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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In all probability there is no subject area more important to clinical psychology and personality study than that of empathy. It is, however, one of the most neglected facets in the field. A few studies have attempted to define empathy, develop an adequate measure of it, and determine its importance in understanding interpersonal relationships (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6).

The majority of investigations have attempted to discover the relationships between empathic ability and insight. Other studies have dealt with sex differences in regard to empathy, the relationship between empathic ability and personality structure, and the role of empathy in mental illness such as schizophrenia. In addition, attempts have been made to establish an operational definition of empathy as a factor in the treatment of personality problems.

Both professional and public opinion is of the belief that psychologists and others who aid human beings should have a greater degree of empathic ability than persons engaged in other fields of endeavor. In this light it is interesting to note that no investigation has been conducted concerning empathic ability among psychologists or among students who major in psychology. That psychologists should possess a greater amount of this ability appears to be of utmost importance. This
study was therefore undertaken in the belief that students of psychology possess a significantly greater degree of empathic ability than do students of other college majors.

Statement of the Problem and Hypothesis

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there is any significant difference in empathic ability between psychology students and business students as a group. A scale developed at Dartmouth College was utilized to measure degree of empathic ability. This scale was originally developed for the purpose of having a forecaster predict for four associates in an attempt to provide an approach to analysis of four variables: raw empathy, refined empathy, projection and similarity. The form, consisting of forty-two statements, was developed to deal with a person's attitudes and feelings toward various situations. The statements were chosen with a view toward tapping various feelings and attitudes which persons commonly experience. Bender and Hastorf (1), who developed this scale, have stated the following concerning its content:

An attempt was made to avoid purely behavioral statements so that forecasts could not be made merely on the basis of simple observation of another person's behavior. Such items as, "I bite my nails" were purposely excluded. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that no attempt was made to develop a personality scale such as introversion-extraversion, etc. (1, p. 505).

This scale apparently did isolate and exhibit the relationship between the four variables stated above. The scale was then utilized in other studies and was chosen as the basis for gathering data in this
study. The scale appears to be more valid than any other yet developed for the purpose of measuring empathy. The scale was utilized in this study because its very design guards against the possibility of forecaster prediction merely on the basis of opinion or simple observation of the behavior of another. The forecaster therefore has to predict on the basis of empathic ability.

It was hypothesized that there is a significant difference in empathic ability between psychology majors and business majors as a group.

Importance and Significance of the Problem

The ability to understand and successfully interact with one's fellow man is obviously of utmost importance in everyday life, to say nothing of its worth to persons engaged in a career of helping others. To be successful in the pursuit of treatment of mental and emotional illness automatically dictates the necessity of understanding others. One must know how and why they are as they are, why they possess their respective value-systems, the reasons for their particular personality structures, and the reasons for which they play their individual roles in life. It has been observed that certain individual psychologists appear to possess a greater degree of ability to place themselves in the role of another and thereby accurately understand and aid that person through this understanding. The question arises, however, as to whether psychologists as a group possess a significantly greater degree of this ability than do individuals of other professions. It would appear of vital
importance that if students of psychology do possess a greater amount of empathic ability, then these same students must therefore be of some particular personality type or structure. This structure would then be important in determining the success or failure of those individuals interested in spending a lifetime in the profession of psychology. Obviously, if a high degree of empathic ability is necessary to the success of psychologists, then those who do not possess this amount of ability possibly would not be successful in this field.

Importance is noted in the area of psychotherapy. What is the abstract ability which enables one individual to help or cure another through a one-to-one relationship found in this type of therapy? Why can this particular type of relationship which is beneficial to the patient because of the skill of the therapist be so valuable, while the usual type of relationship with someone not so gifted with this ability be of no value, possibly even detrimental?

In the main, the significance of the problem concerns itself with the possibility that students of psychology are different from students of other fields. They might be of some particular personality type or structure, differing in the area of degree of empathic ability. It may be this difference, if there is any, which eventually motivates an individual to enter psychology as a profession. It may be this difference which enables the psychology student to be concerned about the mental and emotional welfare of others. Something must account for the motivation to and success within the field of psychology of those persons who have
chosen it as a lifetime career. If empathic ability is one of the factors responsible for that motivation and success in dealing with others, then indeed an important discovery has been made.

Scope of the Study

In this study, one hundred sixty students at the North Texas State College were used as subjects. Eighty of these subjects were chosen on the basis of their major field of study, whether business or psychology, their classification according to year in college, their age, and their sex. These eighty subjects were divided into two groups of forty business majors and forty psychology majors. Each of these two groups was composed of twenty male subjects and twenty female subjects. These eighty subjects in turn individually chose a "close friend" to whom the empathy scale could be administered. There is no reason to assume that these subjects were in any manner atypical of the Junior, Senior or Graduate student population at North Texas State College.

The empathy scale was administered in group form to the forty psychology students and the forty business students. The scale was then administered individually to the chosen "close friend" of each of the business and psychology students. All copies of the scale were then scored.
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CHAPTER II

RELATED STUDIES

The greatest single difficulty encountered with research in the area of empathy is and has been the formulation of an adequate definition, both empirically and operationally. The problem has been attacked by various sources in the social sciences.

Cottrell, believing that empathy is the basic process of all social interaction, says:

The impact of one human organism A, on the activities of another, B, not only stimulates and conditions a response pattern of A to B but also conditions in A the response pattern of B to A as A has perceived that action and vice versa. This process of responding by reproducing the acts of the other(s) has been referred to by various writers as taking the role of the other, identification, introjection, sympathy, empathy, or imitation (1, p. 374).

Dymond, one of the leaders of research in this area, has posited what appears to be the definition closest to this phenomenon. She states:

Although the term empathy has been in the psychological literature for some time it has had several different usages. For this reason, it is important that the term be defined before it is used further. Empathy will be used in this paper to denote the imaginative transposing of one's self into the thinking, feeling, and acting of another and so structuring the world as he does.

Recently there have been suggestions from several different sources that empathy may be one of the underlying processes on which our understanding of others is built. This is sometimes phrased as "sympathy," "fellow-feeling," "soul awareness," or "insight." (3, p. 127).
Hoskins has stated one of the most important possibilities of empathy as a contribution to the area of mental health. He says that

It (empathy) throws open the possibility that the primary defect in schizophrenia, a defect from which the remainder of the symptomatology stems- is inadequate empathy.
Perhaps as fundamentally characteristic as anything about the psychosis is the failure of the subject either to achieve or retain adequate breadth or depth of empathy (5, p. 102).

Concerning an adequate definition of empathy, Dymond states:

Some of the overlapping terms which must be distinguished from empathy are: sympathy, insight, identification, and projection.
Empathy is viewed ... as a mental process. It may lead to positive feelings and closer social relations, as when it results in sympathy, but this is not necessarily the case .... Identification appears to be a very special kind of role taking, one that is more lasting, less frequent and more emotional than is implied in the term empathy .... There is no implication that one would unconsciously like to be the other person in order to empathize with him, nor does empathy necessarily imply any emotional tie with the other (4, p. 343).

Rogers makes this distinction:

... the experiencing with the client, the living of his attitudes, is not in terms of an emotional involvement or emotional identification on the counselor's part, but rather an empathetic identification where the counselor is perceiving the hopes and fears of the client through immersion in an empathetic process (9, p. 33).

And again Dymond states:

Projection seems to be an antithetical process to empathy since projection involves the attribution of one's own wishes, attitudes, and behavior to something or some one other than the self .... This "faculty" of being able to see things from the other person's point of view, while it does not insure more respect or admiration for the other, does seem to assure more effective communication and understanding (4, p. 349).
The importance of empathy to clinical psychology and the field of human interactions can best be illustrated by previous studies and comments by individuals within the profession.

Cottrell says:

... for the student of human interaction, Sullivan's communications bristle with new problems for research, some of which he was aware of and others of which he was apparently unaware or perhaps considered irrelevant to his central concerns. The purpose of the present paper is to point to certain critically important interpersonal processes upon which little or no research has been done and for which an adequate body of theory and hypotheses does not exist. We refer to what we shall call the empathic responses or processes in human interaction ... One of Sullivan's basic conceptions which can serve to point up the problem we are considering is that of the psychiatrist as a participant observer in the therapeutic situation. This conception of the functions of the therapist requires that he become aware of the nature of the interpersonal interaction going on, that he correctly perceive not only his own definition of the situation and his conception of his own role in it, but that he also perceive the patient's definition of the situation and his conception of his role in it as well as his conception of the psychiatrist's role. This requires that the psychiatrist utilize some portion of his reactive system to take the role of his patient--to place himself in the psychological shoes of the patient--and perceive the situation from that perspective and to respond to himself as the patient responds to him. The ability to do this we shall call empathic ability ... These are some of the observations which lead us to propose that a type of human response to others that we are denoting by the term empathy is of the utmost importance in interpersonal dynamics where Sullivan so appropriately locates the central problems of personality disorders. A better understanding of its nature is essential not only in the analysis of such disorders, but in their treatment as well ... The empathic responses are basic in all communicative processes. They are central to the development of the social self ... (2, p. 355).

And further:

... it is indeed most surprising that they (empathic phenomena) have not received more research attention than they have from social scientists ... The nature of the phenomena renders them extremely difficult to study with
available techniques ... Whatever the reasons, it is our contention that research in this area can no longer be avoided (2, p. 357).

Speaking further concerning this research, Cottrell states:

In the first place our experience indicates that it is quite possible to develop a quantitative index of relative empathic ability, which will discriminate reasonably well. In the second place it seemed quite clear that there are wide differences among members of our sample in their empathic ability, and we are certain that a more representative sample of the population will show even greater differences.

A third suggestion emerging from the materials is that there is a significant relation between empathic ability as we have described it and insight into one's own behavior.

In this connection it is interesting to note in passing that the females in our population seemed to average slightly higher in empathic scores than the males (2, pp. 358-359).

Some interesting and important contributions have been made concerning the relationship of empathic ability and personality types or traits. In one of her studies, Dymond found that:

The combined results of the Wechsler, the Rorschach, the TAT and the California Ethnocentrism Test, together with the subjects' own self-analyses gave a picture of those whose empathy is high as outgoing, optimistic, warm, emotional people, who have a strong interest in others. They are flexible people whose emotional relations with others, particularly their early family relations, have been sufficiently satisfying so that they find investing emotionally in others rewarding. Their own level of security is such that they can afford an interest in others. While they are emotional people, their emotionality is well controlled and richly enjoyed.

Those low in empathy are rather rigid, introverted people who are subject to outbursts of uncontrolled emotionality. They seem unable to deal with concrete material and interpersonal relations successfully. They are either self-centered and demanding in their emotional contacts or else lone wolves who prefer to get along without strong ties to other people. Their own early emotional relationships within the family seem to have been so disturbed and unsatisfying that they cannot afford to invest their love in others ... They seem to compensate for their lack of emotional development by stressing the
abstract intellectual approach to life as the safest . . . . The mere fact that they are so inwardly oriented and rigid in their structure makes it impossible for them to empathize with others successfully . . . . It is their own thoughts and feelings which count (4, p. 349).

Regarding personality, one of the important areas of research has been the attempts to discover the differences in personalities between psychologists and those in other professions.

Roe (7, 8) studied the psychological structure of both psychologists and biologists. She found that the psychologists were dependent upon parental figures and were strongly concerned with interpersonal relations. Group Rorschach responses revealed that they were sensitive, intensely concerned with others, rather freely aggressive, and troubled frequently by conflicts over authority. On the other hand, biologists were found to be fairly inconsistent concerning pattern of personality structure. They were found to be low in masculinity and were not outgoing persons. Their social and personal relations tended to be superficial and cold, and they evidenced a greater ability than the average to see things as a whole.

Teevan (11) attempted to determine whether or not personality factors were related to choice of major in college. Three groupings of college majors and scores from the Blackey Pictures were used. Those in literature had higher disturbance scores on oral eroticism than the other divisions; social science majors had higher disturbance scores on oral sadism, oedipal intensity, guilt feelings, and anaclitic love objects; and science majors had the lowest disturbance in
personal relations. The low disturbance scores among science majors were explained by their almost complete lack of interest in personal relationships or an effective retreat from them.

Sternberg (10) studied personality trait patterns in relation to major in college by the use of factor analysis. The most prominent difference between psychology majors and students in the field of science was in the area of direct communication with people. Students of mathematics, chemistry and physics seemed uninterested in aesthetic, social service, or personal contact activities. The psychology students were strong in the areas of prestige, power and personal contact.

McCown (6) conducted a study to determine differences in interpersonal relations between psychology students and physics majors. His findings generally support the concept of "vocational personality types." Specifically, the results reveal that students who major in psychology enter the field because it offers potential satisfaction of the need for others to act personally toward them and the need to initiate relations with people. It was also found that the choice of physics as a major tends to be associated with a lack of interest in people or a retreating from interpersonal relationships.

Further results of the above study indicate that the stereotypes associated with the various occupations do seem to exert some influence upon choice of college major. Only one physics major out of the forty in the sample belonged to a social organization, while
twenty of the forty in the psychology group did belong to such an organization. The results indicated that the various occupations attract people who are similar in the amount of interaction or attention they wish to receive from others. Further results indicated that the fields of physics and psychology offered similar possibilities for satisfaction of the need to control others. Both groups had a similar striving in this area. It was also found that psychology majors perhaps possess a certain amount of rebellion against authority. In degree of expression of affection toward others, the two groups did not differ significantly. The results indicate finally that psychology majors are more desirous of affectionate behavior expressed toward them than are the physics majors. The basis of this difference appears quite vague.

Past research would seem to point out that there are patterns of needs which are characteristic of nearly every occupational grouping.

Obviously, empathy is one of the most important facets of the processes of human interaction. It plays a vital role in all relationships. It is of extreme importance in any attempts to help treat those who are mentally or emotionally ill. Empathy plays a vital role in the psychiatrist's office as well as that of the psychologist. Empathy is related to one's own self-insight. If one cannot empathize, then one cannot successfully interact with others, perceive others as they really are, nor perceive one's self. Whether empathic ability is dependent upon self-insight, or vice versa, is not known, but it is to
be hoped that the answer to that question will not be long in forthcoming. If such an important relationship can be demonstrated and answered, a valuable tool to aid treatment of the mentally ill will have been gained.
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Procedure

A scale designed to measure empathy was used in this study. (See Appendix.) The scale was administered in group form to the forty business and forty psychology students. Each of these subjects was instructed to choose a "close friend," and each of these was in turn administered the scale on an individual basis. Each business student and each psychology student was instructed to answer the questions on the scale as he or she thought the close friend would answer them. These subjects were cautioned about confusing personal opinions of their friends with actual attempts to answer the scale as they felt their friends would answer. Each "close friend," in turn, was instructed to answer the questions on the scale as was true of himself or herself. In short, the procedure was one of A"rates" B and B"rates"himself. All copies of the scale were scored as a sum difference between the two scores obtained from each pair of subjects, each pair being composed of one business or psychology student and one close friend of each of these subjects. For example, if one business student rated his friend's behavior as choice one (1), "almost always," on question number one, and his friend answered this question for himself as three (3), "seldom," the difference was
counted as two. This procedure was followed for each question on the scale. The numerical differences between scores for each question were then added together to obtain a total difference score for each pair of subjects. This total difference score was considered the index of empathic ability of each business and psychology student in relation to the performance of the other subjects in each of the two majors, respectively, as measured by their own individual empathic ability indices.

The empathy scale consisted originally of forty-two questions. Three of these, numbers three, eighteen and twenty-one were struck from the scale, as it was discovered that these questions were primarily for males. The female subjects were having great difficulty in answering them. By removing these three questions from the scale, the introduction of an uncontrolled variable was prevented. Otherwise, in scoring the copies of the scale, those of the males would have included forty-two answers, while those of the females would have included thirty-nine answers. The minimum possible total difference score obtainable on this scale was zero, while the maximum possible difference was one hundred seventeen. This maximum number was obtained by multiplying the total number of scale questions by the total numerical error possible in each question. Thus, thirty-nine questions times three is equal to one hundred seventeen.
The two groups of subjects were homogeneous in that they were chosen within the limitations of being of Junior, Senior or Graduate classification, of the ages between eighteen and twenty-eight, and being students with a major study in either business or psychology.

To test the original hypotheses, the scores were arranged into four groups or cells. These consisted of the male business student subjects, the female business student subjects, the male psychology student subjects and the female psychology student subjects. Each cell thus consisted of twenty individual empathic ability index scores, one for each pair of subjects. Each pair consisted of a major student and his or her "close friend." The above arrangement was then utilized in computing an analysis of variance, using four groups or "cells." Analysis of variance was chosen for this study in order to ascertain whether the results of the computation were due to factors of sex, subject major or interaction between the two.

Analysis of Data

The raw scores for each of the pairs of subjects are presented below, the psychology subjects in Table I and the business subjects in Table II.
TABLE I

INDIVIDUAL RAW SCORES OF PSYCHOLOGY SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was noted that the total range of raw scores was greater for the psychology group than that of the business group. It was noted, in addition, that the subjects ranked from greatest to least in empathic ability in the following order: female psychology students, male psychology students, female business students, and male business students. There was a definite difference in empathic ability; however, the results of the analysis of variance revealed no significant difference. For differences according to sex, $F_s = 1.60$; for differences according to major, $F_m = 1.75$; and for differences
according to interaction, $F_1 < 1$. These resulting $F$-ratios were not significant at any level of confidence. The hypothesis was rejected.

The females exhibited a slightly greater degree of empathic ability, but again this was not significantly greater. This result is in agreement with previous studies. The group of psychology subjects had a greater range of scores, with both lower (greater empathic ability) and higher (less empathic ability) scores as measured by the scale utilized in this study. Although the psychology group did contain three indicators of extremely high empathic ability, the remainder of the group appeared sufficiently low to offset any effects of high empathic ability on the part of the three individuals.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Forty business students, forty psychology students, and a close friend of each at the North Texas State College, of Junior, Senior and Graduate classification, were administered a scale for the measurement of empathic ability. The business and psychology students attempted to accurately answer the scale as they felt each of their respective friends would answer. Each friend then answered the scale for himself or herself. The procedure was that of A "rates" B and B "rates" himself, to test the hypothesis: that there is a significant difference in empathic ability between psychology students as a group and business students as a group.

Procedure for obtaining scores was as follows: the answers given each question respectively by each subject in every pair of subjects were compared numerically; that is, since "A" could answer question one as (1) "almost always," (2) "Often," (3) "Seldom," or (4) "Almost never," and "B" also had a choice among these, then the choices to question one given by "A" and "B" were compared and the difference in their choices given a numerical value. These possible choices may be observed in the copy of the scale included in this work. (See Appendix.) For example, if "A" chose (1) "Almost always" on question one, and his partner "B" chose (4) "Almost
never" on question one, the numerical difference would be three. These numerical differences for each question were added to obtain a total sum of differences between the performance on the scale of "A" and "B" in each pair of subjects. The total difference score is the empathic ability index for the business or psychology student in each pair of subjects. These scores were accordingly arranged into four groups or "cells." Scores from the group of male psychology subjects were placed in one cell, scores from female psychology subjects in another, and so on. The scores were then utilized to compute an analysis of variance. The F-ratios were $F_s = 1.60$, $F_m = 1.75$, and $F_1 = 1$. These F-ratios were effectively equal to total absence of relationship between the criteria and were therefore sufficient to reject the hypothesis.

The results of this study indicate that there is no significant difference in empathic ability between business and psychology students, as a group, of the Junior, Senior and Graduate classification, at North Texas State College.

It should perhaps be noted that public opinion, as well as that within the professions of psychology and psychiatry, has often been of the belief that those within the two above professions would and should be capable of greater empathic ability than individuals in other professions. It has been observed, in addition, that possibly one of the motivating and responsible factors for the choice of one of these two professions by students in college is a greater degree of empathic
ability in regard to working with others. Further, past belief has been widespread that females possess a significantly greater degree of empathic ability than males. The results of this particular study, at least, would certainly tend to negate the above beliefs and opinions.

It must be concluded that students of psychology are no different than others as a group, concerning their degree of empathic ability, and it is doubtful that these students are particularly motivated into the profession nor aided in achieving success therein on the basis of any greater ability to empathize with others. It is therefore felt that other factors must be responsible for this motivation and success. New questions are thus created by the study. Why do certain individuals possess greater empathic ability than others? What are the personality correlates of these individuals? If empathic ability is not responsible for the motivation into and success within the field of psychology, what factors are? Can empathy be measured with greater sensitivity than heretofore? What accounts for the slight difference in empathic ability on the part of females, as a group? These and many other interesting questions must await answers for future research attempts.
APPENDIX
In the interests of a thesis in Psychology, we are asking that you respond to the attached test in a special way. You are to predict how another person would answer these statements. It is imperative that you do not answer these statements with your opinion of the person, but rather as you think he would answer them himself. Please use the following scale. Circle your prediction.


1. 2. 3. 4. (1) I am wary about the trustworthiness of persons whom I do not know well.

1. 2. 3. 4. (2) I feel embarrassed when I am dressed differently than the people I am with.

1. 2. 3. 4. (3) I make conversation with a barber while I am getting a haircut.

1. 2. 3. 4. (4) I feel that many persons I meet in my own age group are not interested in me.

1. 2. 3. 4. (5) I avoid asking the assistance of others because I think that I am only bothering them.

1. 2. 3. 4. (6) When something is really bothering me, I am able to appear outwardly calm and collected.

1. 2. 3. 4. (7) I like to go to parties where I can meet new people.

1. 2. 3. 4. (8) I can readily detect when another person is irritated.

1. 2. 3. 4. (9) I like to carry out planned activities.

1. 2. 3. 4. (10) I avoid mentioning subjects that will irritate another person.

1. 2. 3. 4. (11) I like to be the one to liven up a dull party.

1. 2. 3. 4. (12) I would rather read an historical novel than a work of romantic fiction.
1. 2. 3. 4. (13) I am embarrassed when my companions attract attention in public.

1. 2. 3. 4. (14) People can change my mind even after I have made a decision.

1. 2. 3. 4. (15) When I go to the movies I imagine myself in the role of the hero.

1. 2. 3. 4. (16) I have the feeling of being alone, even when with a group of people.

1. 2. 3. 4. (17) I go straight after what I want, being unconcerned about the feelings of others.

1. 2. 3. 4. (18) When I am dining out with a date, I pay the bill without checking it.

1. 2. 3. 4. (19) While attending a movie I make remarks (witty, encouraging, disparaging, or otherwise) which are audible to those around me.

1. 2. 3. 4. (20) I cover up my shortcomings by my personality.

1. 2. 3. 4. (21) After a very tiring day I decide to keep my seat in a streetcar, even though ladies have to stand. I overhear one of the ladies remark about chivalry being dead. I remain in my seat.

1. 2. 3. 4. (22) I rationalize my failures to my friends.

1. 2. 3. 4. (23) I readily adopt my friends opinion of another person, even before meeting him.

1. 2. 3. 4. (24) I enjoy introducing myself to strangers at a social gathering.

1. 2. 3. 4. (25) If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.

1. 2. 3. 4. (26) I like to argue with people.

1. 2. 3. 4. (27) I feel embarrassed, even when I make trivial errors.

1. 2. 3. 4. (28) When a stranger is seated next to me on a train, I keep my attention on something else in order to avoid conversation with him.

1. 2. 3. 4. (29) I like to give people advice.
1. 2. 3. 4. (30) In a party I like to be the center of attraction.

1. 2. 3. 4. (31) When I am beating a friend in tennis by a large margin, I tend to let up on my play.

1. 2. 3. 4. (32) At a reception or tea I feel reluctant to meet the important person present.

1. 2. 3. 4. (33) I dislike public displays of affection.

1. 2. 3. 4. (34) When I am dancing with my date at a party I resent a fellow cutting in on me.

1. 2. 3. 4. (35) I tend to avoid discussions on topics with which I am unfamiliar.

1. 2. 3. 4. (36) I worry about whether or not people appreciate me.

1. 2. 3. 4. (37) I shrink from emotional scenes.

1. 2. 3. 4. (38) I feel sympathetic with people who are in trouble.

1. 2. 3. 4. (39) I keep my ideals to myself.

1. 2. 3. 4. (40) When I do something selfish I worry about it afterwards.

1. 2. 3. 4. (41) If the group I am with wants to do something I don't approve of, I go along with them without protesting.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


Articles


Unpublished Material