

SOME COMPARISON BETWEEN RACIAL PREJUDICE AND SELF-
ACCEPTANCE IN NEGRO AND WHITE COLLEGE STUDENTS

APPROVED:

Bob L. Winborn
Major Professor

Merl V. Boney
Minor Professor

Witt Blair
Dean of the School of Education

Robert B. Toulouse
Dean of the Graduate School

**SOME COMPARISONS BETWEEN RACIAL PREJUDICE AND SELF-
ACCEPTANCE IN NEGRO AND WHITE COLLEGE STUDENTS**

THESIS

**Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements**

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

Billy Fred Russell, B. S.

Denton, Texas

May, 1964

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Hypotheses	
Significance of the Study	
Basic Assumptions and Limitations	
Definition of Terms	
Related Literature	
II. PROCEDURE	21
Population	
Description of Instruments	
Procedure for Treating Data	
III. RESULTS	29
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	42
BIBLIOGRAPHY	50

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
<p>I. Differences Between the Means of the Prejudice Scale and the Self-Acceptance Scale for Low Scoring and High Scoring White Subjects</p>	29
<p>II. Differences Between the Means of the Prejudice Scale and the Self-Acceptance Scale for Low Scoring and High Scoring Negro Subjects. . . .</p>	30
<p>III. Differences Between the Means of the Prejudice Scale and the Self-Acceptance Scale for White Male and White Female Subjects</p>	31
<p>IV. Differences Between the Means of the Prejudice Scale and the Self-Acceptance Scale for Negro Male and Negro Female Subjects.</p>	32
<p>V. Differences Between the Means of the Prejudice Scale and the Self-Acceptance Scale for White Male Subjects who Tend Toward a High Degree of Racial Prejudice and White Male Subjects who Tend Toward a Low Degree of Racial Prejudice</p>	33
<p>VI. Differences Between the Means of the Prejudice Scale and the Self-Acceptance Scale for White Female Subjects who Tend Toward a High Degree of Racial Prejudice and White Female Subjects who Tend Toward a Low Degree of Racial Prejudice</p>	34
<p>VII. Differences Between the Means of the Prejudice Scale and the Self-Acceptance Scale for Negro Male Subjects who Tend Toward a High Degree of Racial Prejudice and Negro Male Subjects who Tend Toward a Low Degree of Racial Prejudice</p>	35

LIST OF TABLES -- Continued

Table	Page
VIII. Differences Between the Means of the Prejudice Scale and the Self-Acceptance Scale for Negro Male Subjects who Tend Toward a High Degree of Racial Prejudice and Negro Male Subjects who Tend Toward a Low Degree of Racial Prejudice	36

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the importance of self-acceptance and its relation to the behavior of the individual has been considered and studied by many psychologists. The theoretical positions of many prominent psychologists and psychiatrists have stimulated the volume of inquiries dealing with the subject. Among those expounding significant theoretical views have been: Adler (1); Horney (13); Sullivan (25); Murphy (17); Lecky (14); Fromm (2); Combs (3); Snygg (8); Rogers (22); Calman (7); and others. These theories have pointed out and emphasized the behavioral consequences derived from a person's conception of himself. The theorists agree that the manner in which a person perceived himself would serve as a focal point for the consequent manner in which he evaluated and perceived his environmental surroundings, and how the individual reacted to these surroundings.

The individual's perception of his surroundings would naturally include his attitudes toward other people. These attitudes toward others similarly include prejudices attitudes. Hence Rogers states, "When the individual perceives and accepts into a

consistent and an integrated system all his sensory and visceral experiences, then he is necessarily more understanding of others and is more accepting of others as separate individuals" (22, p. 520).

Within this same vein of thought, Fromm stated, "The man who has a recognition of his true self will have a productive orientation to living," and also, "The person who has enjoyed good early relationships will have respect and love for himself, will be able to cherish and love others, and will be able to use his capacity in fruitful work" (2, p. 1428).

From these and other theorists come the concept that one must accept himself (self-acceptance) before his acceptance of others is manifested. In the statements previously quoted from Fromm and Rogers, a positive relationship between acceptance of others and self-acceptance was predicted. The hypotheses tested as a result of this investigation were developed from this theoretical frame of reference.

H. S. Sullivan in his book, The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry, follows what Fromm and Rogers predicted when he states, "If there is a valid and real attitude toward the self, that attitude will be manifest as valid and real toward others. It is not as ye judge that ye shall be judged, but as you judge yourself so shall you judge others" (25, p. 151). Horney more appropriately

brings the concept into focus with regards to prejudiced attitudes when she states:

Being unable to accept himself as he is, he cannot possibly believe that others, knowing him with all his shortcomings, can accept him in a friendly or appreciative spirit. . . . This may lead to a subtle poisoning of all human relations. He may become unable to take any positive feelings of others at their face value (13, p. 135).

Thus she points out the breeding grounds for discontent causing prejudice, or distrust and suspicion, which is the result fostering prejudiced feelings. Also, this self-concept (or acceptance of self) will persist because of distorted perceptions and interpretations arising from it. When a person's self-concept is unacceptable to himself, his behavior will reflect this in his attitudes toward others.

Combs and Snygg make this point clear when they state:

The stability of the phenomenal self makes change difficult by causing us (1) to ignore aspects of our experience which are inconsistent with it or (2) to select perceptions in such a way as to confirm the concepts we already possess (8, p. 159).

In such a way, a person because of his inner frame of reference and distorted acceptance of himself, distorts reality to the degree of changing his perceptions of a situation in order to support his misconception. Therefore, he will not be able to deal effectively with the attitudes and beliefs of others or with general ways of living which vary from his own.

The theory on which this study was based is summarized in the following statement by Rogers. "The person who accepts himself thoroughly, will necessarily improve his relationship with those with whom he has personal contact, because of his understanding and acceptance of them" (22, p. 522). This statement of Rogers' leads one to theorize that the prejudiced individual does not, in fact, accept himself, and in turn does not accept others.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the study was to compare racial prejudice and self-acceptance in Negro and white college students. An attempt was made to determine the degree to which acceptance of self compared with acceptance of people of different races.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses tested in this investigation were as follows:

1. White students who tend toward a high degree of racial prejudice as measured by the prejudice scale of the MMPI will have significantly lower self-acceptance scores as measured by the self-acceptance scale of the Californian Psychological Inventory, than white students who tend toward a low degree of racial prejudice.
2. Negro students who tend toward a high degree of racial prejudice as measured by the prejudice scale of the MMPI

will have significantly lower self-acceptance scores as measured by the self-acceptance scale of the California Psychological Inventory, than Negro students who tend toward a low degree of racial prejudice.

The following sub-hypotheses were also examined:

1. There will be no significant differences between the scores of white male subjects and white female subjects on the prejudice scale of the MMPI or the self-acceptance scale of the CPI.

2. There will be no significant difference between the scores of Negro male subjects and Negro female subjects on the prejudice scale of the MMPI or the self-acceptance scale of the CPI.

3. White male students who tend toward a high degree of racial prejudice as measured by the prejudice scale of the MMPI will have significantly lower self-acceptance scores as measured by the self-acceptance scale of the CPI than white male students who tend toward a low degree of racial prejudice.

4. White female students who tend toward a high degree of racial prejudice, as measured by the prejudice scale of the MMPI, will have significantly lower self-acceptance scores, as measured

by the self-acceptance scale of the CPI, than white female students who tend toward a low degree of racial prejudice.

5. Negro male students who tend toward a high degree of racial prejudice, as measured by the prejudice scale of the MMPI, will have significantly lower self-acceptance scores as measured by the self-acceptance scale of the CPI, than Negro male students who tend toward a low degree of racial prejudice.

6. Negro female students who tend toward a high degree of racial prejudice, as measured by the prejudice scale of the MMPI, will have significantly lower self-acceptance scores, as measured by the self-acceptance scale of the CPI, than Negro female students who tend toward a low degree of racial prejudice.

Significance of the Study

The significance of the present undertaking is the investigation of the dynamics of expressed prejudiced attitudes. Apparently the results of such an undertaking can be both socially and clinically valuable, judging from the reported number of people who are in clinics of various types due to an inability to accept either themselves or others.

It should be pointed out that the present study was undertaken with a clinical viewpoint toward the problem. The results of this

study should be considered in view of the fact that they can be of value to the clinician in many different ways. In the clinical setting, it can be shown that a great number of problems evolve from the basic idea that the individual cannot be successful because of his inability to relate to others. Very often it is found that this inability comes from a lack of self-understanding, and consequently a lack of self-acceptance.

To the clinician, it would be seen what the results of this non-acceptance of oneself would encompass. Firstly, if the patient were unable to relate to others because of his poor perception of others due to his non-acceptance of himself, then relations between the clinician and patient would be difficult. In such an instance, counseling, therapy, or even testing would become impossible. In group or individual therapy, when problems arose from prejudiced feelings, this study would be beneficial in giving the clinician a cue to an individual's feelings of himself and a tool with which to diagnose and thus treat. He would have helpful knowledge in how the two phenomena of prejudice and self-acceptance along with acceptance of others might explain one another.

Basic Assumptions and Limitations

It was necessary to propose certain basic assumptions and to establish certain limitations in order to structure the design of the investigation.

1. It was assumed that the motivational level of all students who took the questionnaire was equal.
2. It was assumed that all students had equal ability to read and comprehend the statements on the questionnaire.
3. It was assumed that the questionnaire used did measure what it was designed to measure.
4. The degree of generalizations from the data obtained will necessarily have limitations due to the number of subjects and the type of subjects involved in the investigation.

Definition of Terms

1. CPI - This term refers to the California Psychological Inventory which is a psychometric instrument to assess personality characteristics having broad personal and social relevance.
2. MMPI - This term refers to the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory which is a psychometric device for the assessment of personality characteristics of both normal and abnormal persons.

3. Prejudice - This term will be operationally defined as the attitude measured by the prejudice scale of the MMPI.
4. Self-Acceptance - This term will be operationally defined as the attitude measured by the self-acceptance scale of the CPI.

Related Literature

The separate efforts of Seeman, Stock, and Sheerer gave rise to the volume of experimental studies dealing with acceptance of self and its relation to acceptance of others. These studies took place in a clinical setting where any progressive change in acceptance of self and others could be noted. Content analysis was done by a board of judges who rated the subject's statements on the categories of positive, negative, and ambivalent feelings toward self and others (12, p. 491). Seeman found that, "the number of positive self-references increased and the number of negative self-references decreased during therapy without any concomitant change in the feelings toward others" (12, p. 491).

However, both Stock and Sheerer found a positive correlation to exist between self-acceptance and acceptance of others. Ten cases, counseled according to the principles of nondirective therapy, were used as the basic data for these studies. The interviews varied from three to nine and were randomly selected by the counseling center at the University of Chicago. Categories were

established and judgments made according to these categories. In assembling the results, the interview was taken as the basic unit. The Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient was the measure used to indicate degree of relationship. Stock stated in her study that:

The total results of this study indicate a definite relationship exists between the way an individual feels about other persons. An individual who holds negative feelings toward himself tends to hold negative feelings toward other people in general. As his feelings about himself change to objective or positive, feelings about others change in a similar direction.

Separate and rather specific factors can be identified within the general area of feeling about others. Feelings toward the self are shown to be correlated in varying degrees with these different aspects of feelings toward others. It was found in this study that attitudes toward individuals in a social relationship correlated more highly with self attitudes than did feelings in the area of family relationships or more impersonal relationships. It was also indicated that there is a close correspondence between self attitudes and the feelings about the relationships with others (24, p. 180).

In the study by Sheerer using the same format as Stock, a product-moment correlation of .51 was found, which was significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence between self-acceptance and acceptance of others (23, p. 173).

Several types of questionnaires have been developed to examine the relationship between self-acceptance and acceptance of others. Phillips (19), developed a questionnaire for his investigation into the relationship between self-acceptance and acceptance of others.

He found that by way of the question-and-answer technique such attitudes could be elicited directly, and to a statistically significant degree. Furthermore, his study showed that the observations made in clinics in regard to self-other attitudes are also true in a normal population.

Another investigator to construct a self-acceptance inventory for measuring acceptance of self and acceptance of others was Berger (5). In his study, he also found that a positive relationship exists between these two concepts.

Omwake undertook a study to make a comparison between the scales developed by Berger, Phillips, Bills, Vence, and McLean. One inventory devised by Bills is called "An Index of Adjustment and Values" and is a comparison between self-concept and ideal-concept scores (4). It has good validation studies (4, 21, 3), and is one of the more popular inventories. Omwake found good agreement between the measuring devices, and she also found evidence to support a positive relationship between self and other acceptance. The results indicated there was a marked relation between the way an individual sees himself and the way he sees others. Those who accept themselves tend to be acceptant of others and to perceive others as accepting themselves. Those who reject themselves

hold correspondingly low opinion of others; and perceive others as being self-rejectant. She summarized her findings as follows:

There is evidence that in the normal population, as well as in those undergoing therapy, attitudes toward the self appear to be reflected in attitudes toward other people; the lower the opinion of the self, the lower the opinion of others. Only when the self is regarded with a fairly high degree of acceptance is it possible to relate effectively to others, to understand them, and to regard them as persons of worth (18, p. 445).

Using a scale which is a self-concept and ideal-concept scale, and two sociometric scales developed by Lipsett, Reese introduced still another relationship into the study of self-acceptance. The subjects of this study were fourth, sixth, and eighth-graders. The subjects were placed into three groups according to their scores on the self-concept scale. He found a curvilinear relationship between acceptance of others, acceptance by others, and acceptance by best friends. The sociometric results were not found to be related to discrepancy between ideal-self and self-concept scores. This prompted Reese to state, "The discrepancy score obtained by subtraction may not be a valid measure of self-acceptance" (20, p. 474). Not only Reese, but other authors have mentioned the question about whether the discrepancy score between self-concept and ideal-self concept is a reliable measure of self-acceptance (26, 15).

Zelen (29) also employed a sociometric device and measures of adjustment in the study of self-acceptance. He tested sixth grade children and found a positive correlation between acceptance of self, acceptance of others and acceptance by others. In discussing his results, Zelen hypothesized that perhaps this relationship existed only in this young population due to the fact that a child's concept of himself is more likely to be affected or derived from the immediate surroundings, thus his self-concept will be similar to the group's feelings toward him. On the other hand, it can be readily seen that an older person's concept of himself would be the result of having been formed through contact with many groups and interactions with them. Thus, the older person would not be so nearly dependent upon one group's feelings toward him as would the child. In view of the fact that this discrepancy is found between an individual's self-concept and a particular group's concept of him, it can not be necessarily attributed to the effects of maladjustment or misinterpretation of reality.

Brownfain, in his study on the stability of the self-concept as a dimension of one's personality, found many related factors. He stated that every evaluative statement a person makes about himself may be thought of as a sample of his self-concept, from which may be inferred certain properties of that self-concept. Adjustment

was measured from subject's behavior in rating himself and others; scores on the Guilford-Martin Inventory of Factors (GAMIN) and the groups' evaluation of self. All findings supported the theoretical prediction that subjects with stable self-concepts were better adjusted than those with unstable self-concepts. He listed several significant traits of the subjects with the more stable self-concepts: they have a higher level of self-esteem as manifested by a higher mean self-rating and also by a higher self-rating on the inventory items defining self-acceptance; are better liked and considered more popular by the group; see themselves more as they believe others see them; and they show less evidence of compensatory behavior of a defensive kind (6, p. 597).

Wylie (28) found while investigating self-acceptance and defensiveness in 378 airmen that individuals low in self-acceptance were high in defensiveness. These results were in keeping with the above study. The results of this and the previously cited study seem to lend support to the ideas put forth by Rogers of people with higher esteem for themselves having better interpersonal relations.

Fey incorporated the Edwards Personality Preference Schedule and ratings of the perceived and ideal self. His findings were interesting in the traits uncovered. He stated in his conclusions:

The high self-acceptance low acceptance of others group uniquely endorsed items which suggest that they overestimate their personal acceptability to others while ascribing

degraded motives to those about them. The high self-acceptance and high acceptance of others group seems healthiest in its positive confidence in self and others, asserting self-determination and accepting personal responsibility. The low self-acceptance and high acceptance of others group almost timidly shuns leadership while the low acceptance of self and low acceptance of others group . . . had low introspection scores, impulsivity, low morale, over-dependence and a marked tendency to accommodate others (9, p. 48).

Rogers stated his hypothesis as such: "The person who accepts himself will, because of this self-acceptance, have better interpersonal relations with others" (22, p. 522). Rogers' statement prompted several investigations which lead to both positive and negative conclusions. McIntyre investigated the responses of 224 second-semester freshmen who had occupied two dormitories since the start of the school year. First, he administered a sociometric test on each floor and the subjects were thus rated from most to least accepted by the other students in their dormitory wing. Secondly, he took the highest and lowest twenty-five per cent of each group and administered the "Phillips Attitude-Toward-Self Scale" and other questionnaires to them. In his results, he stated that: "The results of this study gave no support to Rogers' views that better interpersonal relations are a function of better attitudes toward self and others" (16, p. 626).

Because of these negative findings of McIntyre, Fey undertook another study. Fey had found in a previous investigation (11), that when attitudes of acceptance of others and self-acceptance did not coincide for an individual, that individual would defend himself

interpersonally. From these findings he hypothesized, "That acceptance by others is in part a function of the pattern of interrelationships between one's attitudes toward himself and those toward others" (10, p. 274). He seemed to surmise that it would require a combination of self-acceptance and acceptance of others scores to be able to predict reliably other personality characteristics.

In a study using a scale he developed for the measurement of expressed attitudes of self-acceptance and acceptance of others, Fey found when he tested 58 third-year medical students with his scale and a sociometric instrument that:

Subjects with high self-acceptance scores tend also to accept others ($r = +.43$) to feel accepted by others ($r = +.71$), but actually to be neither more nor less accepted by others ($r = +.07$) than subjects with low self-acceptance . . . In the sample, estimated acceptability is generally unrelated ($r = .00$) to actual acceptance. Self-acceptance and acceptance-of-others scores are positively related but, taken singly, fall to distinguish groups of most and least acceptance of individuals. The only measure which distinguishes the least acceptable from the most acceptable subjects is the tendency of the former to think relatively less well of others" (10, pp. 274-75).

Williams' study which involved a check of Fey's findings also showed similar results to those of both Fey and McIntyre. Williams concluded that: "While it was demonstrated in this study that subjects can predict their acceptance by others, no

evidence was found that acceptance by others is related to acceptance of self, acceptance of others, or the interrelationship of these two variables" (27, p. 441).

From the foregoing studies, many questions can be raised as to the relationship between self-acceptance and a measured scores of prejudice. For example, how is prejudice related to the variable, measured in several of the above studies, of acceptance of others? Are these two attitudes one and the same? Concerning Rogers' hypothesis mentioned earlier, could it be said that prejudiced attitudes toward others are part of what he labeled "interpersonal relations"? If it can be inferred that prejudiced attitudes evolve from a cultural basis, then how could improving one's acceptance of himself through therapy improve his interpersonal relations? Are the two variables that much related? Can a cause and effect relationship be operating?

This study does not propose to answer the above questions, but will bring to light the differences, if any, between the amount of prejudice expressed by an individual and his degree of self-acceptance for both white and Negro subjects, and perhaps provide to the clinician a valuable tool in assessing the dynamic patterns causing an individual to have poor interpersonal relationships.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adler, A. , The Neurotic Constitution, New York, Dodd, Mead and Company, 1926.
2. Arieti, S. , American Handbook of Psychiatry, Vol. II, New York, Basic Books, Inc. , 1959.
3. Berger, E. , "The Relationship Between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (October, 1952), 778-782.
4. Bills, R. E. , "A Validation of Changes in Scores on the Index of Adjustment and Values as Measures of Changes in Emotionality," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVII (April, 1953), 135-138.
5. Bills, R. E. , Vance, E. L. and McLean, O. S. , "An Index of Adjustment and Values," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XV (June, 1951), 257-261.
6. Brownfain, J. , "Stability of the Self-Concept as a Dimension of Personality," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (October, 1952), 597-606.
7. Calman, James C. , Personality Dynamics and Effective Behavior, Chicago, Foreman and Company, 1960.
8. Combs, A. W. , and Snygg, D. , Individual Behavior, New York Harper and Brothers, 1959.
9. Fey, W. F. , "Correlates of Certain Subjective Attitudes Toward Self and Others," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XIII (January, 1957), 44-49.
10. _____ , "Acceptance by Others and Its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, L (March, 1955), 274-276.

11. _____, "Acceptance of Others, and Its Relation to Therapy-Readiness," Journal of Clinical Psychology, X (July, 1954), 269-271.
12. Hall, C. S., and Lindsey, G., Theories of Personality, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957.
13. Horney, K., Neurosis and Human Growth, New York, W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1950.
14. Lecky, P., Self-Consistency, New York, Island Press, 1951.
15. Lowe, C. M., "The Self-Concept: Fact or Artifact?" Psychological Bulletin, LVIII (July, 1961), 325-336.
16. McIntyre, C. J., "Acceptance by Others and Its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (October, 1952), 624-626.
17. Murphy, G., and Jensen, F., Approaches to Personality, New York, Coward-McCann, Inc., 1932.
18. Omwake, K. T., "The Relationship Between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others Shown by Three Personality Inventories," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII (December, 1951), 443-446.
19. Phillips, E. L., "Attitudes toward Self and Others: A Brief Questionnaire Report," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XV (February, 1951), 79-81.
20. Reese, H. W., "Relationships Between Self-Acceptance and Sociometric Choices," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXIII (March, 1961), 472-474.
21. Roberts, G. E., "A Study of the Validity of the Index of Adjustment and Values," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVI (August, 1952), 302-304.
22. Rogers, Carl R., Client-Centered Therapy, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.
23. Sheerer, E. T., "An Analysis of the Relationship Between Acceptance of and Respect for Self and Acceptance of and Respect for Others in Ten Counseling Cases," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIII (June, 1949), 169-175.

24. Stock, D., "An Investigation into the Interrelations Between the Self Concept and Feelings Directed Toward Other Persons and Groups," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIII (June, 1949), 176-180.
25. Sullivan, H., The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry, New York, W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1953.
26. White, Ruth, The Self Concept, Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1961.
27. Williams, J. E., "Acceptance by Others and Its Relationship to Acceptance of Self and Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXV (December, 1962), 438-442.
28. Wylie, R., "Some Relationships Between Defensiveness and Self-Concept Discrepancies," Journal of Personality, XXV (September, 1957), 600-616.
29. Zelen, S., "Acceptance and Acceptability, and Examination of Social Reciprocity," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII (October, 1954), 316.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE

The test administration of the prejudice and self-acceptance scales was done in two parts. The first sessions of testing were done with students at North Texas State University. All testing was done during regularly scheduled class periods. Testing was undertaken immediately following the beginning of the class period. After the instructor introduced the examiner to the members of the class, the examiner handed each class member a copy of the prepared answer sheet. He then proceeded to explain testing procedure. The class was told that the test consisted to true and false statements, and were to be answered with the subjects' first impression upon reading the statement. Information was related to the group concerning the reasons for testing and following this, questions were asked and answered pertaining to directions and the test. The test items were then distributed and the students were told they could begin immediately. The testing time varied from twenty to twenty-five minutes for each class.

The second sessions of testing were done at Bishop College in Dallas, Texas. The exact procedures as outlined above were followed.

Population

The subjects used in this study were taken from two sources, both being college populations. The first group was students from North Texas State University, located in Denton, Texas, with an approximate enrollment of 10,000. These students were taken from introductory psychology courses on the freshman level. This group consisted of 136 total students, 76 being female and 60 being male. All but 3 were white students. Age ranges were from 17 to 36 in this group. The following church affiliations were found: Methodist, Baptist, Lutheran, Church of Christ, Presbyterian, Christian, Jewish, Unitarian, Episcopal, and some reported no religious affiliation.

The second group in the study was students from Bishop College, a Negro school located in Dallas, Texas, with an approximate enrollment of 950. These students were taken from American literature and world literature courses on the freshman level. This group consisted of 74 total students, 41 being female and 33 being male. All were Negro. Age ranges were from 17 to 38 in this group. The following church affiliations were found: Baptist, Methodist, Church of Christ, and Catholic. The 3 Negro students from the North Texas State University population were included in this group in treatment of the data.

Description of Instruments

Permission was given by the Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., to mimeograph the items of the self-acceptance scale of the California Psychological Inventory; and the Psychological Corporation gave its permission to mimeograph the items of the prejudice scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. The two scales were then amalgamated into one scale, alternating the items from the MMPI and CPI for greater obscurity.

the first scale was the self-acceptance scale taken in complete form from the California Psychological Inventory developed by Gough. The SA (self-acceptance) scale of this instrument was developed by the technique of internal consistency analysis. Because this method has inherent limitations, it was used in developing those scales in the instrument where obtaining large samples of criterion subjects for empirical item analysis proved unfeasible. This method was explained the manual as follows: "In the four scales where the method was used, very careful checks were of the completed scales to determine their empirical validity. This is, subjects were obtained by nomination and other non-test methods and the power of the completed scale to identify these subjects was studied. In the four instances under discussion, acceptable levels of validity were attained" (3, p. 21).

Gough described self-acceptance in three parts in his manual. The first part described the scale and its purpose. "Sa (self-acceptance) To assess factors such as sense of personal worth, self-acceptance, and capacity for independent thinking and action" (3, p. 12). Then he stated that those who score high in this area tend to be seen as, "Intelligent, outspoken, sharp-witted, demanding, aggressive, and self-centered; as being persuasive and verbally fluent; and as possessing self-confidence and self-assurance" (3, p. 12). Those who scored low in the same area were seen as, "Methodical, conservative, dependable, conventional, easygoing, and quiet; as self-abasing and given to feelings of guilt and self-blame; and as being passive in action and narrow in interests" (3, p. 12). The scale consisted of 34 true and false items similar to those type found in the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.

The second scale utilized in this study was the Prejudice scale from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, (MMPI).

From the article written by Gough, "A Personality Scale for Anti-Semitic Prejudice (Pr)," in the book, Basic Readings on the MMPI in Psychology and Medicine, there are listed several studies

and the results gained in developing this scale. On a sample of 770 students, the corrected split half reliability for the Pr (prejudice) scale was .79, SE .04. Although test-retest reliability was not established for this scale, the figures quoted above compare favorably with the reliabilities reported for other MMPI scales, and experience with other scales would suggest that it would be higher (2, p. 210).

Sundberg and Bachels reported in a study on the fakability of the California F scale and Gough's Pr scale that 52 elementary psychology students were given the two scales. None belonged to a minority group and they were instructed to fake the scales in the direction of prejudice once and unprejudice once. Results revealed that they were able to change their scores significantly toward the unprejudiced direction only on the Pr scale. When given the two scales with regular instructions, a correlation of .35 was obtained which was significant. They concluded that while the two scales did measure prejudice, they were both subject to the influence of test-taking attitudes and that it appeared particularly easy to fake prejudice scores if the person so inclined (5, pp. 140-142)

In another study by Altus and Tafejian, Gough's Pr scale, validated originally against an anti-Semitism scale, gave correlations of .30 and .37 for two separate college groups, when correlated with the California E-F Scale. They concluded that

the cross validating correlation of .62 between the 40 items in Gough's original work and the E-F Scale would appear to imply a fair amount of validity for the MMPI items, at least for students at the college level (1, pp. 145-149).

Siegmán also found when using the Pr scale in a cross-cultural investigation of the relationship between ethnic prejudice, authoritarianism, ideology, and personality, that a correlation of .53, significant at the one per cent level of confidence, was obtained with the California F scale (4, pp. 654-655).

To again quote from Gough, he pointed out that an item analysis had been done on the items in the scale and there were a number of factors suggested as characteristic of the more prejudiced students. Part of the factors involved in prejudice as described by Gough are as follows:

. . . anti-intellectuality . . . pervading sense of pessimism and lack of confidence in the future . . . feelings of cynicism, distrust, and querulousness . . . a hostile and bitter outlook on the part of the more prejudiced . . . transparent expression of aggression and emphasized the emotional basis of a prejudice person's intolerance . . . a repining, grumbling, and discontented evaluation of their current status . . . a rigid and somewhat dogmatic style of thinking . . . lack of poise and self assurance . . . suggestion of an underlying perplexity, an ominous fearfulness and feelings of estrangement and isolation (2, p. 208).

Procedure for Treating Data

In order to designate high and low prejudice scores on the MMPI prejudice scale, it was necessary to determine a cut-off point. This was done by taking the standard score of 50 which would then indicate that those scores falling above 50 would be inclined toward prejudice and those scores falling below 50 would be inclined toward non-prejudice.

The two variables of the MMPI score and the CPI score were computed for each group, resulting in a mean score on each variable for each group. A Fisher's t test of significance was then computed on these mean scores.

All statistical computations were made on the 1620 IBM Computer at the IBM Computer Center at North Texas State University.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Altus, W. D., and Tafejian, T. T., "MMPI Correlates of the California E-F Scale," Journal of Social Psychology, XXXVIII (1953), 145-149.
2. Gough, H. G., "A Personality Scale for Anti-Semetic Prejudice (Pr)," (Article 23) in Basic Readings on the MMPI In Psychology and Medicine, edited, Welsh, George, and Dahlstrom, W., Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1956.
3. _____, California Psychological Inventory: Manual, Palo Alto, Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1957.
4. Siegman, A., "A Cross-Cultural Investigation of the Relationship Between Ethnic Prejudice, Authoritarianism Ideology, and Personality," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXIII (1961), 654-655.
5. Sundberg, N., and Bachels, W., "The Fakability of Two Measures of Prejudice: The California F Scale and Gough's Pr Scale," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LII (1953), 140-142.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The results of the statistical treatment of the data will be presented in Tables I through VIII. Each table represents each particular group that was compared on each variable.

Table I shows the results of the differences between the means of the low scoring and high scoring white students on both the prejudice scale and the self-acceptance scale.

TABLE I
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS OF THE PREJUDICE SCALE
AND THE SELF-ACCEPTANCE SCALE FOR LOW SCORING
AND HIGH SCORING WHITE SUBJECTS

Group	Mean <u>MMPI</u> Score	Mean <u>CPI</u> Score
Low Scoring White	41.07	58.72
High Scoring White	56.32	57.73
Differences	15.25	00.99
<u>t</u> Ratio	13.75*	00.49

*Significant at the one per cent level of confidence

Significant differences between the high and low scoring groups, at the one per cent level of confidence, can be seen on the prejudice scale. However, the self-acceptance scale failed to demonstrate any significant differences.

Table II shows the results of the differences between the means of the low scoring and high scoring Negro students on both the prejudice scale and the self-acceptance scale.

TABLE II
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS OF THE PREJUDICE SCALE
AND THE SELF-ACCEPTANCE SCALE FOR LOW SCORING
AND HIGH SCORING NEGRO SUBJECTS

Group	Mean <u>MMPI</u> Score	Mean <u>CPI</u> Score
Low Scoring Negro	45.61	50.61
High Scoring Negro	58.71	51.79
Differences	13.10	01.18
<u>t</u> Ratio	9.37*	00.48

*Significant at the one per cent level of confidence

Significant differences, at the one per cent level of confidence, were shown to exist between the high and low scoring groups on the prejudice scale. The self-acceptance scale did not show any significant differences.

In Table III, the results of the comparison of the means of white male and white female subjects is presented for both the prejudice and self-acceptance scales.

TABLE III
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS OF THE PREJUDICE SCALE
AND THE SELF-ACCEPTANCE SCALE FOR WHITE MALE
AND WHITE FEMALE SUBJECTS

Group	Mean <u>MMPI</u> Score	Mean <u>CPI</u> Score
White Male	46.05	61.73
White Female	43.96	55.90
Differences	2.09	5.83
<u>t</u> Ratio	1.40	3.44*

*Significant at the one per cent level of confidence

There were no significant differences between the mean scores for white male and white female subjects on the prejudice scale of the MMPI. However, there were significant differences, at the one per cent level of confidence, on the self-acceptance scale of the CPI.

Table IV shows the results of the comparison of mean scores for Negro male and Negro female subjects on the prejudice scale of the MMPI and the self-acceptance scale of the CPI.

TABLE IV

**DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS OF THE PREJUDICE SCALE
AND THE SELF-ACCEPTANCE SCALE FOR
NEGRO MALE AND NEGRO FEMALE SUBJECTS**

Group	Mean <u>MMPI</u> Score	Mean <u>CPI</u> Score
Negro Male	54.00	55.51
Negro Female	54.19	48.04
Differences	0.19	7.47
<u>t</u> Ratio	0.09	3.38 *

*Significant at the one per cent level of confidence

There were no significant differences between the mean scores for Negro male and Negro female subjects on the prejudice scale of the MMPI. However, there were significant differences, at the one per cent level of confidence, on the self-acceptance scale of the CPI.

Table V presents the results of the comparison of the mean scores of white males who tend to score high on the prejudice scale and white males who tend to score low on the prejudice scale for both the MMPI prejudice scale and the self-acceptance scale of the CPI.

TABLE V

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS OF THE PREJUDICE SCALE
AND THE SELF-ACCEPTANCE SCALE FOR WHITE
MALE SUBJECTS WHO TEND TOWARD A HIGH DEGREE
OF RACIAL PREJUDICE AND WHITE MALE SUBJECTS
WHO TEND TOWARD A LOW DEGREE OF RACIAL PREJUDICE

Group	Mean <u>MMPI</u> Score	Mean <u>CPI</u> Score
Low White Male	41.81	62.64
High White Male	55.94	59.61
Differences	14.13	3.03
<u>t</u> Ratio	9.42 *	1.30

*Significant at the one per cent level of confidence

It was shown that significant differences did exist between the two groups (Table V) with respect to prejudice, at the one per cent level of confidence. However, there were no significant differences between the two groups with respect to self-acceptance.

Table VI shows the results of the comparison of the mean scores of white females who tend to score high on the prejudice scale of the MMPI and white females who tend to score low on the prejudice scale of the MMPI and the self-acceptance scale of the CPI.

TABLE VI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS OF THE PREJUDICE SCALE
AND THE SELF-ACCEPTANCE SCALE FOR WHITE FEMALE
SUBJECTS WHO TEND TOWARD A HIGH DEGREE OF
RACIAL PREJUDICE AND WHITE FEMALE SUBJECTS
WHO TEND TOWARD A LOW DEGREE OF
RACIAL PREJUDICE

Group	Mean <u>MMPI</u> Score	Mean <u>CPI</u> Score
Low White Female	40.55	55.98
High White Female	56.75	55.62
Differences	16.20	0.36
<u>t</u> Ratio	9.88*	0.11

*Significant at the one per cent level of confidence

It was shown that significant differences did exist between the two groups (Table VI) with respect to prejudice, at the one per cent level of confidence. With respect to self-acceptance, however, there were no significant differences apparent.

Table VII shows the results of the comparison of the mean scores of Negro males who tend to score high on the prejudice scale for both the MMPI prejudice scale and the self-acceptance scale of the CPI.

TABLE VII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS OF THE PREJUDICE SCALE
AND THE SELF-ACCEPTANCE SCALE FOR NEGRO MALE SUBJECTS
WHO TEND TOWARD A HIGH DEGREE OF RACIAL PREJUDICE
AND NEGRO MALE SUBJECTS WHO TEND TOWARD
A LOW DEGREE OF RACIAL PREJUDICE

Group	Mean <u>MMPI</u> Score	Mean <u>CPI</u> Score
Low Negro Male	46.45	54.45
High Negro Male	57.77	56.04
Differences	11.32	1.59
<u>t</u> Ratio	5.86 *	0.45

* Significant at the one per cent level of confidence

For these two groups, it was shown that significant differences, at the one per cent level of confidence, did exist with respect to racial prejudice. However, no significant differences were shown to exist with respect to self-acceptance for the same two groups.

Table VIII shows the results of the comparison of the mean scores of Negro females who tend to score high on the prejudice scale of the MMPI and the self-acceptance scale of the CPI.

TABLE VIII

**DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS OF THE PREJUDICE SCALE AND
THE SELF-ACCEPTANCE SCALE FOR NEGRO FEMALE SUBJECTS
WHO TEND TOWARD A HIGH DEGREE OF RACIAL PREJUDICE
AND NEGRO FEMALE SUBJECTS WHO TEND TOWARD
A LOW DEGREE OF RACIAL PREJUDICE**

Group	Mean MMPI Score	Mean CPI Score
Low Negro Female	45.00	47.80
High Negro Female	59.50	48.19
Differences	14.50	0.39
<u>t</u> Ratio	7.27*	0.13

*Significant at the one per cent level of confidence

For these two groups, it was shown that significant differences did exist at the one per cent level of confidence with respect to racial prejudice. However, no significant differences were shown to exist with respect to self-acceptance for the same two groups.

Analysis of Results

The results of each hypothesis will be discussed in its order.

Hypothesis I

This hypothesis stated that white students who tended toward a high degree of racial prejudice as measured by the prejudice scale of the MMPI would have significantly lower self-acceptance scores as measured by the self-acceptance scale of the California Psychological

Inventory, than white students who tended toward a low degree of racial prejudice. This hypothesis was rejected at the one per cent level of confidence. Although the prejudice scale of the MMPI did significantly discriminate between high and low prejudice scores, the t score of 0.49 between the high and low prejudice groups on the self-acceptance scale of the CPI was not statistically significant. Therefore, it cannot be inferred from the results of this study that white students who tend toward a high degree of racial prejudice also tend toward a low degree of self-acceptance.

Hypothesis II

This hypothesis had predicted that Negro students who tended toward a high degree of racial prejudice as measured by the prejudice scale of the MMPI would have significantly lower self-acceptance scores as measured by the self-acceptance scale of the CPI, than Negro students who tended toward a low degree of racial prejudice. This hypothesis was rejected at the one per cent level of confidence. The prejudice scale of the MMPI did significantly show differences in a degree of prejudice for the Negro population. However, the CPI self-acceptance scale failed, with a t score of 0.48 between the high and low prejudice groups, to show any significant differences between the two groups on self-acceptance.

Therefore, it can be stated that the results of this study failed to show any significant differences with regards to acceptance

of self being related to acceptance of others. In both instances, of white and Negro populations, neither showed to a significant degree that if they tended toward high prejudice that they would also tend toward low acceptance of themselves.

Sub-Hypothesis I

This hypothesis had predicted that there would be no significant differences between the scores of white male subjects and white female subjects on the prejudice scale of the MMPI or the self-acceptance scale of the CPI. This hypothesis was partially rejected. The t ratio of 1.40 between the two groups on the prejudice scale of the MMPI was not statistically significant. However, the t ratio of 3.44 between the two groups on the self-acceptance scale of the CPI was significant at the one per cent level of confidence, indicating that white males tend to be more self-accepting than white females, in the population tested.

Sub-Hypothesis II

This hypothesis had predicted that there would be no significant differences between the scores of Negro male subjects and Negro female subjects on the prejudice scale of the MMPI or the self-acceptance scale of the CPI. This hypothesis was partially rejected. The prejudice scale of the MMPI was not statistically significant between the two groups as had been predicted.

However, the self-acceptance scale of the CPI with a t ratio of 3.38 was statistically significant at the one per cent level of confidence in favor of the males. This indicated that, for this population, Negro males tended to be more self-accepting than Negro females.

Sub-Hypothesis III

This hypothesis had predicted that white male students who tended toward a high degree of racial prejudice as measured by the prejudice scale of the MMPI would have significantly lower self-acceptance scores as measured by the self-acceptance scale of the CPI, than white male students who tended toward a low degree of racial prejudice. This hypothesis was rejected at the one per cent level of confidence. The prejudice scale of the MMPI did show significant differences between white males who tended toward high prejudice and white males who tended toward low prejudice. However, the CPI self-acceptance scale, with a t score of 1.30, failed to show any significant differences between the high and low prejudice groups.

Sub-Hypothesis IV

This hypothesis had predicted that white female students who tended toward a high degree of racial prejudice as measured by the prejudice scale of the MMPI would have significantly lower self-acceptance scores as measured by the self-acceptance scale of the CPI, than white female students who tended toward a low degree of

racial prejudice. This hypothesis was rejected at the one per cent level of confidence. The MMPI prejudice scale did indicate significant differences between white females who tended toward high prejudice and white females who tended toward low prejudice. However, the self-acceptance scale of the CPI with a t score of 0.11 failed to show any significant differences between the two groups with respect to self-acceptance.

For sub-hypotheses III and IV, it can be stated that the results of this study failed to show any significant differences with regards to acceptance of self being related to acceptance of others for white male and white female subjects who had been designated as tending toward a high degree of racial prejudice.

Sub-Hypothesis V

This hypothesis predicted that Negro male students who then tended toward a high degree of racial prejudice as measured by the prejudice scale of the MMPI would have significantly lower self-acceptance scores as measured by the self-acceptance scale of the CPI, than Negro male students who tended toward a low degree of racial prejudice. This hypothesis was rejected at the one per cent level of confidence. Whereas the prejudice scale of the MMPI did discriminate significantly between Negro males who tended toward a high degree of racial prejudice and Negro males who tended toward a low degree of racial prejudice; the self-acceptance scale of the

CPI with a t ratio of 0.45 failed to significantly discriminate between the high and low prejudice groups with respect to self-acceptance.

Sub-Hypothesis VI

This hypothesis predicted that Negro female students who tended toward a high degree of racial prejudice as measured by the prejudice scale of the MMPI would have significantly lower self-acceptance scores as measured by the self-acceptance scale of the CPI, than Negro female students who tended toward a low degree of racial prejudice. This hypothesis was rejected at the one per cent level of confidence. The prejudice scale of the MMPI successfully discriminated between the Negro females who tended toward a high degree of racial prejudice and the Negro females who tended toward a low degree of racial prejudice. However, the CPI with a t ratio of 0.13 did not successfully discriminate the high and low prejudice groups with respect to self-acceptance.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was undertaken to compare the relationships that exist between racial prejudice and self-acceptance. An attempt was made to determine the degree to which acceptance of self compared with acceptance of people of different races. The sample consisted of 136 white students at North Texas State University and 74 Negro students from Bishop College. The white students were taken from introductory psychology courses and the Negro students were taken from American and world literature courses on the freshman level.

The two populations were subdivided into eight categories, each category being tested on the prejudice scale of the MMPI and the self-acceptance scale of the CPI. The eight categories were: (1) white students who tended toward a high degree of racial prejudice and white students who tended toward a low degree of racial prejudice; (2) Negro students who tended toward a high degree of racial prejudice and Negro students who tended toward a low degree of racial prejudice; (3) white male subjects and white female subjects; (4) Negro male subjects and Negro female subjects; (5) white male

subjects who tended toward a high degree of racial prejudice and white male subjects who tended toward a low degree of racial prejudice; (6) white female subjects who tended toward a high degree of racial prejudice and white female subjects who tended toward a low degree of racial prejudice; (7) Negro male subjects who tended toward a high degree of racial prejudice and Negro male subjects who tended toward a low degree of racial prejudice; (8) Negro female subjects who tended toward a high degree of racial prejudice and Negro female subjects who tended toward a low degree of racial prejudice. Mean scores from the MMPI prejudice scale and the CPI self-acceptance scale for each category were statistically treated with Fisher's t test of significance.

The main results and conclusions are listed as follows:

1. White students who tend toward a high degree of racial prejudice are not significantly less self-accepting than white students who tend toward a low degree of racial prejudice.
2. Negro students who tend toward a high degree of racial prejudice are not significantly less self-accepting than Negro students who tend toward a low degree of racial prejudice.
3. White male students tend to be more self-accepting than white female students.
4. Negro male students tend to be more self-accepting than Negro female students.

5. White male students who tend toward a high degree of racial prejudice are not significantly less self-accepting than white male students who tend toward a low degree of racial prejudice.

6. White female students who tend toward a high degree of racial prejudice are not significantly less self-accepting than white female students who tend toward a low degree of racial prejudice.

7. Negro male students who tend toward a high degree of racial prejudice are not significantly less self-accepting than Negro male students who tend toward a low degree of racial prejudice.

8. Negro female students who tend toward a high degree of racial prejudice are not significantly less self-accepting than Negro female students who tend toward a low degree of racial prejudice.

Discussion

The results from the first hypothesis are in direct opposition to the theoretical discussions expounded by Rogers, Horney, Sullivan and Combs, and Snygg. They were in agreement with Seeman's findings that a person's positive references to himself could increase without any resultant change in his feelings toward others (1, p. 491). However, the results do support the findings of McIntyre, Fey and Reese.

Taking the two groups represented in sub-hypotheses III and IV separately or together, this finding is in opposition to those of Rogers, Horney, Sullivan, Combs and Snygg. They parallel the findings of this study as stated in hypothesis I and II. Whether the groups are separated into male and female for white students or treated together as high prejudice whites and low prejudice whites appears to make no difference in the results.

Several interesting observations can be made from the results of this study. First, it should be pointed out that throughout the study, prejudiced attitudes have been considered as a function or a part of the general concept of acceptance of others. No previous studies have been made that relates the two variables of racial prejudice and self-acceptance. One explanation for the divergence of findings of this paper with the majority of previous research is that this investigation did not measure acceptance of others and racial prejudice cannot be termed as the same phenomenon.

In utilizing the self-acceptance scale from the CPI to measure the phenomenon of self-acceptance, it should be pointed out that this scale was developed in a very different manner from the questionnaires used in previous studies. Most researchers have utilized the discrepancy score between ideal-self and self-concept scores as an index of self-acceptance. As was noted

earlier, Reese and others because of their findings, have questioned the discrepancy score as being a valid measure of self-acceptance. The results from this study neither confirm nor deny this speculation but it is thought that the results do tend to support the discrepancy score as being more valid than the type scale developed in the CPI for measuring self-acceptance. As was shown by the results, the self-acceptance scale of the CPI gave significant results for only two sets of groups under investigation. Thus, without sufficient empirical evidence, either method of detecting self-acceptance could be acceptable. This points out the need for further investigation in this area to lead subsequently to a more valid index of self-acceptance as a separate phenomenon.

Another factor which had unforeseen implications for the study was the population used. Since both the white and Negro students were from college populations, it can be hypothesized that this was the major cause of the low number of scores which tend toward a high degree of racial prejudice for both groups. At any rate, the two populations could not be called "normal." Many studies have been done in psychology dealing with the effects of a college environment upon attitudes. In the case of this study, it can be hypothesized that college played a large role in changing prejudiced attitudes. This is true for both populations used. The

same atmosphere prevailed in both the white and Negro colleges. Further investigations into the relationships between self-acceptance and prejudice for both white and Negro populations are needed. These investigations should be centered around populations of a more "normal" caliber, separate from a college environment.

Owing to the unrest and tension present today concerning the entire racial question, the lack of significance found between found between the two measures in this study could be, in part, a function of an individual's interpersonal defenses. This, it is thought, would pertain more specifically to college populations for both races investigated. The similarity of the two scales employed in this study, one measure resulting from high scores (self-acceptance) and the other from low scores (prejudice) could lack significant relationships due to an individual's eagerness to make himself appear higher or lower on either scale. This, being an inherent limitation of the scale, their fakability, could produce inaccurate results.

Performance on both the MMPI prejudice scale and the CPI self-acceptance scale could have been a function of the individual's cultural surroundings instead of a function of his personality make-up. The attitudes of prejudice and self-acceptance, it can be hypothesized, could be a result of cultural learning. Thus, an

individual who tended toward a high degree of racial prejudice could not necessarily be termed as a prejudiced person. To classify one as prejudiced would be taking him out of his cultural environment and thus attributing to him an attitude he is not considered, in his cultural surroundings, as possessing.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Hall, C. S., and Lindsey, G., Theories of Personality, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Adler, A. , The Neurotic Constitution, New York, Dodd, Mead and Company, 1926.
- Arieti, S. , American Handbook of Psychiatry, Vol. II, New York, Basic Books, Inc. , 1959.
- Calman, James C. , Personality Dynamics and Effective Behavior, Chicago, Foreman and Company, 1960.
- Combs, A. W. , and Snygg, D. , Individual Behavior, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1959.
- Gough, H. G. , California Psychological Inventory: Manual, Palo Alto, Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. , 1957.
- Hall, C. S. , and Lindsey, G. , Theories of Personality, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc. , 1957.
- Horney, K. , Neurosis and Human Growth, New York, W. W. Norton and Company, Inc. , 1950.
- Lecky, P. , Self-Consistency, New York, Island Press, 1951.
- Murphy, G. , and Jensen, F. , Approaches to Personality, New York, Coward-McCann, Inc. , 1932.
- Rogers, Carl R. , Client-Centered Therapy, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.
- Sullivan, H. , The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry, New York, W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. , 1953.

White, Ruth, The Self Concept, Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1961 .

Articles

Altus, W. D., and Tafejian, T. T., "MMPI Correlates of the California E-F Scale, Journal of Social Psychology, XXXVIII (1953), 145-149.

Berger, E., "The Relationship Between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (October, 1952), 778-782.

Bills, R. E., "A Validation of Changes in Scores on the Index of Adjustment and Values as Measures of Changes in Emotionality," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVII (April, 1953), 135-138.

Brownfain, J., "Stability of the Self-Concept as a Dimension of Personality," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology (October, 1952), XLVII, 597-606

Fey, W. F., "Correlates of Certain Subjective Attitudes toward Self and Others," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XIII (January, 1957), 44-49.

Acceptance of Others, and Its Relation to Therapy-Readiness," Journal of Clinical Psychology (July 1954), 269-271.

Acceptance by Others and Its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, (March, 1955), 274-276.

Gough, H. G., "A Personality Scale for Anti-Semitic Prejudice (pr)" (Article 23) in Basic Readings on the MMPI In Psychology and Medicine, edited, Welsh, George and Dahlstrom, W., Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1956.

- Lowe, C. M., "The Self-Concept: Fact or Artifact?" Psychological Bulletin, LVIII (July, 1961), 325-336.
- McIntyre, C. J., "Acceptance by Others and Its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (October, 1952), 624-626.
- Omwake, K. T., "The Relationship between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others Shown by Three Personality Inventories," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII (December, 1951), 443-446.
- Phillips, E. L., "Attitudes toward Self and Others: A Brief Questionnaire Report," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XV (February, 1951), 79-81.
- Reese, H. W., "Relationships between Self-Acceptance and Sociometric Choices," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXIII (March, 1961), 472-474.
- Roberts, G. E., "A Study of the Validity of the Index of Adjustment and Values," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVI (August, 1952), 302-304.
- Sheerer, E. T., "An Analysis of the Relationship between Acceptance of and Respect for Self and Acceptance of and Respect for Others in 10 Counseling Cases," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIII (June, 1949), 169-175.
- Stock, D., "An Investigation into the Interrelations Between the Self Concept and Feelings Directed toward Other Persons and Groups," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIII (June, 1949) 176-180.
- Williams, J. E., "Acceptance by Others and Its Relationship to Acceptance of Self and Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXV (December, 1962), 433-442.
- Wylie, R., "Some Relationships between Defensiveness and Self-Concept Discrepancies," Journal of Personality, XXV (September, 1957), 600-616.
- Zelen, S., "Acceptance and Acceptability, and Examination of Social Reciprocity," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII (October, 1954), 316.