly efforts. When that person is in trouble, lack of concern or even of interest springs from a disengagement which is already punitive. Letting someone stew in their own juice is not so far from feeling triumphantly that they had it coming to them. Mastery defenders are less prone to do either.

TABLE XXVII. DEFENSE AGAINST SEX AND LIKING

		DEFENSE	
		Avoidance	Mastery
Liking	Hi	6	19
	Med.	15	12
	Lo	19	8

$X^2 = 11.56$
df = 2
P < .005

It may also be that avoidance defenders are less able to feel they are sisters under the skin to any girl who manifests the particular gamut of emotions expressed in the interview. In other words, perhaps emotionality repels them, whereas mastery defenders are not put off by crying and expressions of panic, anger and despair. This second explanation for the negative relationship between sex avoidance and liking would accord well with what has been said about the confirmation of Hypotheses 1 and 2, on page 75 above, namely, that avoiders may become threatened when brought face to face with any material which arouses unpleasant emotions. They may withdraw from any internal or external involvement with the disturbing perceptions, images or thoughts.

Table XXVI (d) shows that Gordon's (23) and Altrocchi's (1) finding that repressors assumed similarity more frequently than sensitisers was not repeated. In fact, whereas it appears from Table XXIV that the effect of the tape on the group as a whole was to decrease separation and increase assumed similarity, the avoidance defenders reversed this trend when one compares their performance on exposure to

the tape with that of the mastery defenders. It seems that avoidance defenders force themselves to maintain separation, as they have a greater stake than do mastery defenders in banishing all imputations of external similarity to someone who so vividly represents the impulses they are defending against. Table XXVIII shows that there is a significant relationship between defense against sex and separation under tape conditions. No such relationship occurs under written conditions.

TABLE XXVIII. DEFENSE AGAINST SEX AND SEPARATION AMONG THOSE EXPOSED TO GREATER PSYCHIC CLOSENESS (tape)

		Separation	
		Hi	Lo
Defense Against Sex	Avoidance	11	8
	Mastery	7	14

$X^2 = 4.5$
$df = 1$
$P < .05$

Perhaps the findings here are not comparable because the judgement of similarity here was about non-impulse-relevant features only. The surface sense of dissimilarity shown by avoidance defenders may hide a tendency to assume similarity about impulse-relevant features. Conversely, though mastery defenders are more ready to admit the girl in the interview into their shoes, they still may not confound Sears' (58) finding that when it comes to impulses, insight is some safeguard against unwarranted assumption of similarity.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The theory about the nature of sympathy and the mental operations involved in evoking a sympathetic response in oneself, which was developed in the first chapters, determined the choice of personality factors to be studied in the experiment proper. Five factors (need affiliation, defense against sex and sex-specific guilt, complexity of interpersonal perception and tolerance of faults) were chosen, each of which could be thought to make a crucial contribution to a person's ability to gather the facts about another's troubles, maintain a sense of separateness from the other person, and yet respond to him with warmth and a wish to help. It was suggested that not only the nature of the other person's problem could affect someone's ability to perform the relevant mental operations, but that the immediacy of the material to be understood and responded to could interact with psychological predispositions of his to bring about success or failure. And the four hypotheses were drawn from this latter contention.

It was found that the five personality factors were not significantly interrelated among themselves. The immediacy of the material did have an effect in and of itself on the subjects' performance on two of the components of sympathy. While no relation could be found among subjects' understanding, ability to maintain separation and their affective/conative response, liking and a wish to help were significantly related.

Of the four hypotheses, only that one was confirmed which predicted effects of type of defense against sexual impulses and psychic distance of the material on the emergency of sympathy. It was found, however, that need affiliation interacted with psychic distance to produce significant

variations in the ability to maintain separation and the wish to help. High need affiliators were better able to maintain separation, from whatever motive, than low need affiliators, but, on closer confrontation with the problems of the girl in the interview, high need affiliators were less helpful than low need affiliators. Choice of defense type against sex had similarly significant effects on liking and separation, with avoidance defenders evincing less liking than mastery defenders, but being better able, again for whatever reason, to maintain separation under conditions of greater psychic closeness than could mastery defenders.

It would seem, then, that turning to a high need affiliator when one is in kind of trouble into which the girl in the interview got herself, would prove a mixed blessing. While one could be grateful for the lack of over-involvement in one's problem which one would encounter, it might be that one would be trying to convey one's misery through a screen of cold indifference to someone who only wishes to dissociate herself as much as possible from what one is telling her. And the more closely the high need affiliator was brought up against one's problem, the less one could expect any positive help from her. Both the sins and virtues of the high need affiliator in such a situation would seem to be those of omission.

It should be remembered that high need affiliation as measured in this study is merely the wish to be with and receive unconditional approval from others <u>whom one judges to be like oneself</u>. The low need affiliator is not necessarily a distant, self-sufficient, unfriendly creature. In fact, she may be just as gregarious and giving as anyone.

But she chooses her friends according to another standard. She likes to be around people who are different from herself. And this propensity seems to go with an urge to step into the other's shoes, to identify with the other person, at least in a situation like the one presented in the interview. The closer the confrontation, the less can this urge be resisted, but the wish to help is greater here than in the high need affiliator.

Choosing a confidante for one's troubles, who defends against her sexual feelings by avoiding them, is fraught with similar hazards. As in the case of the high need affiliator, one would not be faced with the task of helping the sex avoider disentangle herself from too great an identification with one, but one would be for her the object of indifference or outright rejection and punitiveness.

What one wants from someone to whom one turns when in trouble are warmth, understanding, and help, all offered with the sense that one is accepted as a person in one's own right. The high need affiliator and the sex avoider both fail in some measure to deliver the goods.

It was suggested that one's task relative to the three components of sympathy may be made difficult or easy, not only by the nature of the situation up for our assessment and response, but by the psychic closeness of the material. In particular, understanding and the ability to maintain separation were differentially affected by hearing the tape and reading the written version of the interview. Psychic distance encouraged the use of neutralized jargon to describe the experience of the sufferer; greater closeness led subjects to cast their impressions

in words pregnant with emotive force.

"Denn eben wo Begriffe fehlen,

Da stellt ein Wort zur rechten Zeit sich ein."

That is, where true understanding is lacking, mere words will spring in to fill the gap.

And the psychically closer the sufferer, the more is one tempted to step into his shoes, to identify with him, even in ways not germane to his problem.

The experimental results thus bear out the theoretical discussion of Chapters I to III where it was shown how complex a task confronts one when the situation calls for sympathy, and what diverse qualities of mind and heart are needed by anyone who sets himself to be warm, understanding, helpful and yet maintain a proper separation. The intellect and the emotions must function together in a shifting and subtle balance to produce a response which comes from the <u>whole</u> person, so that it will be impossible to distinguish where the heart is speaking and where the mind. Sense tempers sensibility; sensibility infuses reason with motive power.

In his Dissertation upon the Nature of Virtue, Bishop Butler describes the "moral faculty" in general in very much the same words. And that segment of morality which I, following Scheler, have called sympathy can also be summed up, in Butler's apt phrase, "as a sentiment of the understanding, or as a perception of the heart, or, which seems the truth, as including both".

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I

Interviewer: Come in Carol, sit down won't you, yes, over there will be fine . . . Certainly you can smoke. Now, tell me what brought you here.

Carol: Well, there's this boy I've been seeing, and oh, I just don't know what to do . . (cries) . . . I can't sleep, it's just horrible and I can't do my assignments . . .

Interviewer: Yes?

Carol: Oh, in the beginning it was so nice, we had lots of fun, but now since I'm in this trouble . . .

Interviewer: Trouble?

Carol: I've missed my period two times now and I just know . . . (cries)

Interviewer: You think you're pregnant?

Carol: I know I am and what am I going to <u>do</u>? I think I'll go crazy thinking about it. What happened? Why couldn't he have been more careful? It's just awful.

Interviewer: Well, let's see what thoughts you've had about what you could do.

Carol: You mean, like get rid of the baby, get an abortion? But I don't know anyone and every time I think about it I just feel sick and start to cry - I just can't stop crying and the girls ask me what's wrong and I

might get an infection or something, and anyway, it sounds so sordid to get an abortion.

Interviewer: Now let's see what would be the alternatives to having an abortion. I'm sure you've thought about that.

Carol: Well, I could get married I suppose, but I don't really want to - Jack's a lot of fun and we had good times, but now I don't think I really love him. I suppose you think that's awful and sometimes I do too, to sleep with someone and then find out you don't love him . . .

Interviewer: I think if we're going to try to help you make a decision that you feel you want to stick with, it will be very important to be clear about your feelings about Jack. How about if you told me something of how you got together.

Carol: Well I first met Jack because a friend of mine gave him my name to call, and I wasn't too enthusiastic because there are all kinds of jokes about what blind dates are, that they are so ugly and awful-looking and dull company, but he was very handsome and lots of fun and we had a lovely time. I hadn't been to many parties before and we went to his fraternity to a party. And then he called back and we started seeing each other quite a bit . . . he lives in an apartment and he has a roommate, and sometimes we used to go over there and sometimes the roommate was

there and sometimes he wasn't and (cries) I guess we started necking quite a lot and petting some and, well, I hadn't been out with too many fellows before and it was all so new and (cries) I just hate to say this - everyone would think I was awful - but I enjoyed it, I really did. . . . . .

Interviewer: Yes, go on

Carol: Well with all this petting and necking . . . well, he wanted me to . . . go to bed with him and . . I was scared and I really didn't know because I didn't know if I really loved him and I used to think you should love someone first . . . but he said, well he said that . . . that was sort of silly and childish and that lots of girls were doing this and he is a Senior. And my mother said that you never give in to temptation unless you <u>want</u> to, and so I suppose . . . . . and well, one night it just sort of happened (cries) and once it happened it kept on happening. And then, and then, I found I wasn't getting enough work done because instead of going to the library, I would go over to his apartment almost every night and I was doing hardly anything else . . . and I thought I'd flunk out, but I wanted to see him very much and I guess I couldn't stop from going over there. And, you know, I'd just about decided to ease up on things, I really had . . . And now . . . It just isn't fair.

Interviewer: Yes, all these things are very upsetting to you and I can see you must be feeling all sorts of things and having all kinds of worries.

Carol: I feel so mixed up about it, I just don't know what to think.

Interviewer: Yes, go on.

Carol: Sometimes I just don't think it's fair and sometimes I think I deserve it and I tell myself it would never have happened if I had controlled myself better and if Jack hadn't made me do it, but then I think I have a right to have a good time, and if other girls do it it can't be so bad. But then I think it's really wrong to sleep with someone before you're married. I just don't know, I just don't know - everything goes round and round in my head . . . And then I worry that it shows that I'm going to have a baby, but I know it can't show yet, but when it does (cries).

Interviewer: Well, lets talk some more about what you could do besides have an abortion or get married. Have you thought about just having the baby? What do you feel about that? You know I'm not making any recommendations to do one thing rather than another. I just want us to have all the possible alternatives before us and think about all of them.

Carol: Well I could get married, I guess . . . or else . . sometimes girls go away and just have the baby and give it away for adoption. But you read that girls think they're going to give the baby away and then after it's born they can't part with it, so I don't know if I really had a baby if I could give it up, and I'd always wonder about where it was and who was taking care of it and how it was living . . . so if I kept it, well, I can't do that, I just can't - I couldn't face people, the girls, my parents and all the folks back home. I can't go back there with an illegitimate baby (cries).

Interviewer: Well, do you suppose your mother would help you take care of it?

Carol: And I'd have to leave school . . . and my parents would be so disappointed, they wanted so much for me to go to college and they just won't understand how it happened.

Interviewer: Do you know how it was that you happened to get pregnant?

Carol: Well, Jack always took care of . . of . . . well, of being careful, I mean, of (whispers) contraceptives.

Interviewer: I'm sorry I didn't hear what you said.

Carol: Of contraceptives and I can't imagine what went wrong, something must have happened, but why? Why?

Why couldn't he have been more careful? Oh God, my mother and dad will just about kill me, they'll be so mad.

Interviewer: Do you really feel they won't have any understanding for what happened?

Carol: Oh no! no! they'll throw me out - I just don't dare tell them. My mother thinks that sex before marriage is disgusting and (cries) . . .

Interviewer: And?

Carol: Oh, they'll be so disappointed. I can't tell them, I just can't - it would be too dreadful, my mother would ask all sorts of questions - how it happened and for how long and about Jack and my dad'll want to see Jack and . . . it will be just too embarrassing and awful (cries).

Interviewer: And yet you must feel you want your parents' help.

Carol: Oh yes, I want somebody to help me but I can't tell anyone and I'm all alone and I can't stand it - I just shake all over all the time and feel sick - I suppose it's the baby that's making me feel sick - and every time I think of it and I think of it all the time, I just can't forget it for a single moment. . . . And what'll Jack say?

Interviewer: What do you suppose he will say?

Carol: I don't know - I suppose he'll be terribly upset, I guess he'll want to marry me, at least I hope so

- he's got to do something to help. But I don't know if I want to marry him . . . (panic) Maybe he won't want to marry me, maybe he'll just not want to see me ever again. Maybe he knows someone who would get rid of the baby or some place I could go and have it away from here. But I don't know myself what I want to do - oh! what can I do - everything is just terrible and awful. Suppose I gave it away, how would I know it would be alright, but if I didn't give it away - I can't look after a baby and go to school and I don't want to leave college, I was just beginning to have fun. I never had any fun before, my mother and dad wouldn't let me do anything, they were always checking on me, like they didn't trust me, and what'll they say now? Oh God, I wish I was dead!!!

Interviewer: Yes, you really must be feeling very despairing now, but, as you see, there are things you can do, ways to solve this. None of them are easy, I know, but they are there. Certainly Jack has a right to know what has happened, I should think. Let's discuss this a bit more, shall we?

Carol: Well, I suppose he does have a right. After all, the baby is half his and I will tell him soon. It's not that I'm not fond of him, I think a lot of him, and I really believe that he loves me, and that he will think he ought to marry me. But that worries me: he's just 20 and still in college, how can he afford to marry me, I mean, the

money? And a baby costs such a lot, clothes for it and the hospital. He just isn't ready, but I suppose since it's his fault he ought to do something. But he wants to go to med. school like his brother did, and that's something else - his brother dropped out of med. school because he got married and couldn't afford to go on and I know how much Jack wants to go and I just can't, can't do that to him (cries) . . . but then maybe it won't look so bad for me at home if I got married and . . .

Interviewer: Well, I'm afraid our time is up now Carol. I'd like to see you again tomorrow if you can make it. Do you have a class at 11? No? Can you come then? Good.

APPENDIX II

INTRODUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PERSONALITY TESTS:

Today you are going to be subjects for two different studies. We shall be conducting one study and in the second half of the evening some other people will be asking you to do things for their own study. We worked it out so that you will be able to fulfill your requirement in one evening. And the others will be telling you then what their study is about.

My study has to do with finding out about how different people feel about important personal relationships with others. We have been working with different groups of people, different types of groups, and now we want to find out from you how you, as college students, feel about these things. It is important for this that everybody is as frank as possible about how they feel in order for us to get an accurate picture. Since we are fairly crowded here this evening, I'm sure it will be a temptation to look across and see what other people are putting down just out of curiousity. We would rather you wouldn't since we would like to get your own individual appraisals. There are no right or wrong answers to most of the questions, so just give your own impressions. But first, please fill out the sheet in front of you. Does anyone not have one? Please answer all the questions. You have 5 minutes.

Let's now start with this. We are interested in your impressions of what goes on in a dating relationship. In a minute I am going to show you a picture, which shows Margie, a college girl, out with her date. They are petting. We are looking for some good descriptive captions for this picture. On the sheets I am going to hand out you will see a sentence, and below the sentence there is a list of a number of ways you might feel about the sentence as a descriptive caption, for the picture. If you think it would be an extremely suitable caption, put a check mark where it says "extremely suitable", if you think it suitable, but not perfectly suitable, put a check mark where it says "suitable", if you think it only fairly suitable, check the appropriate place. If you think it extremely unsuitable, check there and so on.

When you have done this for the first two sentences, turn the pages. There you will find other sentences and I want you to do just the same with them. Treat each sentence individually, that is, don't try to remember what you have put for previous sentences and don't check back to see. You will probably find that there are several sentences which just fit the picture in your judgement. Do them in order and don't

leave any out. This is very important. This is very important. When you come to the blank page, stop. Don't turn over the booklet till I give you the word.

Now write your name and birth date on the back of the booklet. Everyone done that? Good. Now, here is the picture. Everyone see it? Now turn the booklet over and go ahead. Remember to stop at the blank page. You have 5 minutes. Please check to see that your name and birthdate are on the back of the booklet.

On the next page you will find a list of all the sentences you have judged. Next to the one you think most suitable, put the number 1. For the next most suitable, put 2, for the next 3 and so on until you put 12 for the least suitable one in your opinion. Please do not check back to the first part of this test. When you have finished, every sentence should have a different number next to it, and you should end with the number 12. Please check to see, because this is very important. When you have finished, go on to the next page and follow the instructions. You have 10 minutes.

Now I will show you another picture of Margie. She has been seriously petting, and this is just afterwards, and there are all sorts of ways she might be feeling, things she might be thinking and plans she might be making, aren't there? On the following pages you will see sentences which describe how she might be feeling and what she might be thinking. You are to do with these just what you did with the other sentences. Remember, treat each sentence individually without reference to the ones that have gone before. Just keep right on to the end of the booklet this time.

Everyone got a booklet? Now write your name and birth date on the back of the booklet . . . Now here is the picture. Everyone see it? Turn over and go right ahead to the end. You have ten minutes.

What you have just done had to do with dating relationships. Two other important aspects of being with other people are how you feel about yourselves and what you think about your friends. On these sheets being handed out, there are questions having to do with that. Just go ahead and fill them out. You have 15 minutes. Before you start, please write your name and birthdate on the top of the first page. Everyone done that? Alright, go ahead . . .

Now we have questions having to do with how you feel about people in general. On the first page list the 10 people you know best. They can be any age and they can be male or female. Just use initials. When you have done that, turn the page and follow the instructions. Go right to the end of the booklet. You have 15 minutes.

Just go right ahead..after you have written your name and birthdate.

Now our study is over and Miss _____ and Miss _____ will direct you in their experiments.

APPENDIX III

INTRODUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE INTERVIEWS (TAPE)

This study has to do with the reactions of students to problems faced by young people studying here at the University of Michigan. This is part of a larger study on how students adjust to university life and various areas in which they find difficulty coping with things. What is happening is that various groups of subjects are being presented with different problems faced by actual students here. We have asked students with problems to allow us to make tape recordings of interviews where they talk about their problems. Tonight you will hear some interviews chosen from among a great number we have recorded.

The students you will hear have given us their permission to record these interviews and to play them to you as part of the study. Of course, we have tried to delete personal information to preserve anonymity.

I will now play the first interview. (MARY-ANN)

I am now going to hand out some questions about the interview. Please leave them face down till I give you the word.

Before you begin, write your full name at the top of the first page, and your date of birth. Make sure you do this first. And then just follow the instructions. You have 5 minutes.

Now I am going to play another interview. (CAROL)

I am now going to hand out some questions about what you have just heard. Please leave them face down.

Now write your name on the top of the first page and your birthdate. . . . everybody finished? Now just go ahead and answer the questions. Just keep going right through the booklet, and please do not check back to what you have put for previous questions as you go along. Just do the questions off the top of your head as the answers occur to you. You have 10 minutes.

Now I am going to hand round something else. I am going to ask you to pick the most accurate, next most and so on of a series of paragraphs describing what went on in the interview. Because this was a longer interview this will be more difficult. You will have to make some quite subtle distinctions in order to make your judgements. There are no right or wrong answers in a strict sense. First read the instructions, then turn back the page and you will see that some of the paragraphs are printed on the back of the first page. There are 4 altogether. We have had them printed this way so that you will be able to have them all before you when you make your judgements. Then turn the whole booklet over and follow the instructions right on the back. Please do not begin till everybody has their material.

Now begin. You have 5 minutes. First write your name and birthdate.

MOPPING UP

In a minute you will have opportunity to ask questions about everything you just did. But before that I want to clear up a slight deception which was necessary for this study. The interviews presented to you were written specially for this study. They were not problems which an actual student experienced in just this form, and with just those complications. We made a kind of composite problem with features from many ways in which some students encountered similar problems to these. We had to pretend to you that they were real because our study is about sympathy, the capacity to feel sympathetic towards actual people we meet. And we would not have got a proper measure of sympathy towards real people if we had measured sympathy towards fictional people.

In the hand-out which I shall give you as you leave, you will find a full description of everything you did this evening. In fact, both things you did this evening, the captions to pictures, the desert island questions, and the rest of the first section as well as the interviews are part of one study having to do with the personality concomittants of sympathy. The handout will explain what all the questions were designed to assess. But, in brief, we think that several personality dimensions have an important effect on whether a person will experience sympathy with another or not. The personality dimensions we were studying were, type of defense against impulse expression, method of coping with the guilt aroused by impulse expression, the degree of complexity with which a person sees others, need affiliation, and the ability to confront weaknesses in oneself. The questions after the interview about Carol assessed sympathy in three ways: the degree to which people are able to see others as different and separate from them, whether they feel warm and friendly and want to help them, and how well they understand what is going on in the other person.

If you have any further questions beyond that, the person in charge of this study will be glad to answer them. Her name is Ruth Falk and you could call her at NO 33597.

Together with the hand-out I shall give you a feedback card which the psychology department would like you to fill out after you have read the handout. Just drop the card in any campus mail box. Are there any questions?

Thank you for coming this evening.

APPENDIX IV

AN INVESTIGATION INTO SOME DETERMINANTS OF SYMPATHY

This study has to do with some of the situational and personality factors affecting sympathy. Among the circumstances which make it that a person will or will not feel sympathy towards another are: internal personality factors in the observer, characteristics of the person to be sympathized with (the nature of his predicament and his own reaction to it) and the degree of immediacy of the situation to the observer (compare reading the statistics about casualties in a bombing raid to actually being there). Certainly, people differ in their capacity to make statistics bleed, as they differ in their ability to tolerate unpleasant realities in the flesh.

Definition of sympathy: Following Max Scheler, three elements must be present -

1. perceived separation between the sympathizer and the person sympathized with.

2. the sympathizer must adequately comprehend the feelings, wishes and circumstances of the object of sympathy.

3. there must be some appropriate affective and/or conative response in the sympathetic person.

Personality determinants, i.e., independent variables:

1. type of defense against impulse expression

2. method of coping with guilt aroused by impulse expression. These were measured by subjects' rank ordering of captions for a projective picture.

3. cognitive complexity of interpersonal awareness, which was assessed from descriptions of subjects' best friend.

4. ability to confront weaknesses in oneself, which was assessed by direct and indirect questions.

5. need affiliation which was measured by the degree of correlation between perceived similarity of others to the self (description of people) and felt attraction (Desert Island questionnaire).

Experimental variable:

Degree of distance of the material from the subject. A tape recording of a fictional interview with a pregnant, unmarried student will be considered as "closer" than a typewritten transcript of the same interview.

Method:

The subjects (100 female students) will first take the personality tests, will then be divided into two experimental groups which will respectively hear and read the interview and make judgments and express reactions, which will constitute measures of the dependent variable, sympathy, in all its three aspects.

It is expected that all these personality dimensions will affect arousal of sympathy differently under the two conditions of degree of distance from the material. The defenses fall roughly into two kinds, mastery defenses which inhibit feelings but not ideas and avoidance defenses which are also directed against ideas. Hypotheses deal with the relation between the independent variables and sympathy. A major hypothesis is that avoidance defenders will be more sympathetic with less immediate (written) than with more immediate cues, since it is assumed that greater defensiveness will lead to less sympathy and that more immediate cues will call forth greater defensiveness in avoidance defenders. Conversely, mastery defenders will be more sympathetic with more immediate than with less immediate cues, since their problem is to clothe the verbal skeleton with affective flesh and blood.

It is also expected that there will be relationships among the personality measures themselves.

APPENDIX V

LIST OF TEN LIVING PEOPLE I KNOW BEST

It can be an older person, a younger person, or a person the same age as you. It can be male or female. Use initials.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

The purpose of this form is to measure what you think about the people you know well by having you judge them against a series of descriptive scales. In filling out this form, make your judgments on the basis of what each person you list means to you. At the top of each page of this booklet is a blank. Fill in the blanks with the initials of the people you have listed on the previous page--put the initials of the first person you have listed on the previous page in the blank of the next page, put the initials of the next person you have listed on the previous page on the succeeding page and so on until you have filled ten pages with the initials of the people you have listed as ones you know best--one set of initials for each page. Then, go on to do the judgment task described below for each person.

You are to rate each person initialed on a set of scales. You are to rate each person on each of the scales in order.

Here is how you are to use these scales:

If you feel that the person at the top of the pages is <u>extremely related</u> to one end of a scale, you should place your X as follows:

e.g., AUNT SALLY

fair__X__:____:____:____:____:____:____unfair

or

fair____:____:____:____:____:____:__X__unfair

If you feel that she is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely) you should place your X as follows:

e.g., AUNT SALLY

strong____:__X__:____:____:____:____:____weak

or

strong____:____:____:____:____:__X__:____weak

If the person seems <u>only slightly related</u> to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral) then you should X as follows:

e.g., AUNT SALLY

active____:____:__X__:____:____:____:____passive

or

active____:____:____:____:__X__:____:____passive

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seems most characteristic of the person you're judging.

If you consider the person to be neutral for a certain scale, or both sides of the scale equally associated with the person, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, then you should place your X in the middle space:

safe____:____:____:_X_:____:____:____unsafe

IMPORTANT: 1) Place your X's in the middle of the spaces, not on the boundaries:

		THIS			NOT THIS
____:	____:	X :	____:	____:	X____

2) Be sure you check every scale for every concept - do not omit any.

3) Never put more than one X on a single scale.

Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the test. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at a fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items that are necessary.

compliant____:____:____:____:____:____:____stubborn

wholesome____:____:____:____:____:____:____unwholesome

logical____:____:____:____:____:____:____intuitive

unique____:____:____:____:____:____:____typical

excitable____:____:____:____:____:____:____calm

sociable____:____:____:____:____:____:____unsociable

tough____:____:____:____:____:____:____tender

sophisticated ____:____:____:____:____:____:____naive

predictable____:____:____:____:____:____:____unpredictable

warm____:____:____:____:____:____:____cool

straight____:____:____:____:____:____:____curved

serious____:____:____:____:____:____:____humourous

feminine____:____:____:____:____:____:____masculine

weak____:____:____:____:____:____:____strong

(This page was repeated 10 times.)

NOW RATE YOURSELF ON THE FOLLOWING SCALES

SELF

compliant____:____:____:____:____:____:____stubborn

wholesome____:____:____:____:____:____:____unwholesome

logical____:____:____:____:____:____:____intuitive

unique____:____:____:____:____:____:____typical

excitable____:____:____:____:____:____:____calm

sociable____:____:____:____:____:____:____unsociable

tough____:____:____:____:____:____:____tender

sophisticated____:____:____:____:____:____:____naive

predictable____:____:____:____:____:____:____unpredictable

warm____:____:____:____:____:____:____cool

straight____:____:____:____:____:____:____curved

serious____:____:____:____:____:____:____humourous

feminine____:____:____:____:____:____:____masculine

weak____:____:____:____:____:____:____strong

DESERT ISLAND QUESTIONNAIRE

Look at the list of the ten people you earlier said you knew best. After the numeral 1 below, put the initials of a person from that list that you would most like to have with you if you and only one other person were stranded on a desert island together where there was plenty of things to eat and no real dangers to contend with. After the 2 put the initials of the person you would next consider to be stranded with if only two of you were stranded together. And so on, until after the 10 you have put the initials of the person from your list of people you know best who you would least care to be stranded with in the above situation.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

APPENDIX VI

All of the captions were first presented to the subjects for rating on the following scale:

_____extremely suitable
_____suitable
_____fairly suitable
_____fairly unsuitable
_____unsuitable
_____extremely unsuitable.

They were then given the instruction:

Next to the caption you think the most suitable write (1), for the next most suitable write (2), for the next most suitable after that write (3) and so on. When you finish, every caption should have a number. This is very important.

_____ Margie is repelled and just freezes up when her date touches her

_____ Margie has never felt any sexual desires towards a boy, and this fellow is no exception

_____ Margie will pet with her date but only because this is what he expects of her

_____ Margie wishes she were back at an age where these problems did not exist

_____ Margie gets disgusted when her date makes advances

_____ Margie is looking forward to petting with her date and is ready to go to the limit

_____ Margie is not sure what her date is after

_____ Margie realizes that sex is part of life and does her best to develop this side of herself within reason

_____ Margie wishes she were back in her room where she can daydream about her ideal date who is so much more exciting than this boy

_____ Margie reminds herself of how her mother has said she ought to behave on dates

_____ Although the boy has not made any serious advances, Margie is sure he will

_____ Margie pets with the boy so he won't think her a prude

I am interested in your own suggestions for captions for the picture. The more captions you can contribute the better. Do them off the top of your head and don't bother about writing good English. It's the general idea that counts. Don't worry if they sound like some of the sentences you have been judging: there will be important and subtle differences. And don't worry if your own ideas are quite unlike any of the sentences, as they certainly didn't exhaust all the possibilities. Do not check back to earlier parts of the test. This is very important.

APPENDIX VII

MASTERY DEFENSES

Margie will pet with her date but only because this is what he expects of her	projection/ rationalisation
Margie is looking forward to petting with her date and is ready to go to the limit	counterphobic
Margie realises that sex is part of life and does her best to develop this side of herself within reason. .	intellectualisation
Margie wishes she were back in her room where she can daydream about her ideal date who is so much more exciting than this boy	fantasy formation
Although the boy has not made any serious advances Margie is sure he will.	projection
Margie pets with the boy so he won't think her a prude	rationalisation

AVOIDANCE DEFENSES

Margie is repelled and just freezes up when her date touches her.	phobic
Margie has never felt any sexual desires towards a boy and this fellow is no exception	denial
Margie wishes she were back at an age where these problems did not exist.	regression
Margie gets disgusted when her date makes advances. .	reaction formation/ reversal of affect
Margie is not sure what her date is after.	repression
Margie reminds herself of how her mother has said she ought to behave on dates	identification with parental prohibitions

APPENDIX VIII

All of the captions were first presented to the subjects for rating on the following scale:

_____ extremely suitable
_____ suitable
_____ fairly suitable
_____ fairly unsuitable
_____ unsuitable
_____ extremely unsuitable

They were then given the instruction:

Next to the caption you think the most suitable write (1), for the next most suitable write (2) and so on. Do not leave any caption without a number.

_____ Margie thinks about going home and finding out from her roommate whether she has gone as far as Margie has

_____ Margie tells herself that most girls go much further than she does

_____ Margie feels that what she has been doing is written all over her face for anyone to see

_____ Margie doesn't feel that there is anything wrong with what she is doing while she is petting, but maybe a day afterward she feels very bad about it

_____ Margie thinks about confessing to her roommate and blaming herself and hopes her roommate will tell her she is not as bad as she thinks she is

_____ Margie tries to forget what happened between her and her date

_____ Margie feels very disgusted with herself and just hates herself

_____ Margie thinks about going right home and taking a long shower

_____ Margie makes a vow never to let this happen again

_____ Margie worries whether she might be involved in an accident on the way home

_____ Margie knows she wouldn't have gone so far if the boy hadn't led her on

_____ Margie wants to go right home because she has a splitting headache

I am interested in your own suggestions for captions for the picture. The more captions you can contribute the better. Do them off the top of your head and don't bother about writing good English. It's the general idea that counts. Don't worry if they sound like some of the sentences you have been judging: there will be important and subtle differences. And don't worry if your own ideas are quite unlike any of the sentences, as they certainly didn't exhaust all the possibilities. Do not check back to earlier parts of the test. This is very important.

APPENDIX IX

METHODS OF COPING WITH GUILT WHICH REFLECT AND RESULT IN A TOLERANCE FOR GUILT FEELINGS

When Margie gets home she will find out from her roommate whether she has gone as far as Margie has. . .	sharing the guilt
Margie tells herself that most girls go much further than she does	rationalisation/ projection
Margie doesn't feel that there is anything wrong with what she is doing while she is petting, but maybe a day afterward she feels very bad about it	delay via isolation
Margie thinks about confessing to her roommate and blaming herself and hopes her roommate will tell her she is not as bad as she thinks she is	seeking forgiveness
Margie feels very disgusted with herself and just hates herself	self-reproach
Margie knows she wouldn't have gone so far if the boy hadn't led her on	projection of responsibility

METHODS OF COPING WITH GUILT WHICH REFLECT AND RESULT IN AN INTOLERANCE FOR GUILT FEELINGS

Margie feels that what she has been doing is written all over her face for anyone to see	social phobic reaction
Margie tries to forget what happened between her and her date	suppression/ repression/denial
Margie makes a vow never to let this happen again . . .	
Margie thinks about going right home and taking a long shower	undoing
Margie worries whether she might be involved in an accident on the way home.	seeking punishment
Margie wants to go right home because she has a splitting headache.	somatisation of punishment

APPENDIX X

Imagine you have to describe your best friend to someone who knows nothing at all about humans, say, a man from a far off planet. Your task is to describe every aspect of your friend which you feel would be important in helping a person completely unfamiliar with humans to get a good picture of a particular human being. You are being asked for complete objectivity.

APPENDIX XI

CODE FOR QUESTIONS: Describe your best friend
How would you like a child of yours to be different from you?
What are your strong points?
What are your weak point, your faults?

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION
I	physical appearance, e.g., 5' tall, red hair, athletic build, tall, wide smile, attractive
II	other objective descriptions, e.g., is a registered nurse, can twist, makes good grades, doesn't date too often, is agile, is a Catholic. Any phrases which include words such as "likes", "believes", "wants", "is interested in" or any other words denoting psychological states, e.g., 'is a devout Catholic' against 'is a Catholic' should be coded under III or IV
III	interpersonal virtues, vices, traits, e.g., is easy to get along with, is gregarious, careful of others' feelings, generous, frank, cruel, i.e., any trait which needs the presence of another person to manifest itself.
IV	noninterpersonal traits and preferences, belief, etc., e.g., is religious, tomboyish, creative, has a mind of her own, carefree, optimistic, likes to date, scatterbrained, happy, likes doing things well

Do not code any material which is not relevant to the above categories.

CODE FOR QUESTION: How are you different from most other people?

Assign each of the phrases or words to the categories "positive, i.e., favourable" or "negative, i.e., unfavourable".

APPENDIX XII

How are you different from most other people?

How would you like a child of yours to be different from you?

What are your own strong points?

What are your own weak points, your faults?

APPENDIX XIII

INTERRELATIONSHIP AMONG "TOLERANCE OF FAULTS" QUESTIONS

Q.2. How are you different from most other people?

Q.3. How would you like a child of yours to be different from you?

Q.5. What are your weak points, your faults?

Q3 \ Q2	+	-
+	24	14
-	17	28

$X^2 = 4.28$

df = 1

$P < .05$

Q5 \ Q2	+	-
+	33	24
-	7	20

$X^2 = 6.38$

df = 1

$P < .025$

Q5 \ Q3	+	-
+	31	26
-	8	18

$X^2 = 3.00$

df = 1

$P < .10$

APPENDIX XIV

PERSONAL DATA SHEET

1. Name_____ _____ _____
   first middle last
2. Age_____years _____months
3. I want to major in _____
4. Name of place where I grew up _____ State_____
5. Father's occupation_____
6. Number of brothers _____older _____younger
   Number of sisters _____older _____younger
7. Hair colour_____
8. Eye colour _____
9. Height _____feet _____inches
10. Religious preference_____
    I go to church (synagogue, etc.) ____more than once a week
    ____once a week
    ____once every two weeks
    ____once a month
    ____less than a dozen times a year
    ____never
11. In my free time I like to (write in as many things as you like)

12. Most people in America like to trace back where their ancestors came from.
    Place outside America where my mother's folks came from_____
    Place outside America where my father's folks came from_____
13. Place of residence in Ann Arbor (check one)

    _____dorm _____sorority _____co-op
    _____own apartment _____at home
    other (write in)_____
14. Your grade-point average in college_____ in high school_____

APPENDIX XV

Here are some other questions about Carol. I want you to supply the answers from your imagination, from your picture of what a girl like Carol might be like. I want to see how good you are at predicting other things about Carol from the information you already have.

1. What are Carol's hobbies and interests?

2. Where did Carol grow up? (check one)

   _____on a farm
   _____in a small town (between 5,000 and 50,000 people)
   _____in a medium sized town (between 50,000 and 5,000,000 people)
   _____in a city of over 5,000,000 people

3. What is Carol's father's occupation?

4. How many sisters has Carol? _____
   How many brothers? _____

5. How tall is Carol (give feet and inches) _____feet _____inches

6. What colour is Carol's hair? _____
   What colour are Carol's eyes? _____

7. The ancestors of everyone in America (except the Indians) originally came from somewhere else outside America. Where did Carol's ancestors come from? _____

8. What will Carol major in, supposing she comes back to school?

   _____

9. How many close girl friends has Carol? _____

10. What is Carol's favourite colour? _____

11. What is Carol's religious preference? _____

12. Where does Carol live? (check one) _____dorm _____sorority _____co-op
_____own apartment other_____ (write in)

13. What is Carol's grade-point average?_____

APPENDIX XVI

CODE FOR SEPARATION TEST

Score only the following questions

Q.2. Where did Carol grow up?
Score 1 for "place where grew up" with population in the same category.

Q.3. What is Carol's father's occupation?

(a) professional
(b) white collar other than professional, clerical, sales
(c) blue collar

Score 3 for exactly the same, score 2 for within the same group as above, score 1 for adjacent group.

Q.4. How many sisters has Carol? How many brothers?

Score 1 for brothers the same, +1 for sisters the same

Q.5. How tall is Carol?

Score 1 for within two inches, score 2 for exactly the same

Q.6. What colour is Carol's hair? What colour are her eyes?

Score 1 for hair the same +1 for eyes the same

Q.7. . . . Where did Carol's ancestors come from?

Score 1 if either the subject's mother or father came from the same place as ascribed to Carol's ancestors.

Q.8. What will Carol major in . . . ?

(a) math, science, medicine
(b) humanities, arts.
(c) nursing, education, home economics
(d) engineering architecture

Score 1 for the same group, score 2 for exactly the same.

Q.11. What is Carol's religious preference?

Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, none. Score 1 for the same

Q.12. Where does Carol live? Score 1 for the same

Q.13. What is Carol's grade-point-average?

Score 1 if in same group, e.g., 1.--, 2.--, etc., score 2 if within 5 points in the same group.

APPENDIX XVII

Here are some more paragraphs. These describe what went on in the interview with Carol. Again, you are to work from your general impression of the interview, from what you think was most important in it, and put the number (1) next to the paragraph which, in your opinion, is the most accurate reflection, the paragraph you would choose to describe the interview to someone who did not know what went on. There are no right or wrong answers. Next to your second choice, put (2), and so on down to (4). Make sure that each paragraph has a different number and that you get down to the number (4).

_____ Carol has had an awful thing happen to her: she is going to have a baby and she isn't married to the boy. And, she doesn't know whether she is really enough in love with him after all to marry him. Of course, Carol is desperate and she has no idea what to do even though she has tried to think things through. Whatever she comes up with has something wrong with it. If she got rid of the baby, she might get hurt. If she had the baby, she feels she couldn't tear herself away from him (or her); but if she kept the baby, how could she find the time to go on in college, which she has her heart set on doing. And, anyway, her parents would be so disappointed in her. She is sure they will be terribly angry with her and dreads telling them. Life just seems black and threatening; she is petrified with anxiety; she is terribly resentful that this had to happen and she can't get anything straight in her mind. She wonders who was to blame. Was it her parents for sitting on her all the time? Was it Jack for having gotten her so excited that she just wanted to make love with him all the time: She tells the interviewer how they met on a blind date, how they saw each other often, and how they got so sexually excited that they couldn't help making love. She also feels it was her fault. She toys with the idea of marrying Jack so that her parents and the people she knows won't look down on her. But she wonders how she can do this to Jack who is still a senior and too young to be weighed down with responsibilities.

_____ This was a recording of a student named Carol being interviewed about her illegitimate pregnancy. The father of the child is a senior in college. They met on a blind date and continued seeing each other frequently, their contacts becoming more and more physically intimate and eventuating in frequent and satisfying sexual intercourse. Throughout the interview Carol was presenting the pros and cons for each of several alternative solutions to her problem, namely, to procure an abortion, to have the child and give it up for adoption, to have it

and keep it, or to get married. The main arguments she presented against each of these alternatives were as follows: she was afraid of coming to physical harm as a consequence of an abortion, she thought she might not want to give the child up if she had it, she did not think she would have time to continue her studies and keep the child, and she was not sure of the degree of her commitment to the father and of his willingness and ability to provide for her. On the other hand, she wondered if others would not think so badly of her if she were married. During the interview she also talked about her parents' probably negative reaction to her pregnancy, and justified herself by reference to her restricted upbringing and to the student's contribution to their physical intimacy. The general tone of the interview was one of anxiety, confusion, hostility, and depression. She was not clear about what attitude to take toward her own actions and the degree of her responsibility in the matter under discussion.

Carol is experiencing the consequences of sleeping with someone before you're married. She is going to have an illegitimate baby. She met this boy on a blind date and before she knew it they were sleeping together because she didn't control herself properly. Now, of course, she is scared and miserable and angry at everyone else for what happened. At times she tries to shove the responsibility for what she did onto her parents or onto the boy. She rebelled against her parents and thought that their rules were unreasonable. Now she feels guilty and is afraid to tell them she is in trouble because she thinks they will punish her and be disappointed that she didn't make the best of her chance in college. She tries to think of ways out of her problem but everything she thinks of she finds something wrong with. She doesn't feel like marrying the boy because she doesn't know if she loves him! If she had the baby and kept it, she is afraid of the disgrace and the trouble of looking after it and going to college too. But, if she planned to give it up, she doesn't know whether she could go through with that either. She thought of getting rid of the baby too, but is afraid of an infection. One way to save her own skin, she thinks, would be to marry the boy, but she isn't sure if he can provide for her and make a career for himself too, because he is still a senior in college.

_____ Carol is very upset because she is going to have an illegitimate baby. She goes over possible things she might do in her mind and everything she thinks of has features that make it seem impossible to go through with. She doesn't know whether she loves Jack enough to marry him; she is panicky at the thought of giving the baby up if she had it; and yet she is resentful at the prospect of having to leave college and look after the baby. She is frightened of abortion because she might get sick. Also, she is terrified of how her parents will take the news. They will not understand at all, and she will have disappointed them in their hopes for her getting a college education. She met Jack on a blind date, and liked him very much. They saw each other a lot and got more and more sexually aroused on their dates. In the end they made love. They both enjoyed it so much they couldn't stop. Carol would like to feel it is not all her fault, so she tries to put the blame on Jack for arousing her and on her parents for not being sympathetic to her wish to go out and have fun. She also feels very guilty and shudders to think how her parents will feel when they find out. Her mood shifts between feeling frightened, deeply unhappy, angry and torn by doubts about what is the best thing to do. She swings desperately from blaming herself to blaming others. Marrying Jack would be a good way of not having to feel so embarrassed that she is going to have a baby. But this would put a terrible strain on Jack who is still a senior in school.

None of these paragraphs were exhaustive of everything that went on in the interview. Below make a list of important things which, in your opinion, were left out.

APPENDIX XVIII

Suppose Carol had an abortion, how willing would you be to help her in any way you could?

_____completely willing
_____very willing
_____somewhat willing
_____somewhat unwilling
_____very unwilling
_____completely unwilling

Suppose Carol went away to have the baby and gave it up for adoption, how willing would you be to help her in any way you could?

_____completely willing
_____very willing
_____somewhat willing
_____somewhat unwilling
_____very unwilling
_____completely unwilling

Suppose Carol had the baby and kept it without getting married, how willing would you be to help her in any way you could?

_____completely willing
_____very willing
_____somewhat willing
_____somewhat unwilling
_____very unwilling
_____completely unwilling

Suppose Carol married Jack and had the baby, how willing would you be to help her in any way you could?

_____completely willing
_____very willing
_____somewhat willing
_____somewhat unwilling
_____very unwilling
_____completely unwilling

APPENDIX XIX

Here are some ways you might feel about Carol. Put a check mark next to the three (3) sentences that best describe your attitude. Be sure to pick three that are closest to the way you feel.

_____ I loathe the whole subject of Carol

_____ Why get so worked up about Carol; she's not the only one with problems

_____ I feel sorry for Carol

_____ Carol got what she deserved

_____ How can Carol expect others to help her after what she did

_____ I feel concerned about Carol

_____ I am quite indifferent to Carol

_____ If only I could be with Carol and share her troubles

_____ I don't much care about Carol's problems

_____ I feel warm and protective about Carol

_____ I feel for Carol

_____ I am glad Carol got her just deserts.

APPENDIX XX

Interv: Sit down Mary Ann. Now, what's the trouble?

Mary Ann: Well, it's about my major. . . .

Interv: What year are you in?

Mary Ann: I'm a sophomore.

Interv: And you have a problem about what to major in next year, is that right?

Mary Ann: Yes, you see I got engaged to a fellow and he's a senior this year and wants to go to Law School and, . . . well, it's this way - I always wanted to major in history ever since high school and I've taken some history courses already and I really like it and I want to go on with it.

Interv: And how have your grades been in history?

Mary Ann: Oh, I've gotten straight A's.

Interv: But there's some reason why you can't go ahead as you planned?

Mary Ann: Well, you see we plan to get married in August and we've been looking into everything you need to get married, and what it costs to live and all that, and . . . well, my parents and Chuck's parents don't have too much money, and . . . I mean . . . well, Chuck's parents hadn't planned on supporting him through Law School and my parents can just afford to keep me in college if I work summers for my tuition.

Interv: So you're wondering whether you can afford to stay in college?

Mary Ann: Not exactly, but I should be making some money, shouldn't I? I mean sometime soon, and that's just it, I can get a scholarship if I change over to education that will pay tuition and books and a bit more and then I can be earning something right after I graduate. But if I take history . . . well, I'd always wanted to go on to graduate school in history and even if I didn't, well if I got a part-time job it would go into tuition and . . .

Interv: Yes, go on.

Mary Ann: Well, Chuck was planning to work part-time anyway through law school, but I don't suppose you can make too much that way . . . I mean . . . enough for both of us and . . .

Interv: And?

Mary Ann: And, well, I mean he's thought about working full time, but that'd slow him up some and all his time would be taken up and I wouldn't see too much of him, and anyway, it's such a strain . . .

Interv: So the problem seems to be that you feel you ought to make some money, and one way to do this would be to change to education and this would give you a chance to start earning more in two years. But on the other hand your heart was set on majoring in history and then perhaps going on to graduate school. Is that right?

Mary Ann: Yes, yes, that's it exactly, and I just don't know what I ought to do.

Interv: Well, what does Chuck say? I suppose you've discussed it all with him?

Mary Ann: Oh, yes, and he says . . . well . . . that I should do what I want. But that's just the problem and I just can't decide.

Interv: How do you feel about going into teaching?

Mary Ann: I don't feel too keen about it, but . . . I mean, I don't hate the idea, it just doesn't appeal to me. It would be a drag to take all those education courses and I couldn't do as much history as I want, but my mother - she's a teacher - she says I'll get to like it maybe and I can go on with history while I'm teaching . . . but I don't want to wait that long.

APPENDIX XXI

Here are some ways you might feel about Mary-Ann. Put a check mark next to the two (2) sentences that best describe your attitude. Be sure to pick two that are closest to the way you feel.

_____ Why get so worked up about Mary-Ann's troubles

_____ I feel for Mary-Ann

_____ I wish I could be with Mary-Ann and help her

_____ I am quite indifferent to Mary-Ann

_____ I feel warm and friendly towards Mary-Ann

_____ Why do I have to be bothered with Mary-Ann's problems

_____ I feel sorry for Mary-Ann

On this page there are three paragraphs which describe what went on in the interview with Mary-Ann. Next to the one you think best reflects what went on put the number (1). For the next best one, put (2). And for the last, put (3). There are no right or wrong answers. What we are interested in is your general impression of how these paragraphs reflect what you think was most important about the interview. For example, which of the paragraphs would you choose to describe the interview to someone who did not know what went on? And which would be your second choice?

_____ Mary-Ann doesn't know what to major in. She wants to take history, but she is engaged to a boy who wants to go to law school. She feels she ought to be earning some money so that he won't have to make so much. Taking education would be one way of getting to earn money sooner and she could get some scholarship money if she did that. Her mother has encouraged her to go into teaching and put off the history courses till later, but that would mean waiting to do the thing she really wants.

_____ Mary-Ann needs to make some money when she is married so that her husband, who wants to go to law school, won't have to work so hard. She considers going into education as she can get some scholarship money if she does that. But what she really wants to do is major in history now, instead of waiting till she is teaching as her mother has advised. She does not know what she really ought to do.

_____ Mary-Ann's conflict is as follows: her inclination is to take history, but she feels a responsibility to contribute financially in her projected marriage to a future law student. She could do this by committing herself to a career in education for which she could obtain financial support. Her mother has advised this latter course, but Mary-Ann does not look forward to the delay in pursuing her own interests.

APPENDIX XXII

TABLE XXIX
INTERRELATIONSHIPS AMONG INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

		Complexity	
		Hi	Lo
Defense Against Guilt	Avoidance	22	18
	Mastery	16	20

$X^2 = 0.47$
df = 1
$P < .50$

		Tolerance of faults	
		Hi	Lo
Defense Against Sex	Avoidance	21	19
	Mastery	20	20

$X^2 = .025$
df = 1
$P < .90$

		Complexity	
		Hi	Lo
Need affiliation	Hi	15	21
	Lo	25	18

$X^2 = 0.89$
df = 1
$P < .50$

		Defense against sex	
		Avoidance	Mastery
Complexity	Hi	20	21
	Lo	22	14

$X^2 = 0.66$
df = 1
$P < .50$

Tolerance of faults

Complexity	Hi	Lo
Hi	19	26
Lo	22	15

$X^2 = 1.78$

df = 1

$P < .25$

Tolerance of faults

Defense Against Guilt	Hi	Lo
Avoidance	21	20
Mastery	23	18

$X^2 = 0.05$

df = 1

$P < .90$

Defense against sex

Need Affiliation	Avoidance	Mastery
Hi	21	18
Lo	16	20

$X^2 = 0.47$

df = 1

$P < .50$

Defense against guilt

Need Affiliation	Avoidance	Mastery
Hi	17	22
Lo	20	19

$X^2 = 0.2$

df = 1

$P < .75$

APPENDIX XXIII

TABLE XXX
INTERRELATIONSHIPS AMONG THE COMPONENTS OF SYMPATHY

Liking

Understanding	Hi	Med	Lo
Balanced	9	10	11
Over-involved	6	3	6
Intellectualised	10	15	11
Punitive	0	1	2

$X^2 = 3.164$
df = 6
$P < .90$

Helping

Understanding	Hi	Lo
Balanced	14	16
Over-involved	8	7
Intellectualised	22	14
Punitive	1	2

$X^2 = 1.77$
df = 3
$P < .75$

Liking

Separation	Hi	Med	Lo
Hi	15	15	17
Lo	10	14	12

$X^2 = 0.431$
df = 2
$P < .90$

Separation

Helping	Hi	Lo
Hi	21	17
Lo	26	19

$X^2 = 0.00$

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Altrocchi, J., Interpersonal perceptions of repressors and sensitizers and component analysis of assumed dissimilarity scores, J. abnorm. soc. psychol., 1961, 62, 528-534

2. Bogardus, E. S., Introduction to Social Research, Suttenhouse, N. Y., 1936

3. Bronfenbrenner, U., Harding, J. and Gallwey, M., The measurement of skill in social perception, in McClelland, D., ed., Talent and Society, Van Nostrand, N. Y., 1958

4. Bruner, J. S., and Tagiuri, R., The Perception of people, in A. Lindzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Addison-Wesley, Cambridge, Mass., 1954

5. Bullough, E., Psychical Distance, quoted in Langer, Susan, Feeling and Form, Routledge, Kegan Paul, Lond., 1953

6. Chance, June and Meaders, W., Needs and interpersonal perception, J. Pers., 1960, 28, 200-209

7. Chein, I., The awareness of self and the structure of the ego, Psychol. Rev., 1944, 51, 304-314

8. Cohen, A., Some complications of self-esteem for social influence, In Hovland, C., Personality and Persuasibility, Yale Studies in Attitude and Communication, v. II, Yale Press, 1959

9. Cooley, C. H., Human Nature and the Social Order, Scribners, N. Y., 1902

10. Cowden, R. C., Empathy or projection? J. clin. Psychol., 1955, 11, 188-190

11. Cronbach, L. J., Proposals leading to analytic treatment of social perception scores, in Tagiuri, B. and Petrullo, L. (eds.), Person Perception and Interpersonal Behaviour, Stanford Univ. Press, Stanford, 1958

12. Culbertson, F. M., Modifications of an emotionally held attitude through role playing, J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1957, 54, 230-233

13. Dymond, R., Personality and empathy, J. consult. Psychol., 1950, 14, 343-350

14. Ehrenwald, H. J., New Dimensions of Deep Analysis, Grune and Stratton, N. Y., 1955

15. Fenichel, O., The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis, Norton, N. Y., 1954

16. Feuerbach, L. A., The Essence of Christianity, tr. by G. Eliot, N. Y., 1957

17. Fliess, R., Countertransference and counteridentification, J. Amer. Psychoanal. Ass., 1953, I, 268-284

18. Fliess, R., The metapsychology of the analyst, Psychoanal. Quart., 1942, 11, 211-227

19. Freud, S., A child is being beaten, Collected Papers, v. II, Hogarth, Lond., 1956

20. Freud, S., The Ego and the Id, Hogarth, Lond., 1935

21. Freud, S., Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego, Hogarth, Lond., 1940

22. Freud, S., Libidinal Types, in Collected Papers, v. V, Hogarth, Lond., 1953

23. Gordon, J., Interpersonal predictions of repressors and sensitizers, J. Pers., 1957, 25, 585-698

24. Gage, N. L., Accuracy of social perception and effectiveness in interpersonal relationships, J. Pers., 1953, 22, 128-141

25. Goldstein, K., The Organism, American Book Company, N. Y., 1939

26. Granit, R., Receptors and Sensory Perception, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1955

27. Hastorf, A. H. and Bender, I. E., A caution respecting the measurement of empathic ability, J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1952, 47, 574-576

28. Halpern, H. M., Empathy, similarity and self-satisfaction, J. consult. Psychol., 1955, 19, 449-452

29. Hebb, D. O., Organization of Behaviour, Wiley, N. Y., 1949

30. Hegel, G. W., Phänomenologie des Geistes, ed. G. Lasson, Leipzig, 1907

31. Helvetius, C. A., Treatise on Man, trs. W. Hooper, Albion Press, Lond., 1810

32. Hobbes, T., The Leviathan, Library of Liberal Arts, N. Y., 1958

133. Holmes, S. J., The reproductive beginnings of altruism, Psychoanal. Rev., 1945, 52, 109-112

34. Hume, D., Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding, ed. Selby-Bigge, Clarendon Press, Oxf., 1902

35. James, W., Principles of Psychology, MacMillan, Lond., 1901

36. Janis, I. L. and Field, P. B., Sex differences and personality factors related to persuasibility, in Hovland, C., Personality and Persuasibility, Yale Studies in Attitude and Communication, v. II, Yale Press, 1959

37. Jekels, L., The Psychology of Pity, in Selected Papers, Imago, Lond., 1952

38. Klages, L., Vom Wesen des Bewusstseins, Leipzig, Barth, 1926

39. Kovacs, S., Introjektion, Projektion und Einfühlung, Zentrallblat für Psychoanalyse u Psychotherapie, 1912, 2, 253-263, 310-327

40. Kris, E., Psychoanalytic Explorations in Art, International Universities Press, N. Y., 1952

41. Lipps, Theodor, Zur Einfühlung. . . Engelmann, Leipzig, 1913

42. Locke, J., An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, Everyman

43. Lundholm, H., Reflections upon the nature of the psychological self, Psychoanal. Rev., 1940, 47, 110-126

44. Lundy, R., Assimilative projection and accuracy of prediction in interpersonal perceptions, J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1956, 52, 33-38

45. MacDougall, W., Outline of Psychology, Scribners, N. Y., 1923

46. Maslow, A. H., Deficiency motivation and growth motivation, in M. R. Jones (Ed.) Nebraska symposium on motivation, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 1955, 1-30

47. Mead, G. H., Mind, Self and Society, Univ. of Chicago Press, Chic., 1934

48. Moreno, J. L., Psychodrama, in Arieti, S. (ed.), American Handbook of Psychiatry, v. 2, Basic Books, N. Y., 1959

49. Olden, Christine, Development of empathy, Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, v. 13, 1958

50. Piaget, J., The Moral Judgement of the Child., Routledge, Lond., 1932

51. Plato, The Republic, Everyman

52. Pope, Alexander, "Essay on Man", Collected Poems, Everyman, 1946

53. Sarbin, T. R., Contributions to role-taking theory: I. Hypnotic behaviour, Psychoanal. Rev., 1950, 57, 255-270

54. Sartre, J. P., The Reprieve, tr. by E. Sutton, N. Y., Knopf, 1947

55. Schafer, R., Generative empathy in the treatment situation, Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 1959, 38, 342-373

56. Schachtel, E., Metamorphosis, Basic Books, N. Y., 1959

57. Scheler, M., The Nature of Sympathy, trs. P. Heath, Routledge and Kegan Paul, Lond., 1954

58. Schopenhauer, A., The Basis of Morality, tr. by A. B. Bullock, Sonnenschein, Lond., 1903

59. Sears, R., Experimental studies of projection, J. soc. Psychol., 1936, 7, 151-163

60. Spanner, M., Attribution of traits and emotional health as factors associated with prediction of personality characteristics of others, J. consult. Psychol., 1961, 25, 210-215

61. Steingart, I., Conditions of personality organization related to empathic ability among normal and schizophrenic subjects, J. consult. Psychol., 1962, 26, 416-421

62. Stewart, D., Preface to Empathy, Philosophical Library, N. Y., 1956

63. Stewart, D., The psychogenesis of empathy, Psychoanal. Rev., 1954, 41, 206-228

64. Sullivan, H. S., Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry, William Alanson White Foundation, 1947

65. Sutcliffe, J. P., A general method of analysis of frequency data for multiple classification designs, Psychol. Bull., 1957, 54 134-7

66. Szasz, T., Pain and Pleasure, Basic Books, N. Y., 1957

67. Taft, R., The ability to judge people, Psychol. Bull., 1955, 52 1-23

68. Veroff, J., Facets of interpersonal incentives, mimeographed paper

69. West, R., Conscience and Society, Methuen, Lond., 1942

70. White, R. W., Motivation reconsidered: the concept of competence, Psychoanal. Rev., 1959, 66, 297-333

71. Wolfe, B., Everything Happens at Night, Signet, N. Y., 1955