

SOME COMPARISONS AMONG SELF-ACCEPTANCE, AUTHORITARIANISM
AND DEFENSIVENESS IN NEGRO AND WHITE COLLEGE STUDENTS

APPROVED:

Jack R. Hayes
Major Professor

Roy L. Williams
Minor Professor

Dwaine Kingery
Director of the Department of Education and
Psychology

Robert B. Toulouse
Dean of the Graduate School

SOME COMPARISONS AMONG SELF-ACCEPTANCE, AUTHORITARIANISM,
AND DEFENSIVENESS 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

Sandra L. Hands, B. S., M. B. A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Purpose of the Study	
Limitations	
Definition of Terms	
II. RELATED LITERATURE.	25
III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE	40
Subjects	
Description of the Instruments	
Statistical Treatment of Data	
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.	50
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	68
Conclusions	

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Correlation Coefficients and Levels of Significance for Self-Acceptance Scores and Authoritarianism Scores	51
II. Correlation Coefficients and Levels of Significance for Authoritarianism Scores and Defensiveness Scores	52
III. Test of Significance of the Differences Between the High Self-Acceptance Negro and White Subjects and the Low Self-Acceptance Negro and White Subjects on the Defensiveness Scale.	53
IV. Tests of Significance Between the Negro Subjects and the White Subjects on the Self-Acceptance, Authoritarianism, and Defensiveness Scales.	54
V. Tests of Significance Between Negro Males and Negro Females on the Self-Acceptance, Authoritarianism, and Defensiveness Scales.	59
VI. Tests of Significance Between White Males and White Females on the Self-Acceptance, Authoritarianism, and Defensiveness Scale	60
VII. Tests of Significance Between Negro Males and White Males on the Self-Acceptance, Authoritarianism, and Defensiveness Scale	64
VIII. Tests of Significance Between the Negro Females and White Females on the Self-Acceptance, Authoritarianism, and Defensiveness Scales.	65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Though the human personality is a composite of many differing facets, the most important, from the point of view of this study, is the individual's own conception and acceptance of himself. The self-concept appears to be the hub around which the rest of the personality is organized, and the manner in which a person sees himself, and whether or not he accepts what he sees, are significant determinants of his behavior.

In recent years psychologists, psychiatrists, sociologists, and anthropologists have given considerable attention to the concept of the "self" as an important factor in personality development. Horney (18), Adler (1), Rogers (30), LaFon (23), and others have related aspects of the individual's self-perception to his emotional and social adjustment. Snygg (34), Combs (34), Wylie (41), and others have elaborated on the behavioral consequences of the individual's self-concept. Lipton (25), Bills (6), and other self-perceptionists have found evidence that the self-concept of the child influences his ability to function effectively in a learning

situation. Several authors have asserted that the basic human need is the drive to preserve and enhance the self-structure (24, 30, 34).

The impact of a high self-regard on interpersonal relationships and acceptance of others has been stressed by Rogers (30), Sheerer (32), Stock (35), Berger (5), and Omwake (27). Horney (19) and Fromm (14) share the belief that love of others is not likely unless one first loves and respects himself. Fromm suggests that the individual who cannot love himself is consumed by a basic hostility toward others which arises out of the suppression of the individual's real self. Horney declares that an individual's self-contempt may lead to a subtle poisoning of all his human relations, because he has difficulty in accepting positive feelings of others at their face value. It has been generally conceded that a low degree of self-regard can be found to be related to some area of maladjustment, whether it is merely an aspect of such maladjustment or a direct cause.

Having accepted the premise that the individual's conception of his "self" and his acceptance or rejection thereof is of prime importance to his personality development and ultimate behavior, it then becomes necessary to determine what factors are most influential in the development of the

self-concept. It is Snygg's and Combs' thesis that the culture into which an individual is born is a factor of much greater importance than his physical surroundings:

Out of the interaction of the child with the world around him, the individual comes to differentiate more and more clearly his phenomenal self. Obviously this concept can only be a function of the way he is treated by those who surround him. . . . The child can only see himself in terms of his experience, and in terms of the treatment he receives from those responsible for his development. He is likely to be strongly affected by the labels which are applied to him by other people. . . . Since his phenomenal self is the result of his experience, his behavior can only be an outgrowth of the meaning of that experience, and he must necessarily become in truth what he has been labelled by the community which surrounded him (34, p. 83).

A very similar view is expressed by Dai (11, p. 439).

He maintains that an individual's "self system" is acquired in the process of socialization and depends to a great extent on the personalities he comes in contact with and on the culture. Following the same line of thought, Rogers states

As a result of interaction with the environment, and particularly as a result of evaluational interaction with others, the structure of self is formed--an organized, fluid, but consistent, conceptual pattern of perceptions of characteristics and relationships of the "I" or "me" together with values attached to those concepts (30, p. 501).

Snyder (33), in applying self-concept theory to the educational setting, maintains that the self-concept emerges from the social situations in which the individual is involved. The self-concept reflects the actual or perceived expectations

of the significant others in the situation and, in effect, functions to direct the individual's behavior. Horney further elaborates the point when she states

Only the individual himself can develop his given potentialities. But, like any other living organism, the human individual needs favorable conditions for his growth; he needs an atmosphere of warmth to give him both a feeling of inner freedom enabling him to have his own feelings and thoughts and to express himself. He needs the good will of others, not only to help him in his many needs but to guide and encourage him to become a mature and fulfilled individual (18, p. 18).

To understand the full impact of the self-concept on the individual personality, it is necessary to look no further than the culture of the Negro in American society as it exists today. Not since the opening of the slave trade to the present has the American Negro been taken seriously as a person of value. According to Honigmann, the Negro's status in society has shaped his personality which is a "product of the expectations, actions or suggestions of other people, transmitted and perceived directly or mediationaly in social interaction" (17, p. 201).

The Negro's unique position in American society is the result of a caste barrier which separates him from the majority white group, a barrier that has created in the Negro a feeling of racial inferiority. The Negro American differs biologically in no important attribute from other human beings.

Emotionally, he lives in a different psychological, sociological, and economic atmosphere from the white majority. The Negro joins the American Indian as an American from his birth with roots only in the American culture. His is an American past and an American heritage, and still he has been denied, with the Indian, the opportunity to participate fully in the American culture. Lipton emphasizes this point as follows:

Cultural heritage enables a child to look at himself and acquire a feeling of strength and worth, in terms of the people from which he came. To identify with a people's hero, with a history, with a movement gives strength and courage to children of many backgrounds. The Negro child, however, has not been placed in such a fortunate position as to have his heroes and his history. For generations in America, the Negro has been denied a place in the history of his country and his role has been negated in many subtle ways. . . . The Negro has been pushed aside by our historians by denying his role as an effective mover of people, as a leader in the many fights for freedom fought since the Revolution (25, p. 211).

The development of a negative self-concept has its beginning in the early childhood of the Negro. Cox (10) states that the dominant socio-psychological pressure of color prejudice produces a collapsing effect upon the Negro's self-respect that makes him ashamed of his existence. This prejudice is intended to reduce him to a condition of no social consequence; and, unfortunately, many Negroes, to some extent, accept the labels placed on them.

Vontress (38) sees these circumstances as producing confusion in the Negro child in regard to his feelings about himself and his racial group. The child necessarily desires to think well of himself, but rather tends to judge himself according to the standards of the white majority group. These mixed emotions lead to self-hatred and rejection of the Negro's own group with a concomitant hostility toward the majority group because he realizes the impossibility of being what he cannot be. Vontress states, "When one is a member of a down-trodden reference group, he not only tends to despise his group, but also to hate himself for being a member of the group" (39, p. 212).

Dai asserts that the greatest obstacle to the development of a positive self-concept among Negro children is the blind acceptance of white racial prejudices and the common occurrence of measuring one's personal worth by the degrees of proximity to white complexion and other Caucasian features. The effects of racial prejudice to the developing Negro personality are pointed out by Dai in the following statement:

The personality problems that are more or less peculiar to Negro children are closely associated with the peculiar social status that their elders are socially and legally compelled to occupy in this society and the peculiar evaluation of skin color, hair texture, and other physical features that are imposed upon them by the white majority. So far as the personality

development of Negro children is concerned, the most important conditions resulting from living under caste restrictions seem to be the preponderance of lower class families with their special codes of conduct, broken homes accompanied by the dominance of maternal authority, the special emphasis attached to skin color and other physical features, and the extraordinary stress on social status. Each of these cultural situations is apt to leave its indelible impact on the personality of the Negro child (11, p. 444).

The Negro child soon learns to associate his dark skin, facial features, and kinky hair not only with ugliness but with inferiority as well. But what is more surprising is the fact that this conviction is often reinforced and even strengthened by his treatment within his own group. The darker child in the family often is treated as the ugly duckling. The color of one's skin is not infrequently made an issue of much significance among Negroes. Kardiner and Ovesey, in their study, The Mark of Oppression (20), found many instances where the darker-skinned Negro was discriminated against by both lighter- and darker-skinned Negroes.

The Negro's self-esteem is lowered as a consequence of the discrimination he suffers. In his relations with whites, the Negro receives an unpleasant image of himself that causes him to devalue himself. This is not at all surprising in view of the fact that psychologists have long stated that we tend to see ourselves as others see us. We all learn who we are and what we are primarily through the actions of other

people. Snyder says,

If people are treated differently, this will be reflected in their self-image and their behavior. Low self-esteem, and conscious or unconscious self-hatred and ambivalence is a probability for the Negro child who experiences discrimination, and sees the low social status of his race (33, p. 245).

Clark, a well-known writer on Negro problems, likewise sees discrimination and segregation as producing deep feelings of inferiority within the Negro. He states that "the institutionalized forms of racial rejection have denied to the Negro his human dignity and the resulting conflict about the worth of self has resulted in self-hatred, rejection of their own group and lowering of personal ambition" (8, p. 247).

Frazier (15) maintains that self-hatred among Negroes is a consequence of the Negroes' repressed hostilities against whites which they instead direct toward themselves. It is often revealed in the intense competition which exists among them for status and recognition.

McLean (26), Karon (21), Kardiner (20), and Ovesey (20) agree that the dominant characteristic of the Negro personality is that of feeling that he is inferior and worthless. Since this feeling has been produced in him by the white majority against whom he cannot retaliate, he must hate himself, punish himself and others like him.

Kardiner and Ovesey (20) declare that the frustrations the Negro experiences in his relationships with whites stimulates hostility which he fears to express. As a result, the Negro individual expends a great deal of energy toward disposing of the hostility that he cannot release in retaliatory aggression against the source of frustration. Only in the past few years has there been seen any real break in the Negro's reluctance to display his hostility against the white majority group.

Almost all Negroes in America are subjected to some unpleasantness and humiliation in their lives, and since these experiences are common to the racial group, it is possible to speak of a group personality. Honigmann states that "class and caste structures interfere with the distribution of a uniform personality throughout a stratified community" (17, p. 315). Kardiner and Ovesey lend substance to this thesis when they state that

A hasty comparison of the reactions of a minority group like the Negro makes the conclusion imperative that they are in some ways different from the relations surrounding whites. Differences can be explained by scientific logic. It maintains that the divergent reactions of the Negro are expressions of specific social pressures to which the white man is not subject. . . . The Negro is forced to live within the confines of a caste system which tends to stifle effective protest by the threat of retaliation from the majority whites. Such oppression cannot but leave a permanent impact on the Negro personality (20, p. 10).

Kluckhohn and Murray give substantial support to the above proposition in their assertion that "members of an organized enduring group tend to manifest certain personality traits more frequently than do members of other groups" (22, p. 48). They feel that these similarities of personality are traced not so much to constitutional factors as to the formative influences of the environmental experiences the members of the group commonly share. Kluckhohn and Murray have observed in their studies of different cultures that similarities of life experiences and heredity tend to produce similar personality characteristics in different individuals, regardless of the society in which they live.

Allport, following the same line of thought, states that

although each individual has his own unique personality . . . the ubiquity of racial prejudice in the United States guarantees that virtually all Negro Americans face at some level the impersonal effects of discrimination, the frightening experience of being a black man in a white man's world (3, p. 34).

Piaget (29) says that all people, being born into groups, take on whatever meanings these groups have so that the child has no choice--the culture of the subgroup to which he belongs as a child is determinative.

Persistent social attitudes, like other persistent traits, are somehow organized with the rest of the individual's

personality. A group of people who are constantly being discriminated against may be expected to assume a submissive, yielding facade in order to attain a momentary sense of well-being. The fate of a minority people who have accustomed themselves to a passive and dominated role, seems to be a tendency to identify themselves with their persecutor. According to frustration-aggression theory, the majority group treatment of the Negro should result in the Negro's direct expression of hostility toward the white group. But instead, the Negro, who is fearful of retaliation, comes to identify consciously or unconsciously with the majority group, and this seems to be especially true if he is of the middle class.

Clark (7) concludes that the typical reactions to racial frustrations of Negro children from the middle and upper classes are withdrawn and submissive behavior and rigidly controlled aggression. The middle-class child is expected to react to discrimination by developing patterns of over-compensatory, socially acceptable forms of behavior and an unbending conformity to middle-class values and standards. His training from earliest childhood is directed toward repudiating the stereotyped concept of the aggressive, unclean, and unreliable Negro.

Rokeach (31) reveals the dynamics behind this pattern of adaptation when he states that by over-identification with

some absolute authority, and by submitting to the arbitrary requirements that result, an attempt is made to defend the self against feelings of aloneness, isolation, self-hate, and misanthropy with a resulting justification for self-righteousness and moral condemnation of others. It is Allport's (4) contention that a strong need for authority reflects a deep distrust of human beings, the essential philosophy of democracy implying that we are to trust a person until he proves himself untrustworthy.

Honigmann (17, pp. 326-327) states that the result of the continuous frustration that the Negro individual endures is to create a person who lacks confidence in human relations, who manifests an external vigilance and distrust of others which is supposed to protect him against repeated disappointment and frustration. He operates on the assumption that the world is hostile.

To a large degree the Negro's method of adjustment is appropriate, for in certain parts of our country the Negro must be more careful and vigilant and must exercise controls of which the white group is free. In many places the police are more likely to arrest Negroes under any suspicious circumstances. Once arrested, they are frequently treated with discourtesy, if not violence. Frazier expresses this "external

vigilance" as follows:

In the South, the Negro on the job, in the schools, on the street, can never forget that his life and security are dependent on the white man. He must learn early how to placate and please the white god if he is to survive (16, p. 285).

It would not be surprising, in view of the Negro's background of discrimination and segregation and his manner of coping with it, to find him predisposed to the development of authoritarian attitudes. Webster, Sanford and Freedman (40) refer to authoritarianism as a "basic disposition" which underlies a wide range of behavior and attitudes. Fromm (13) defines authoritarianism as a mechanism of escape for the individual in which he is willing to give up his independence and freedom and fuse himself with something or somebody outside of himself in order to acquire the strength that he is lacking. Essentially, the authoritarian person is driven by his fear of being weak and is trying to escape his intolerable feelings of aloneness and powerlessness.

The development of an authoritarian syndrome is described by Adorno and his associates as follows:

The authoritarian syndrome follows the "classic" psychoanalytic pattern involving a sadomasochistic resolution of the Oedipus complex. . . . External social repression is concomitant with the internal repression impulses. In order to achieve "internalization" of social control which never gives as much to the individual as it takes, the latter's attitude towards authority and its

psychological agency, the superego, assumes an irrational aspect. The subject achieves his own social adjustment only by taking pleasure in obedience and subordination. This brings into play the sadomasochistic impulse structure both as a condition and as a result of social adjustment. . . . Ambivalence is all pervasive, being evidenced mainly by the simultaneity of blind belief in authority and readiness to attack those who are deemed weak and who are socially acceptable as victims. Stereotypy, in syndrome, is not only a means of social identification, but has the truly "economic" function in the subject's own psychology, it helps to canalize his libidinous energy according to the demands of his overstrict superego (2, p. 473).

Pearl (28) describes the authoritarian individual as representing a rigid adherence to conventional values, a consequence of externalized social pressure rather than the result of an introjected and integrated value system. The individual with authoritarian attitudes assumes a submissive attitude toward external authorities and, at the same time, hostile, punitive attitudes which he disguises as moral indignation and self-justification toward those who seem to deviate from the conventional standards of behavior and thought.

Frenkel-Brunswik (12, p. 264) maintains that the authoritarian individual's surface glorification of parents and authorities is combined with an underlying resentment and even hatred of these authorities. There is considerable stress placed on virility, which is accompanied by a fundamental passivity and receptivity which leads to the desire to submit to a strong authority. While overt emphasis is placed

on conventional values, there is simultaneously a predilection for destruction and chaos. Frenkel-Brunswik sees the avoidance of ambiguity and the need for absolutes in the authoritarian person as an attempt to counteract the internal chaos and lack of personal and social identity.

Adorno (2) and his associates found the authoritarian syndrome to encompass the following dimensions as well: an over-submissiveness to authority; a readiness to punish others in the name of in-group authority; relative inability to accept blame; a cynical attitude with respect to human nature; fear of fraud and trickery; opposition to the subjective, imaginative, or tender-minded; belief in the mystical determination of an individual's fate; and an unwillingness to deal with the indefinite.

Conceivably, there are a number of ways in which social attitudes and the self-concept might be related. Frenkel-Brunswik (12, p. 262) contends that the excessive stress which the authoritarian person places upon sincerity, honesty, and his other conventional values, as well as his tendency toward self-glorification as his "official self-image" are actually accompanied by a real weakness rather than strength in the particular area concerned. This suggests that the authoritarian individual's highly positive social facade functions to mark a very real lack of self-acceptance. An

extension of this argument has been investigated by Cowen (9) who found that his subjects with the more positive self-concept were less predisposed toward authoritarian attitudes.

LaFon (23) maintains that a person who is lacking in self-esteem defends himself against the feelings of insecurity which arise from this condition, while the self-accepting individual does not need to make excuses for his behavior. Likewise, Adorno (2) found that the low authoritarian scorers on the California F Scale showed a greater readiness to accept and to face their weaknesses.

It is Taylor and Combs' view that "the well-adjusted individual ought to be able to accept more unflattering (and hence threatening) facts about himself than would be expected of the less well-adjusted individual" (37, p. 89).

Wylie ties the concept of defensiveness to self-concept discrepancies as follows:

Discrepancies or contradictions within the self-concept tend to induce anxiety and defensiveness partially because inconsistencies in the behavior arising from these discrepancies would lead to a lowered degree of prediction and control of the behavior of self and environment (42, p. 602).

While on the surface both the self-accepting individual and the individual with defensively maintained self-esteem share the common appearance of a favorable self-concept, underlying the outward indications of self-satisfaction, the defensive

person may be presumed to have hidden feelings of self-dissatisfaction.

The manner in which defensiveness is related to race is made clear by Sutherland's findings that the "caste-like status which surrounds the Negro results inevitably in defensive attitudes designed to protect the self" (36, p. 74). Allport also affirms that ego-defensive traits are likely to be found wherever an individual's self-esteem is threatened:

Since no one can be indifferent to the abuse and expectations of others we must anticipate that ego-defensiveness will frequently be found among members of groups that are set off for ridicule, disparagement, and discrimination (4, p. 143).

Purpose of the Study

It was the purpose of this study to investigate the relationship among three personality variables--self-acceptance, authoritarianism, and defensiveness; and, further, to determine what, if any, differences exist between Negro and white college students on these variables.

From the theoretical framework considered previously, the following hypotheses to be tested in this investigation have been formulated:

1. There will be a significant negative correlation between the residualized self-acceptance scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the observed scores on Webster's

Scale of Authoritarianism.

2. There will be a significant negative correlation between the scores on Webster's Scale of Authoritarianism and the scores on the Self Criticism scale of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. The negative correlation will indicate a positive relationship between the two variables inasmuch as low scores on the Self Criticism scale are indicative of a higher degree of defensiveness than are high scores.

3. Those subjects who tend toward a high degree of self-acceptance will show significantly less defensiveness than those who tend toward a low degree of self-acceptance.

4. Negro subjects will have significantly lower self-acceptance scores than will white subjects.

5. Negro subjects will have significantly higher authoritarianism scores than white subjects.

6. Negro subjects will show a significantly greater degree of defensiveness, as shown by lower scores on the Self Criticism scale, than will white subjects.

Limitations

The degree to which generalizations can be made from the results of the study is, of course, limited due to the number of subjects and type of subjects involved. In addition, such variables as socio-economic status, family

training and background, etc., could not be controlled. To the extent that they were influential in determining the responses of the subjects, above and beyond the factors hypothesized, the interpretation of the results will have to be judged accordingly.

Definition of Terms

1. Self-acceptance refers to the degree to which an individual expresses satisfaction with his physical self, his moral and ethical self, his personal self, his family self and his social self as measured in this study by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Sheerer has defined the self-accepting person as follows:

The self-accepting person:

1. Relies primarily upon internalized values and standards rather than on external pressure as a guide to his behavior.
2. Has faith in his capacity to cope with life.
3. Assumes responsibility for and accepts the consequences of his own behavior.
4. Accepts praise or criticism from others objectively.
5. Does not attempt to deny or distort any feelings, motives, limitations, abilities, or qualities which he sees in himself, but rather accepts all without self-condemnation.
6. Considers himself a person of worth on an equal plane with other persons.
7. Does not expect others to reject him whether he gives them any reason to reject him or not.
8. Does not regard himself as totally different from others or generally abnormal in any way (32, p. 170).

2. Authoritarianism will be considered to encompass in varying degrees the dimensions given by Adorno, Pearl, Frenkel-Brunswik, and Fromm in the introduction of this chapter, and will be operationally defined as the attitudes measured by the Webster Scale of Authoritarianism.

3. Defensiveness refers to the extent to which an individual fails to ascribe to himself characteristics of a generally valid but socially unacceptable nature--the extent to which he fails to reveal the degree of his self-dissatisfaction. Defensiveness will be operationally defined as the personality variable measured by the Self-Criticism scale of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adler, Alfred, The Neurotic Constitution, New York, Dodd, Mead and Co., 1926.
2. Adorno, T., E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality, New York, Harper, 1950.
3. Allport, Gordon W., Pattern and Growth in Personality, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
4. _____, The Nature of Prejudice, Boston, The Beacon Press, 1954.
5. Berger, Emanuel M., "The Relationship Between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (October, 1952), 778-782.
6. Bills, Robert, "Believing and Behaving: Perceptual Learning," Learning More About Learning, Third Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, D. C., 1959.
7. Clark, Kenneth B., "Color, Class, Personality and Juvenile Delinquency," Journal of Negro Education, XXVIII (1959), 240-251.
8. _____, Prejudice and Your Child, Boston, The Beacon Press, 1955.
9. Cowen, E. L., "The Negative Self-Concept as a Personality Measure," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII (1954), 138-142.
10. Cox, Oliver C., Caste, Class and Race, New York, Monthly Review Press, 1959.

11. Dai, Bingham, "Some Problems of Personality Development Among Negro Children," in Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture, edited by Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry Murray, New York, Alfred Knopf, 1948.
12. Frenkel-Brunswik, Elsie, "Further Explorations by a Contributor to The Authoritarian Personality," in Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality, edited by R. Christie and Marie Jahoda, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1954.
13. Fromm, Eric, Escape from Freedom, New York, Farrar and Rinehart, Inc., 1941.
14. _____, "Selfishness and Self Love," Psychiatry, II (1939), 507-523.
15. Frazier, E. Franklin, Black Bourgeoisie, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1957.
16. _____, "The Negro Family," in The Family: Its Function and Destiny, edited by Ruth N. Ashen, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1949, 157-158.
17. Honigmann, John J., Culture and Personality, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1954.
18. Horney, Karen, Neurosis and Human Growth, New York, W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1950.
19. _____, The Neurotic Personality of Our Time, New York, W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1937.
20. Kardiner, Abram and Lionel Ovesey, The Mark of Oppression, New York, W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1951.
21. Karon, Bertram P., The Negro Personality, New York, Springer Publishing Co., Inc., 1958.
22. Kluckhohn, Clyde and Henry Murray, "Personality Formation: the Determinants," Personality in Nature, Society and Culture, New York, Alfred Knopf, 1948.
23. LaFon, Fred E., "Behavior on the Rorschach Test and a Measure of Self Acceptance," Psychological Monographs, LXVIII (1954), 1-14.

24. Lecky, P., Self-Consistency, New York, Island Press, 1945.
25. Lipton, Aaron, "Cultural Heritage and the Relationship to Self-Esteem," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXVI (January, 1963), 211-212.
26. McLean, Helen, "The Emotional Health of Negroes," Journal of Negro Education, XVIII (Summer, 1949), 284-286.
27. Omwake, Katherine, "The Relationship Between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others Shown by Three Personality Inventories," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XV (1951), 79-84.
28. Pearl, David, "Ethnocentrism and Self-Concept," Journal of Social Psychology, XL (1954), 137-147.
29. Piaget, Jean, The Child's Construction of Reality, translated by Margaret Cook, London, Routledge and Paul, 1958.
30. Rogers, Carl R., Client-Centered Therapy, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951.
31. Rokeach, Milton, The Open and Closed Mind, New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1960.
32. Sheerer, Elizabeth, "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.
33. Snyder, Eldon E., "Self-Concept Theory: An Approach to Understanding the Behavior of Disadvantaged Pupils," Clearing House, XL (December, 1965), 242-248.
34. Snygg, Donald and Arthur Combs, Individual Behavior, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1949.
35. Stock, Dorothy, "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.

36. Sutherland, Robert L., Color, Class and Personality, Washington, D. C., American Council on Education, 1942.
37. Taylor, C. and A. W. Combs, "Self-acceptance and Adjustment," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVI (1952), 89-91.
38. Vontress, Clemmont E., "The Negro Against Himself," Journal of Negro Education, XXXII (Summer, 1963), 237-242.
39. _____, "The Negro Personality Reconsidered," Journal of Negro Education, XXXV (Summer, 1966), 210-217.
40. Webster, H., N. Sanford, and M. Freedman, "A New Instrument for Studying Authoritarianism in Personality," Journal of Psychology, XL (1955), 73-84.
41. Wylie, Ruth C., The Self Concept, Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1961.
42. _____, "Some Relationships Between Defensiveness and Self Concept Discrepancies," Journal of Personality, XXV (September, 1957), 600-616.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

It was proposed in Chapter I that a relationship exists among the three personality variables considered in this study. After consideration of various writers' theories, it was hypothesized that self-acceptance was negatively related to authoritarianism and to defensiveness and that authoritarianism and defensiveness were positively related. Negro and white differences were also linked theoretically with these variables.

The literature is replete with studies in the area of self-acceptance, authoritarianism and defensiveness. While many of the findings are essentially in agreement, the results of other studies concerning the relationships among the variables have been diametrically opposed. The findings with reference to racial differences seem to have been more consistent than those regarding the relationship among the variables.

There have been several studies conducted for the purpose of relating acceptance of self to acceptance of others. McIntyre (20) administered a sociometric device and a

questionnaire designed to measure attitudes toward self and others to 315 male college students living together in a large dormitory. He found a correlation of $+0.46$ between acceptance of self and acceptance of others and ambiguous results with respect to Roger's hypothesis that better attitudes toward self and others are positively related to better interpersonal relationships.

The influence of situational variables on self-acceptance is shown in a study by Thorne (37). He found that following induced failure on a mirror drawing task, subjects whose initial level of self-acceptance was high tended to lower their self-ratings. Thorne interpreted these results as indicating that self-acceptance is influenced by environmental events and that persons respond "self-reflexively" to the perceived success or failure of their endeavors. Harvey, Kelly, and Shapiro (12), in an investigation of a similar nature, discovered in their subjects a general tendency for self-evaluations to be shifted in an unfavorable direction after they received negative evaluations by close friends and a stranger. Sarbin and Rosenberg (33), in their study of a college student population, found that normal students were more self-accepting and less self-critical than students diagnosed as neurotic.

There are many studies establishing the fact that self-evaluations are influenced by defensive behavior or the perceived social desirability of the personality statements to which the subject responds. It is Edwards' (6) opinion that the failure to control for the effects of this variable means, in effect, that the test in question may better be interpreted as a measure of social desirability than of self-acceptance. McKinley, Hathaway, and Meehl (21) and Zuckerman and Monashin (40), in their studies of college undergraduate students and hospitalized psychiatric patients, found self-acceptance to be positively correlated with the MMPI K Scale, interpreted as a measure of test-taking defensiveness.

The results of a study by Jervis (15) disclosed that the positive self-concept group of subjects actually contained individuals with low self and low ideal-self scores as well as individuals with high self and high ideal-self scores. Rogers and Walsh (29) tested the hypothesis that the unwitting self-evaluations of highly defensive people shows greater dislike of the self than that of moderately defensive people. Subjects were shown subliminal tachistoscopic exposures of their own photographs as well as photographs of other young women. They were asked to rate them as to attractiveness. The subliminal photographs were masked by a supraliminal

drawing of an expressionless face. The defensive group rated themselves as significantly lower in attractiveness than the control group although the judges perceived no differences in the attractiveness of the two groups. Thus the possibility that real differences could account for the results was ruled out. Wylie (39) found, in her study of self-acceptance and defensiveness in 378 airmen, that individuals who were low in self-acceptance were high in defensiveness.

In a study of the relationship between self-acceptance and authoritarianism, Brodbeck and Perlmutter (3) found that results for both men and women were in the direction predicted. They hypothesized that individuals with marked authoritarian attitudes would be higher in feelings of self-dislike than those individuals who did not hold such attitudes. Self-dislike scores differentiated the extremes of the high and low scoring authoritarian males, but did not hold as strongly for females. Rokeach and Fructer (30), studying the same variables, found that high self-rejection was associated with high authoritarianism as measured by the California F Scale.

Findings contradictory to the above research have been obtained by a number of investigators. Rubenstein and Lorr (31) found that subjects who prematurely terminated psychotherapy were more self-satisfied, according to the self-rating

scales, than were those who continued in therapy. Their F-Scale scores were also higher, indicating a positive relationship between self-satisfaction and authoritarianism.

Pearl (26), investigating the same variables, found that, for the subjects in his study, authoritarian attitudes were related to an unrealistically high self-evaluation.

Frymier (8), in studying the relationship between authoritarianism and acceptance by others, used a sociometric device with a group of high school students. The students were later tested with a measure of authoritarianism. His results indicated that students with more authoritarian attitudes tended to be rejected by their peers. Rohde (28) obtained similar results in a study of 126 aircrew members.

There appears to be little research dealing with the relationship of authoritarianism to defensiveness. Loevinger and Ossorio (19, p. 392) state that "during the college years there is a decline in authoritarian tendencies and a shift to a more liberal and tolerant view of others, with a more sophisticated, differentiated, self-critical and realistic self-concept." This would seem to indicate that authoritarian attitudes were somehow related to defensiveness, inasmuch as a decline in such attitudes is accompanied by a more self-critical concept of self. Smith (35), in studying a group of

Peace Corps volunteers, found that the more authoritarian members tended to be more self-defensive. This finding was significant at the .10 level. However, authoritarianism was found to be unrelated to successful performance as a Peace Corps teacher in Africa.

Jensen's (14) study, using the MMPI K Scale, regarded as an indicator of defensive attitudes, and a measure of authoritarianism, revealed a negative correlation. This finding is in contradiction to Smith's results, noted above, which indicate a positive relationship between authoritarianism and defensiveness.

The theoretical framework presented in Chapter I provides substantial support for the hypotheses of racial differences in the personality variables of interest to this study. How these variables--self-acceptance, authoritarianism, and defensiveness--are related to Negro and white differences can be seen by the results of the following studies.

Radke, Sutherland, and Pearl (27), in studying Negro and white school children, found that when compared with whites, the Negro is much less positive toward his own race. Harris (11) conducted a similar study and established that Negroes are more likely to view themselves in terms of a racial response than whites. He thus assumed that Negroes are more

self-conscious of their racial identity as a result of their minority group status.

Landreth and Johnson (18) studied 228 children and reached the conclusion that lower-class Negro children respond to skin color in terms of a value judgement. Butts (4) obtained similar results from his study of nine-to-twelve-year-old boys and girls. He found a strong tendency on the part of his Negro subjects to measure personal worth by the degree of proximity to white complexion. The study confirmed his hypothesis that Negro children with impaired self-esteem would perceive themselves less accurately in terms of skin color.

Many studies have been concerned with the attitudes and stereotypes which Negroes and other minority groups hold with respect to their own race. These studies are consistent in the finding that minority group members tend to hold attitudes and stereotypes about their groups which are similar to those held by the white majority. Bayton (2) and Meenes (23) both found that their Negro subjects held stereotypes of "the Negro" as being lazy, superstitious, musical, loud, and very religious. These are the same items that appear in the most common stereotypes that whites have of Negroes.

McLean (22) found repeatedly in the dreams of Negro patients in therapy an expression of self-loathing and the wish to be white. Outstanding examples of Negro self-hatred have been given by Ausubel and Ausubel (1) and Kardiner and Ovesey (16).

The importance of the individual's acceptance of himself as requisite to acceptance of others has been stressed in the theories of Rogers, Horney and others, as mentioned in Chapter I. Trent (38) tested these theories using a group of Negro children and found that the most self-accepting Negroes expressed significantly more positive attitudes toward both Negroes and whites than the least self-accepting group.

Several investigators have shown interest in the question of ethnic differences in authoritarianism. Koontz (17) compared white and Negro students from two southern universities and found no significant differences between the two groups. Greenberg, Chase, and Cannon (10) tested Negro and white high school students in segregated school systems and found the Negroes scored significantly higher in authoritarianism than the white students.

Middleton's (24) results coincided with the above authors' findings. In studying Negro and white reactions to racial

humor, he found that the Negro subjects represented a considerably higher level of authoritarianism as measured by the California F Scale than did the white subjects.

Stechler (36) investigated authoritarian ideology in Negro college students and found that his subjects' scores on the California F Scale surpassed those of any other group studied by the California investigators, Adorno et al. with the exception of prison inmates, whose scores were approximately the same. Stechler feels that his findings indicate a particular kind of authoritarian identification and conformity to the values and standards of the white majority among the Negro middle class. He feels that their highly authoritarian attitudes reveal an attempt to identify with stereotyped white middle-class values and to disassociate themselves from other members of their own race.

Smith and Prothro (34) tested white and Negro college freshmen in a southern state on the California F Scale and obtained significant differences between the two groups. The results were contrary to the hypotheses formulated by the investigators. The Negro group was more authoritarian, ranking higher on twenty-nine of the thirty items on the F Scale. The fact that the Negro group came mainly from the lower class and still ranked higher in authoritarianism suggested to the

investigators that the explanation of the differences must lie outside the bounds of socio-economic status and child-rearing practices. The author accepted Christie's (5, p. 175) interpretation that the differences are related to the reality of the referent in the F Scale items to members of lower socio-economic classes as evidenced by the following statement:

Referents of the southern Negro must be quite different from those of the southern white. Something inherent in the way of life of the region rather than social status or child-rearing practices produces the variation found. The experiences peculiar to the Negro, especially in the South, are likely to stimulate greater conventionalism, authoritarian aggression and submission, respect for power and toughness, and in general a high degree of authoritarianism. The constant frustration and fear with which the Negro lives produce aggressiveness, respect for authority and the position of the whites, and superstition and submission within his personality (34, p. 338).

Mussen (25), in his study of TAT responses of Negro and white boys, found that the Negro group viewed the general environment as more hostile than did the white group. In very few cases did they see themselves as being respected, followed or obeyed by others. In another study utilizing projective techniques, Goldfarb (9) found the Negro's view of life, as projected in Rorschach inkblots, as profoundly dangerous, hostile, and potentially violent.

Hokanson and Calden (13), in their study of Negro and white differences on the MMPI, found their Negro subjects to have significantly higher F and L scores. The L score is based on test items expressing socially undesirable attitudes which presumably would be admitted to by most people and hence can be considered to detect a defensive response set on the part of the high L score individual. The F score tends to be high for subjects who attempt to fake bad records and has been found by Freedman, Webster, and Sanford (7) to be positively related to an intro-punitive tendency in the form of early incorporation of hostility which has been directed against the self. The writers state that such intro-punitiveness appears to be a quality of high authoritarianism.

Runyan (32) conducted an investigation of racial differences in white and Negro college students using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. His study revealed a significant negative relationship between self-esteem scores and the use of defense mechanisms for both races.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ausubel, David and Pearl Ausubel, "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children," in Education in Depressed Areas, edited by A. Harry Passow, New York, Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1963.
2. Bayton, J. A., "Racial Stereotypes of Negro College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXVI (1941), 97-102.
3. Brodbeck, Arthur J. and Howard Perlmutter, "Self Dislike as a Determinant of Marked Ingroup-Outgroup Preference," Journal of Psychology, XXXVIII (1954), 271-280.
4. Butts, High F., "Skin Color Perception and Self-Esteem," Journal of Negro Education, XXXII (Spring, 1963), 122-128.
5. Christie, Richard, "Authoritarianism Re-examined," in Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality, edited by Richard Christie and Mane Jahoda, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1954.
6. Edwards, A. L., The Social Desirability Variable in Personality Assessment and Research, New York, Dryden, 1957.
7. Freedman, Marvin, Harold Webster, and Nevitt Sanford, "A Study of Authoritarianism and Psychopathology," Journal of Psychology, XLI (1956), 315-322.
8. Frymier, Jack R., "The Relationship of Authoritarianism to Rejection," Journal of Educational Research, LIII (September, 1959), 33-34.
9. Goldfarb, William, "The Rorschach Experiment," in The Mark of Oppression, edited by Abram Kardiner and Lionel Ovesey, New York, W. W. Norton and Co., 1951.

10. Greenberg, Herbert, Arthur L. Chase, and Thomas M. Cannon, Jr., "Attitudes of White and Negro High School Students in a West Texas Town Toward School Integration," Journal of Applied Psychology, XLI (February, 1957), 27-31.
11. Harris, Edward E., "Racial and National Identities: An Exploratory Study in Self and 'We-Group' Attitudes," Journal of Negro Education, XXXIV (Fall, 1965), 425-430.
12. Harvey, O. J., Harold H. Kelley, and Martin M. Shapiro, "Reactions to Unfavorable Evaluations of the Self Made by Others," Journal of Personality, XXV (1957), 393-411.
13. Hokanson, J. E., and G. Calder, "Negro-White Differences on the MMPI," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XVI (January 1960), 32-33.
14. Jenson, Arthur R., "Authoritarian Attitudes and Personality Maladjustment," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIV (May, 1957), 303-311.
15. Jervis, Frederick M., "The Meaning of a Positive Self-Concept," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XV (October, 1959), 370-373.
16. Kardiner, Abram and Lionel Ovesey, The Mark of Oppression, New York, W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1951.
17. Koontz, Miriam F., "A Comparison of False Nonauthoritarians in Two Ethnic Groups," unpublished Phd. Dissertation; George Peabody School for Teachers, 1955.
18. Landreth, C. and B. Johnson, "Young Children's Responses to a Picture and Inset Test Designed to Reveal Reactions to Persons of Different Skin Color," Child Development (1953), 63-80.
19. Loevinger, Jane and Abel Ossocio, "Education of Therapy by Self-Report: A Paradox," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XVIII (1959), 392-394.

20. McIntyre, Charles J., "Acceptance by Others and Its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (July, 1952), 624-625.
21. McKinley, J. C., S. R. Hathaway, and P. E. Mech, "The MMPI: VI The K Scale," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XII (1948), 20-31.
22. McLean, Helen, "The Emotional Health of Negroes," Journal of Negro Education, XVIII (Summer, 1949), 284-286.
23. Meenes, M. A., "A Comparison of Racial Stereotypes of 1930 and 1942," Journal of Social Psychology, XVII (1943), 327-336.
24. Middleton, Russell, "Negro and White Reactions to Racial Humor," Sociometry, XXII (1959), 175-183.
25. Mussen, Paul, "Differences Between the TAT Responses of Negro and White Boys," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVII (1953), 373-376.
26. Pearl, David, "Ethnocentrism and Self-Concept," Journal of Social Psychology, XL (1954), 137-147.
27. Radke, Marian J., Jean Sutherland, and Pearl Rosenberg, "Racial Attitudes of Children," Sociometry, XIII (1950), 154-171.
28. Rohde, K. J., "The Relation of Authoritarianism of the Aircrew Member to His Acceptance by the Airplane Commander," American Psychiatry,
29. Rogers, Arthur H. and Terrence M. Walsh, "Defensiveness and Unwitting Self-Evaluation," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XV (July, 1959), 303-304.
30. Rokeach, M. and B. Fructer, "A Factorial Study of Dogmatism and Related Concepts," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XIII (1956), 356-360.

31. Rubenstein, E. A. and M. Lorr, "A Comparison of Terminators and Remainders in Out-patient Psychotherapy," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XII (1956), 295-298.
32. Runyan, E. L., "The Relationship Between the Self-Concept and Adaptational Maneuvers in White and Negro College Students," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Reserve University, 1958.
33. Sarbin, T. R. and B. G. Rosenberg, "Contributions to Role-Taking Theory: A Method for Obtaining a Qualitative Estimate of the Self," Journal of Social Psychology, XLII (1955), 71-81.
34. Smith, Charles and James W. Prothro, "Ethnic Differences in Authoritarian Personality," Social Forces, XXXV (May, 1957), 334-338.
35. Smith, M. Brewster, "An Analysis of Two Measures of 'Authoritarianism' Among Peace Corps Teachers," Journal of Personality, XXXIII (December, 1965), 513-535.
36. Steckler, George, "Authoritarian Ideology in Negro College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIV (May, 1957), 396-399.
37. Thorne, R. B., "The Effects of Experimentally Induced Failure on Self Evaluation," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1954.
38. Trent, Richard D., "The Relation Between Expressed Self-Acceptance and Expressed Attitudes Toward Negroes and Whites Among Negro Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, XCI (September, 1957), 25-31.
39. Wylie, Ruth, "Some Relationships Between Defensiveness and Self-Concept Discrepancies," Journal of Personality, XXV (1957), 600-616.
40. Zuckerman, M. and I. Monashkin, "Self-Acceptance and Psychopathology," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXI (1957), 145-148.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

Subjects

The subjects for the present research were freshman and sophomore students enrolled in introductory psychology courses at a university in Denton, Texas during the spring semester of 1967. Also included in the study were freshmen students enrolled in a freshman orientation course at a Negro college in Dallas, Texas during the fall of 1966.

Sixty-one white students, 29 male and 32 female, and fifty-nine Negro students, 38 male and 21 female, participated in the research. Two Negro students who took part in the research at the university were included in the Negro college group in the statistical treatment of the data.

The students were not informed of the nature of the research in which they were participating. They were told by their respective instructors that they were assisting in research that would be incorporated into a thesis for the requirements of a Master's degree.

The instructions were given by the investigator. The subjects were asked to record their name and sex on the two instruments given them. Instructions for taking the Tennessee Self Concept Scale were read from the inside cover

of the test booklet. Students were asked to discontinue the

directive to record the time taken to complete the test as this was of no particular value to the examiner.

The instructions for taking Webster's Scale of Authoritarianism were printed on the first page of that instrument and were read to the subjects by the examiner. They were asked to answer each statement either true or false as it applied to them personally and were instructed not to omit any of the items.

Description of the Instruments

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale which was selected as a measure of self-acceptance was developed by William Fitts. The scale consists of 100 self-descriptive statements derived from other self-concept measures and written self-descriptions of patients and non-patients. In taking the scale the testee responds to each item on a Likert-type five-point scale which runs from "Completely False" to Completely True." The responses are then scored according to a two-dimensional classification scheme, one dimension being five aspects of the self (physical, moral, ethical, personal, family, and social) and the other representing the dynamics associated with each of these (what the person is, how he accepts himself, and how he acts).

The examiner used only two of the several scores given by the scale. The Self Satisfaction score which reflects the level of self-acceptance comes from those items where the

The Self Criticism scale was used as a measure of defensiveness. It is composed of ten items taken from the L scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. All are mildly derogatory statements which most people admit as being true for them. Individuals who deny most of these statements most often are being defensive and making a deliberate effort to present a socially acceptable image of themselves. High scores generally indicate a healthy openness and capacity for self-criticism. Low scores indicate defensiveness and suggest that the other scores are probably influenced in a positive direction by this defensiveness.

The norms for the scale were developed from a broad sample of 626 people with ages ranging from twelve to sixty-eight. Both sexes were represented in approximately equal numbers. The norm group represents all intellectual and educational levels from the sixth grade through the Ph.D. degree. The norms are overrepresented in number of college students, white subjects, and persons in the twelve to thirty year age range. The scale is available in two forms, the Clinical and Research Form and the Counseling Form. The Counseling Form was used in the present research.

Reliability coefficients are based on test-retest with sixty college students over a two-week period. For the self-satisfaction score, used as a measure of self-acceptance, the reliability coefficient was .88; for the defensiveness scale it was .75.

Additional evidence of reliability is found in the remarkable similarity of profile patterns found through repeated measures of the same individuals over long periods of time. Through differing types of profile analyses, Fitts has demonstrated that the distinctive features of individual profiles are still present for most persons a year or more after the first testing.

On validation procedures involving discrimination between groups, highly significant differences have been obtained on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale between 369 psychiatric patients and 626 non-patients for almost every score utilized on the scale. Other studies (Congdon, 4; Piety, 9; Havener, 6; and Wayne, 11) have obtained similar findings in patient vs. non-patient groups.

Fitts (5) in another study on group differences, found that people characterized as high in personality integration differed from the norm group in the direction opposite from that of the patient group. The scale has also been found to discriminate within patient groups by differentiating the type of disorder as well as the degree of disorder. Data collected by Huffman (7) have shown marked differences for different diagnostic groups that constitutes a kind of clinical validity of the scale inasmuch as they are in the direction that would be predicted from the type of pathology and defenses represented by the diagnoses.

Studies by Atchison (2) and Lefebber (8) obtained significant differences in the scale scores between juvenile delinquents and a control group. Boston and Kew (3), in a study of unwed mothers, found differences in the direction hypothesized on nearly every variable of the scale.

A recent study by Ashcraft and Fitts (1) is the most thorough study yet undertaken with the scale on changes that occur in the self-concept through psychotherapy. The study included an experimental group consisting of thirty patients who had been in therapy for an average of six months and a no-therapy control group of twenty-four patients who had been waiting for therapy for six and one-half months. All subjects were measured on a test-retest basis with the scale. The group that was in therapy showed significant changes in the expected direction on eighteen of the twenty-two variables studied while the control group changed on only two variables.

An unpublished scale devised by Webster, Sanford, and Freedman (1), hereafter referred to as Webster's Scale, was used as a measure of authoritarianism. Construction of Webster's Scale was begun by the administration of the California F Scale and E Scale to 441 college freshmen. In addition they responded to 677 true-false items from various personality tests. From these, 149 items which had sufficient correlation with the F Scale were taken to comprise the final scale. All 149 items had item validities significant at the .05 level in two separate samples. Cross-validation of the scale with a sample of 402 college freshmen gave a

correlation with the F Scale of .74. A scale composed of 123 items of the test had a Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficient of .88.

The items of the scale were grouped into clusters according to the theory set forth in The Authoritarian Personality. While the California F Scale was originally devised as a measure of potential fascism, the present scale is less ideologically oriented and more personality centered. Criticisms have been made, notable by Rokeach (10), that the F Scale measured only right-wing authoritarianism and failed completely as a measure of authoritarianism as it exists in individuals who lean more to the left in their political ideology.

Webster's Scale appears to cover enough of the variables ordinarily used in the description of authoritarianism and its correlation with the F Scale is high enough that it may be used as a substitute for the original scale. The scale appears to be a typical personality test with no relationship to the areas of politics, economics, or social relations. The scale is, therefore, less dependent upon the individual's contemporary culture or group membership than is the F Scale.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Because of the evidence that the self-acceptance scores are inflated by a defensive response set, a regression equation was employed to remove the effects of defensiveness from the self-acceptance scores. The resulting residualized

self-acceptance scores were used in the remaining statistical calculations.

Three Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed to test the first hypotheses that there will be a significant negative correlation between the residualized self-acceptance scores and the authoritarianism scores. The correlations were determined for the Negro and white groups separately and for the two groups combined.

Three Pearson correlation coefficients were computed to test the second hypothesis that there will be a significant negative correlation between the observed scores on Webster's Scale of Authoritarianism and the Self Criticism scale of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. A negative correlation in this case would indicate that a positive relationship exists between the two variables inasmuch as low scores on the Self Criticism scale suggest a higher degree of defensiveness than high scores. The correlations were determined for the Negro and white groups separately and for the two groups combined. A t-test was used to determine if the correlation coefficients were significantly different from zero.

Fisher's t-test was used to test the third hypothesis that subjects who tend toward a high degree of self-acceptance will show significantly less defensiveness than those who tend toward a low degree of self-acceptance. The mean score for all subjects was computed. Subjects having scores above the mean on the Self-Acceptance scale were considered high in

self-acceptance while those with scores below the mean were considered low in self-acceptance.

Fisher's t-test was used to test Hypothesis four that Negro subjects will score significantly lower on a measure of self-acceptance than white subjects, Hypothesis five that Negro subjects will score significantly higher on a measure of authoritarianism than white subjects, and Hypothesis six that Negro subjects will show a significantly greater degree of defensiveness than white subjects. To determine at the same time if there were any sex differences in the scores of Negro and white subjects, t-tests were run for the following groups: Negroes and whites, Negro females and Negro males, white females and white males, Negro males and white males, and white females and Negro females. The .05 level of significance was established as the point of acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ashcraft, Carolyn and William H. Fitts, "Self-Concept Change in Psychotherapy," Psychotherapy, Vol. I, No. 3 (1964), 115-118.
2. Atchison, Calvin, "A Comparative Study of the Self-Concept of Behavior Problem and Non-Behavior Problem High School Boys," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Psychology, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, 1958.
3. Boston, Geneva N. and Katherine L. Kew, "The Self-Concept of the Unmarried Mother in the Florence Crittendon Home, Nashville, Tennessee," unpublished master's thesis, Department of Psychology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1964.
4. Congdom, C. S., "Self-Theory and Chlorpromazine Treatment," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Psychology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, 1958.
5. Fitts, William H., Tennessee Self Concept Scale Manual, Nashville, Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.
6. Havener, P. H., "Distortions in the Perception of Self and Others By Persons Using Paranoid Defenses," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Psychology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, 1961.
7. Huffman, T. B., "Relationships Between the Self-Concept and Three Psychopathological Types," unpublished master's thesis, Department of Psychology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1964.
8. Lefeber, James, "The Delinquent's Self-Perception," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Psychology, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1964.

9. Piety, K. R., "The Role of Defense in Reporting on the Self-Concept," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Psychology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, 1958.
10. Rokeach, Milton, The Open and Closed Mind, New York Basic Books, Inc., 1960.
11. Wayne, S. R., "The Relation of Self-Esteem to Indices of Perceived and Behavioral Hostility," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, 1963.
12. Webster, H., N. Sanford, and M. Freedman, "A New Instrument for Studying Authoritarianism in Personality," Journal of Psychology, XL (March, 1955), 73-84.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As stated in Chapter III, a regression equation was employed to statistically remove the effects of defensiveness from the self-acceptance scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. A Pearson product moment correlation coefficient of $-.24$ was obtained between the self-acceptance scores and the defensiveness scores on the Self-Criticism scale. Because a low score on the Self-Criticism scale indicates a greater degree of defensiveness than does a high score, it appears that the self-acceptance scores were automatically influenced in an upward direction by a defensive response set on the part of the individuals taking the test. It was the purpose of the residualization to remove the effects of such defensiveness and thus obtain a "purer" measure of self-acceptance. In the statistical data presented, the residualized self-acceptance scores were used rather than the original scores.

The coefficients of correlation between the variables of self-acceptance and authoritarianism for the Negro and white groups combined and for each group separately are

shown in Table I. Hypothesis one that self-acceptance and authoritarianism are negatively related is upheld by the results for Negroes and whites combined and for the whites

TABLE I
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR
SELF-ACCEPTANCE SCORES AND AUTHORITARIANISM SCORES

Group	<u>r</u>	<u>P</u>
Negro and White Combined	-.26	.01
Negro	-.21	*
White	-.35	.01

*Not significant

separately, both r's being significant at the .01 level. However, this relationship does not appear to hold true for the Negro group alone, at least not to a significant degree. For the Negro group high self-acceptance is not significantly related to either high or low authoritarianism although the tendency is in the direction predicted.

The correlation coefficients for the variables of authoritarianism and defensiveness for the Negro and white groups combined and for the two groups separately are shown in Table II. The results indicate that the correlation

TABLE II

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR
AUTHORITARIANISM SCORES AND DEFENSIVENESS SCORES

Group	<u>r</u>	<u>P</u>
Negro and White Combined	-.10	*
Negro	-.05	*
White	.06	*

*Not significant

between authoritarianism and defensiveness does not differ significantly from zero. Therefore, Hypothesis two that a positive relationship exists between authoritarianism and defensiveness cannot be accepted. The results are contrary to Smith's (15) findings with Peace Corps volunteers that the more authoritarian members were also more defensive and to Adorno's (1) finding that the high scorers on the California F Scale showed a significantly greater degree of defensiveness.

The test of significance of the differences between the mean scores on the scale of defensiveness for subjects scoring high in self-acceptance and the means for Negro and white subjects scoring low in self-acceptance can be seen in Table III. A t of 1.05 did not reach the required level

TABLE III

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE
HIGH SELF-ACCEPTANCE NEGRO AND WHITE SUBJECTS AND THE
LOW SELF-ACCEPTANCE NEGRO AND WHITE SUBJECTS
ON THE DEFENSIVENESS SCALE

High Self-Acceptance Subjects		Low Self-Acceptance Subjects		\bar{t}	P
Mean Defensiveness Score	S. D.	Mean Defensiveness Score	S. D.		
35.61	5.82	36.70	5.33	1.05	*

*Not significant

of significance, and, therefore, hypothesis three that the high self-acceptance subjects would show less defensiveness than the low self-acceptance subjects cannot be accepted. This finding is contrary to the theoretical conclusions and empirical findings of such investigators as Rogers and Walsh (13), Wylie (22), and others.

The findings regarding Negro and white differences on the three variables considered in the present study can be seen in Table IV. Contrary to Hypothesis four, Negro subjects did not score lower in self-acceptance than did white subjects. In fact, the mean score of Negro subjects (56.03) is almost identical to that of the white subjects (56.89).

TABLE IV
 TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN THE NEGRO SUBJECTS
 AND THE WHITE SUBJECTS ON THE SELF-ACCEPTANCE,
 AUTHORITARIANISM AND DEFENSIVENESS SCALES

Test Scale	Negro Subjects		White Subjects		<u>t</u>	<u>P</u>
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.		
Self-Acceptance	56.03	12.55	56.89	16.92	.31	*
Authoritarianism	94.10	13.55	71.98	18.21	6.92	.001
Defensiveness	34.94	5.49	37.32	5.47	2.35	.05

*Not significant

This finding is in complete opposition to the theoretical arguments of Negro self-dissatisfaction and poor self-image as well as the empirical studies which seem to indicate that Negroes respond to their skin color in terms of a value judgment and perceive themselves accordingly.

Although the theory concerning the Negro's poor self-concept and basic self-dislike seems to be sound, there are several factors in the present research that could account for the failure to find this self-dissatisfaction. First of all, much of the literature is based on either Negroes living in the crowded ghettos of highly populous northern and eastern cities or in the deep South where constant discrimination

and racial bigotry prevail. The extent to which regional factors influence the Negro's image of himself is not easily ascertained. But it is possible that the Negroes in the present study, coming largely from a metropolitan area that has had no apparent racial conflict and where integration has taken a relatively smooth course, might have different attitudes toward themselves and their racial group than those who experience life differently elsewhere.

Another factor that might account for the results is the differences in subjects used. Much of the literature deals with Negro individuals who were patients in psychotherapy. To the extent that emotional difficulties are associated with distortions and conflicts within the self-concept, one would expect a patient population to differ from a non-patient population in such a vital, pervasive factor as self-acceptance. Many of the theories and findings regarding Negro self-esteem are based on studies with young school children. While it could be expected that there might be some generalization to an older group, there can be no doubt that a college population of Negroes is not the same as an elementary school group. In many of the studies, the children were confronted with the task of making comparisons between themselves and white children, in which case they tended to give responses indicating that they did not perceive themselves of equal worth (3, 9, 12).

The one factor of major importance appears to be the fact that the Negroes who participated in the present study were a highly selected group from within their own racial community. Only a very small percentage of Negro youth further their education as far as college, and those who succeed in reaching this level most likely perceive it as a significant attainment. It is probable that rather than using the white majority group as their frame of reference in determining their status and self-worth, their comparisons are based on their relative achievement with reference to others of their own racial group. In this case they would be likely to regard themselves more positively. White subjects, in a similar fashion, are probably comparing themselves with the rest of the white population. Inasmuch as relatively large numbers of white youth avail themselves of the opportunity for a college education, it is not such a great distinction to attend college in this group. Consequently, the individual in this group may not compare himself with the others so favorably.

Recent legislative enactments and Supreme Court decisions have resulted in the breaking of barriers previously maintained to preserve the status quo of the Negro. Because these are relatively recent occurrences, much of the literature may be outdated to some degree by an overall upgrading in the Negro's perception of his race, himself, and his opportunities for education and vocational advancement. Though the self-concept

is theoretically formed at a very early age, empirical findings do indicate that it is susceptible to change (6, 20).

While there were no significant differences between the Negro and white groups in terms of their self-acceptance scores, significant differences were obtained on Webster's Scale of Authoritarianism. As shown in Table IV, the Negro subjects scored significantly higher (mean score of 94.10) than did the white subjects (mean score of 71.98). The t-ratio of 6.92 was significant at the .001 level, thus confirming hypothesis five. This finding supports the results of studies by Greenburg, Chase and Cannon (5); Stechler (17); and Smith and Prothro (16) and is in opposition to Koontz's (8) findings. It is possible that for the upwardly mobile Negro subjects used in this investigation, the highly authoritarian attitudes reveal an attempt to identify with stereotyped white middle class values and repudiate the stereotyped concept of the dishonest, unreliable, aggressive and morally deficient Negro. This high authoritarianism could perhaps be interpreted as an over-compensation on the part of the Negro subjects which takes the form of rigid conformity to what they consider to be socially acceptable attitudes and behavior.

Negro and white discrepancies in judgement of the social desirability of certain attitudes incorporated into the items on the Authoritarianism scale might also partially account for the differences. Edwards (4) has given considerable evidence that a social desirability factor plays an important

part in tests of self-acceptance. It is also possible that the perceived social desirability of the items on Webster's Scale of Authoritarianism was an important factor in determining an individual's response. Sherif and Hovland (14) investigated differences in favorable and unfavorable ratings assigned to personality statements by a group of Negro judges and a group of white judges. They found that the absolute scale values assigned to corresponding items differed appreciably for the two groups. They interpreted their results as reflecting the different attitudes and values of the two groups. While differences in perceived social desirability of items might have influenced the results to some degree, it is unlikely that they alone could account for such a large difference between the two groups as was obtained. Therefore, it appears that the results do indicate true differences in authoritarian attitudes held by the Negro and white subjects included in this study.

As indicated in Table IV, a difference significant at the .05 level was found between the mean scores of Negro and white subjects on the Self-Criticism scale of defensiveness. The Negro subjects, with a mean score of 34.94, showed significantly more defensiveness than the white subjects, with a mean of 37.32. A t-ratio of 2.35 was significant at the .05 level, thus confirming Hypothesis six. This finding is in agreement with that of Sutherland (19) and Hokanson and Calden (7) in their study of Negro and white differences on the MMPI. The

finding lends additional credence to Allport's (2) theory that ego-defensiveness is a probability among members of minority groups that suffer discrimination.

Of interest also is the fact that on both the Self-Acceptance scale and the Authoritarianism scale the Negro group's standard deviations are lower than those of the white group. This fact suggests that the Negro group is more homogeneous in regard to these personality variables than is the white group.

Although no sex differences were hypothesized on any of the three variables considered, some interesting results regarding such were obtained. The mean scores of Negro males and Negro females on the Self-Acceptance, Authoritarianism, and Defensiveness scales can be seen in Table V. No significant differences were shown to exist between Negro females

TABLE V

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN NEGRO MALES AND NEGRO FEMALES ON THE SELF-ACCEPTANCE, AUTHORITARIANISM, AND DEFENSIVENESS SCALES

Test Scale	Negro Males		Negro Females		<u>t</u>	<u>P</u>
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Self-Acceptance	56.44	11.03	55.30	14.88	.28	*
Authoritarianism	91.55	13.95	98.00	11.91	1.33	*
Defensiveness	34.55	5.09	35.66	6.08	.73	*

*Not significant

and Negro males on any of the three variables although Negro females tended to be more authoritarian (mean score of 98.00 vs. male mean score of 91.55).

The results of the differences between means for white females and white males are shown in Table VI. Significant differences at the .05 level were shown to exist between white males and white females on their self-acceptance scores, with the white males showing significantly greater self-acceptance (mean score of 61.50 vs. female mean score of 52.71).

TABLE VI

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN WHITE MALES AND WHITE FEMALES ON THE SELF-ACCEPTANCE, AUTHORITARIANISM, AND DEFENSIVENESS SCALES

Test Scale	White Males		White Females		t	P
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Self-Acceptance	61.50	16.03	52.71	16.61	2.30	.05
Authoritarianism	68.92	18.35	74.74	17.63	1.36	*
Defensiveness	37.17	5.37	37.46	5.56	.20	*

*Not significant

No such differences were found in the Negro group between males and females. One reason perhaps is that in many of the lower-class Negro homes and to a lesser extent the middle-class homes, the head of the household is a female. Even where this is not the case, the female is often the most dependable

source of income for the family. Vontress (21) traces the low status ascribed to the Negro male back to the days of slavery when the Negro woman's role was much more prestigious. He states that the Negro male's role has always been confused and often meaningless. In many Negro families the male fulfills his biological role but fails to fulfill his social and cultural role and consequently comes to be dependent on women who are seen as threats to his masculinity.

The strong tendency for greater self-acceptance among the males as compared to the females in the white group of subjects is not found in the Negro group for perhaps the reasons mentioned above. But that alone does not explain why the white females are less self-accepting than the white males. One inference that could be made from the finding is that the content of the self-conceptions, particularly the individual's self-acceptance, is a reflection of the differences in the esteem with which the two sexes are regarded in our society. Menninger (11, p. 41) states that our social and economic order, as well as our religious concepts and legal codes, make the historic assumption that man is the more important figure. Women are born to serve him, love him, be protected by him and assist in reproducing him.

That some men and women of college age have by and large accepted this assumption is revealed by the studies of McKee and Sherriff (10). They found in a University of California population of 83 men and 93 women, that both men and women

regarded males more highly than females. The fact that both college males and females estimated the attributes of females less favorably than the attributes of males might, by a process of generalization, result in the female's assuming an attitude of intellectual inferiority. McKee and Sherriff make particular note of the fact that the intellectual career achievements of women fall short of that of men, and recognition of this fact may affect self-estimates.

Additional explanation for this difference in self-acceptance can be found in the fact that most college females are oriented primarily toward marriage and family roles and not toward occupations. Yet college training in the majority of schools is geared to prepare one for an occupation. Today, more than ever before, college educated women are expected to make a contribution to society in roles other than those of wife and mother. It is possible that these circumstances are responsible for generating a certain amount of role conflict in the college female.

A study by Steinmann, Levi, and Fox (18) sheds further light on the role-conflict explanation. Their research, using 75 young women from a college in a large northeastern city, indicated a shift in orientation between a slightly passive self-concept to a more active ideal self-concept. The authors interpreted their results as indicating intra-psychic conflict for the woman whose self-concept is not the same as she thinks it should be. The females in the study felt that they should

be more passive and accepting of a subordinate role in both personal development and family structure, while they simultaneously preferred a more active role. Such a situation, concluded the authors, might result in antagonism within the self image.

It is thus possible that role conflict of the family vs. career variety or the stereotyped role of the passive, subordinate female vs. a more active self-achieving role may account for the results obtained in the present research. The fact that society seems to regard the male role with greater esteem, and the preference for this role on the part of many women, are likewise considered to have bearing on the results.

Although the differences were not significant, white females tended to be more authoritarian (mean score of 74.74) than white males (mean score of 68.92). Mean scores on the Defensiveness scale for white males and females were almost identical (37.17 for the males vs. 37.46 for females), indicating no differences in either direction.

The results of the differences between mean scores for Negro males and white males can be seen in Table VII. Though white males tend to be more self-accepting (mean score of 61.50) than Negro males (mean score of 56.44), the difference does not reach the required level of significance. The two groups did differ significantly, however, on the authoritarianism scores. The Negro males, with a mean of 91.55, showed a significantly greater degree of authoritarianism than their

TABLE VII

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN NEGRO MALES AND WHITE MALES
ON THE SELF-ACCEPTANCE, AUTHORITARIANISM,
AND DEFENSIVENESS SCALES

Test Scale	Negro Males		White Males		<u>t</u>	<u>P</u>
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Self-Acceptance	56.44	11.03	61.50	16.03	1.38	*
Authoritarianism	91.55	13.95	18.35	18.35	5.23	.001
Defensiveness	34.55	5.09	37.17	5.37	1.90	*

*Not significant

white counterparts, whose mean score was 68.92. The difference was significant at the .001 level. The differences in mean scores for Negro and white males on the Defensiveness scale fell just short of being significant at the .05 level. Negro males showed a tendency to greater defensiveness, with a mean of 34.55, compared to a mean of 37.17 for white males.

The findings regarding differences between Negro females and white females on the Self-Acceptance, Authoritarianism, and Defensiveness scales can be seen in Table VIII. There were no significant differences in self-acceptance between the Negro and white females although Negro females did score slightly higher. Negro females scored significantly higher on Webster's Scale of Authoritarianism than did the white females. The difference between the mean score of 98.00 for Negro females and 74.74 for white females as significant at

TABLE VIII

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN THE NEGRO FEMALES
AND WHITE FEMALES ON THE SELF-ACCEPTANCE,
AUTHORITARIANISM, AND DEFENSIVENESS SCALES

Test Scale	Negro Females		White Females		<u>t</u>	<u>P</u>
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Self-Acceptance	55.30	14.88	52.71	16.61	.62	*
Authoritarianism	98.00	11.91	74.74	17.63	4.89	.001
Defensiveness	35.66	6.08	37.46	5.56	1.15	*

*Not significant

the .001 level. There were no significant differences between the scores on defensiveness for the two groups, although Negro females tended to be more defensive, with a mean of 35.66, than white females, with a mean of 37.46.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adorno, T., E. Frenkel-Brunswick, D. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1950.
2. Allport, Gordon W., The Nature of Prejudice, Boston, The Beacon Press, 1954.
3. Butts, Hugh F., "Skin Color Perception and Self-Esteem," Journal of Negro Education, XXXII (Spring, 1963), 122-128.
4. Edwards, A. L., The Social Desirability Variable in Personality Assessment and Research, New York, Dryden, 1957.
5. Greenberg, Herbert, Arthur L. Chase, Thomas M. Cannon, Jr., "Attitudes of White and Negro High School Students in a West Texas Town Toward School Integration," Journal of Applied Psychology, XLI (February, 1957), 27-31.
6. Harvey, O. J., Harold H. Kelley, and Martin M. Shapiro, "Reactions to Unfavorable Evaluations of the Self Made by Others," Journal of Personality, XXV (November, 1957), 393-411.
7. Hokanson, J. E., and G. Calden, "Negro-White Differences on the MMPI," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XVI (January, 1960) 32-33.
8. Koontz, Miriam F., "A Comparison of False Non-Authoritarians in Two Ethnic Groups, unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody School for Teachers, 1955.
9. Landreth, C., and B. Johnson, "Young Children's Responses to a Picture and Inset Test Designed to Reveal Reactions to Persons of Different Skin Color," Child Development, XXIV (November, 1953), 63-80.
10. McKee, John P., and Alex C. Sherriff, "Men's and Women's Beliefs, Ideals, and Self-Concepts," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (April, 1959), 356-363.
11. Menninger, Karl, Love Against Hate, New York, Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1942.

12. Radke, Marian J., Jean Sutherland, and Pearl Rosenberg, "Racial Attitudes of Children," Sociometry, XIII (June, 1950), 154-171.
13. Rogers, Arthur H., and Terrence M. Walsh, "Defensiveness and Unwitting Self-Evaluation," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XV (July, 1959), 302-304.
14. Sherif, M. and C. I. Hovland, "Judgemental Phenomena and Scales of Attitudes Measurement: Item Displacement in Thurstone Scales," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (December, 1952), 822-833.
15. Smith, Charles and James W. Prothro, "Ethnic Differences in Authoritarian Personality," Social Forces XXXV (May, 1957), 334-338.
16. Smith M. Brewster, "An Analysis of Two Measures of Authoritarianism' Among Peace Corps Teachers," Journal of Personality, XXXIII (December, 1965), 513-535.
17. Steckler, George, "Authoritarian Ideology in Negro College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIV (May, 1957), 396-399.
18. Steinmann, Anne, Joseph Levi, and David Fox, "Self-Concept of College Women Compared with Their Concept of Ideal Woman and Men's Ideal Woman," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XI (Winter, 1964), 370-374.
19. Sutherland, Robert L., Color, Class and Personality, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1942.
20. Throne, R. B., "The Effects of Experimentally Induced Failure on Self-Evaluation," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1954.
21. Vontress, Clemmont E., "The Negro Personality Reconsidered," Journal of Negro Education, XXXV (Summer, 1966), 210-217.
22. Wylie, Ruth C., The Self Concept, Lincoln, Nebraska, University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was undertaken to investigate the relationships that exist among three variables: self-acceptance, authoritarianism, and defensiveness, and to determine what differences, if any, exist between Negro and white college students on these variables. The data were also analyzed to determine if there were any significant sex differences on the self-acceptance, authoritarianism, and defensiveness scales used in this study.

The sample consisted of sixty-one white students enrolled in introductory psychology courses at a university in Denton, Texas during the spring semester of 1967. Also included were fifty-nine Negro students enrolled in a freshman orientation course at a Negro college in Dallas, Texas in the fall of 1966.

Two instruments were used in this study: the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and Webster's Scale of Authoritarianism. The Self-Satisfaction score on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale was used as an indicator of self-acceptance and the Self-Criticism score from the same scale was used as a measure of defensiveness.

Findings of a correlational analysis for the variables of self-acceptance, authoritarianism, and defensiveness are summarized as follows:

1. A significant negative relationship exists between self-acceptance and authoritarianism for Negro and white subjects combined and for white subjects separately. The relationship is not significant for the Negro subjects considered separately.

2. Authoritarianism and defensiveness are not significantly related for the Negro and white subjects combined or for either group considered separately.

A summary of group comparisons for the three variables considered reveals the following:

1. Low scorers on the Self-Acceptance scale are not significantly more defensive than high scorers on the Self-Acceptance scale.

2. White subjects are not significantly more self-accepting than Negro subjects.

3. Negro subjects tend to be more authoritarian than white subjects.

4. Negro subjects tend to be more defensive than white subjects.

5. Negro males and Negro females do not differ significantly in self-acceptance, authoritarianism, or defensiveness.

6. White males tend to be more self-accepting than white females. The two groups do not differ significantly in authoritarianism or defensiveness.

7. Negro males tend to be more authoritarian than white males. The two groups do not differ significantly in self-acceptance or defensiveness.

8. Negro females tend to be more authoritarian than white females. The two groups do not differ significantly in self-acceptance or defensiveness.

Conclusions

The results of the study indicate that self-acceptance and authoritarianism are negatively related. No other significant relationship was found among the three variables investigated.

The failure to find significant differences in self-acceptance between Negro and white subjects was related to several different factors, principally the fact that the Negro subjects participating in this study were a highly selective group of individuals within their own community whose achievements in comparison with other members of their race are most likely perceived as significant accomplishments. Such a perception of their relative attainments vis-a-vis the majority of their group would likely result in increased self-esteem and self-acceptance.

The high degree of authoritarianism evidenced by the Negro subjects was related to that group's probable striving for middle-class status. The high authoritarianism may be representative of compensatory behavior and attitudes which result in a somewhat rigid conformity to what they consider to be a socially acceptable standards. The greater degree of defensiveness evidenced by the Negro subjects is in accordance with Allport's theory that discrimination results in ego-defensiveness in an attempt to maintain self-esteem on the part of those who are the objects of discrimination.

The finding that white college males tend to be more self-accepting than white college females was interpreted as a consequence of the greater esteem with which the male sex is regarded in our society and the role conflict engendered in the female by the contrasting expectations of college, society, and the opposite sex. The fact that similar differences were not found in the Negro group was attributed to the widely established tradition of female dominance which has tended to assign a subordinate role to the Negro male.

It is suggested that further studies of self-acceptance be undertaken with other Negro groups to see if this all important aspect of personality is partly a function of the individual's relative attainments within his racial group.

A study of self-acceptance using a non-college population compared to a college population would shed further light on the subject.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Adler, Alfred, The Neurotic Constitution, New York, Dodd, Mead, and Co., 1926.
- Adorno, T., E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality, New York, Harper, 1950.
- Allport, Gordon W., Pattern and Growth in Personality, New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.
- _____, The Nature of Prejudice, Boston, The Beacon Press, 1954.
- Ausubel, David and Pearl Ausubel, "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children," Education in Depressed Areas, edited by A. Harry Passow, New York, Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1963.
- Christie, Richard, "Authoritarianism Re-examined," in Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality, edited by Richard Christie and Marie Jahoda, Glencoe, Illinois, the Free Press, 1954.
- Clark, Kenneth B., Prejudice and Your Child, Boston, The Beacon Press, 1955.
- Cox, Oliver C., Caste, Class and Race, New York, Monthly Review Press, 1959.
- Dai, Bingham, "Some Problems of Personality Development Among Negro Children," in Personality in Nature, Society and Culture, edited by Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry Murray, New York, Alfred Knopf, 1948.
- Edwards, A. L., The Social Desirability Variable in Personality Assessment and Research, New York, Dryden Press, 1957.
- Fitts, William H., Tennessee Self Concept Scale Manual, Nashville, Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.

Frazier, E. Franklin, Black Bourgeoisie, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1957.

_____, "The Negro Family," in The Family: Its Function and Destiny, edited by Ruth N. Ashen, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1949.

Frenkel-Brunswik, Elsie, "Further Explorations by a Contributor to The Authoritarian Personality," in Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality, edited by Richard Christie and Marie Jahoda, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1954.

Fromm, Erich, Escape from Freedom, New York, Farrar and Rinehart, Inc., 1941.

Goldfarb, William, "The Rorschach Experiment," in The Mark of Oppression, edited by Abram Kardiner and Lionel Ovesey, New York, W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1951.

Honigmann, John J., Culture and Personality, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1954.

Horney, Karen, Neurosis and Human Growth, New York, W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1950.

_____, The Neurotic Personality of Our Time, New York W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1937.

Kardiner, Abram and Lionel Ovesey, The Mark of Oppression, W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1951.

Karon, Bertram P., The Negro Personality, New York, Springer Publishing Co., Inc., 1958.

Kluckhohn, Clyde and Henry Murray, "Personality Formation: the Determinants," in Personality in Nature, Society and Culture, New York, Alfred Knopf, 1948.

Lecky, Prescott, Self-Consistency, New York Island Press, 1945.

Menninger, Karl, Love Against Hate, New York, Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1942.

Piaget, Jean, The Child's Construction of Reality, translated by Margaret Cook, London, Routledge and Paul, 1958.

Rogers, Carl R., Client-Centered Therapy, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951.

Rokeach, Milton, The Open and Closed Mind, New York, Basic Books Inc., 1960.

- Snugg, Donald and Arthur Combs, Individual Behavior, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1949.
- Sutherland, Robert L., Color, Class and Personality, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1942.
- Wylie, Ruth C., The Self Concept, Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

Articles

- Ashcraft, Carolyn and William H. Fitts, "Self-Concept Change in Psychotherapy," Psychotherapy, I, No. 3 (1964) 115-118.
- Bayton, J. A., "Racial Stereotypes of Negro College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXVI (June, 1941), 97-102.
- Berger, Emanuel M., "The Relationship Between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (October, 1952), 778-782.
- Brodbeck, Arthur J. and Howard Perlmutter, "Self-Dislike as a Determinant of Marked Ingroup-Outgroup Preferences," Journal of Psychology, XXXVIII (1954), 271-280.
- Butts, Hugh F., "Skin Color Perception and Self-Esteem," Journal of Negro Education, XXXII (Spring, 1963), 122-128.
- Clark, Kenneth B., "Color, Class, Personality, and Juvenile Delinquency," Journal of Negro Education XXVIII (Fall, 1959), 240-251.
- Cowen, E. L., "The Negative Self-Concept as a Personality Measure," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII (Spring, 1954), 138-142.
- Freedman, Marvin, Harold Webster, and Nevitt Sanford, "A Study of Authoritarianism and Psychopathology," Journal of Psychology, XLI (September, 1956), 315-332.
- Fromm, Erich, "Selfishness and Self-Love," Psychiatry, II (April, 1939), 507-523.
- Frymier, Jack R., "The Relationship of Authoritarianism to Rejection," Journal of Educational Research LIII (September, 1959), 33-34.

- Greenberg, Herbert, Arthur L. Chase and Thomas M. Cannon, Jr., "Attitudes of White and Negro High School Students in a West Texas Town Toward School Integration," Journal of Applied Psychology, XLI (February, 1957), 27-31.
- Harris, Edward E., "Racial and National Identities: An Exploratory Study in Self and 'We-Group' Attitudes," Journal of Negro Education, XXIV (Fall, 1965), 425-430.
- Harvey, O. J., Harold H. Kelley and Martin M. Shapiro, "Reactions to Unfavorable Evaluations of the Self Made By Others," Journal of Personality, XXV (March, 1957), 393-411.
- Hokanson, J. E. and G. Calden, "Negro and White Differences on the MMPI," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XVI (January, 1960), 32-33.
- Jenson, Arthur R., "Authoritarian Attitudes and Personality Maladjustment," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIV (May, 1957), 303-311.
- Jervis, Frederick M., "The Meaning of a Positive Self-Concept," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XV (October, 1959), 370-373.
- LaFon, Fred E., "Behavior on the Rorschach Test and a Measure of Self Acceptance," Psychological Monographs, LXVIII (1954), 1-14.
- Landreth, C. and B. Johnson, "Young Children's Responses to a Picture Inset Test Designed to Reveal Reactions to Persons of Different Skin Color," Child Development, (January, 1953), 63-80.
- Lipton, Aaron, "Cultural Heritage and the Relationship to Self-Esteem," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXVI (January, 1963), 211-212.
- Loevinger, Jane and Abel Ossorio, "Evaluation of Therapy by Self-Report: A Paradox," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LVIII (September, 1959), 392-394.
- McIntyre, Charles J., "Acceptance by Others and Its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (July, 1952), 624-625.
- McKee, John P. and Alex C. Sherif, "Men's and Women's Beliefs, Ideals and Self-Concepts," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (April, 1959), 356-363.

- McKinley, J. C., S. R. Hathaway and P. E. Meehl, "The MMPI: VI The k Scale," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XII (Fall, 1948), 20-31.
- McLean, Helen, "The Emotional Health of Negroes," Journal of Negro Education, XVIII (Summer, 1949), 284-286.
- Meenes, M. A., "A Comparison of Racial Stereotypes of 1930 and 1942," Journal of Social Psychology, XVII (November, 1943), 327-336.
- Middleton, Russell, "Negro and White Reactions to Racial Humor," Sociometry, XXII (August, 1959), 175-183.
- Mussen, Paul, "Differences Between the TAT Responses of Negro and White Boys," Journal of Consulting Psychology XVII (Spring, 1953), 373-376.
- Omwake, Katherine, "The Relationship Between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others Shown by Three Personality Inventories," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XV (December, 1951), 79-84.
- Pearl, David, "Ethnocentrism and Self-Concept," Journal of Social Psychology, XL (November, 1954), 137-147.
- Radke, Marian J., Jean Sutherland and Pearl Rosenberg, "Racial Attitudes of Children," Sociometry, XIII (March, 1950), 154-171.
- Rogers, Arthur H. and Terrence M. Walsh, "Defensiveness and Unwitting Self-Evaluation," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XV (July, 1959), 302-304.
- Rohde, K. J., "The Relationship of Authoritarianism of the Aircrew Member to His Acceptance by the Airplane Commander," American Psychiatry, XVII (July, 1951), 56-59.
- Rokeach, M. and B. Fructer, "A Factorial Study of Dogmatism and Related Concepts," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIII (December, 1956), 365-360.
- Rubenstein, E. A. and M. Lorr, "A comparison of Terminators and Remainders in Out-Patient Psychotherapy," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XII (January, 1956), 295-298.
- Sarbin, T. R. and B. G. Rosenberg, "Contributions to Role-Taking Theory: A Method for Obtaining a Quantitative Estimate of the Self," Journal of Social Psychology, XLII (August, 1955), 71-81.

- Sheerer, Elizabeth, "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).
- Sherif, M. and C. I. Hovland, "Judgement Phenomena and Scales of Attitude Measurement: Item Displacement in Thurstone Scales," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (December, 1952), 822-833.
- Smith, Charles and James W. Prothro, "Ethnic Differences in Authoritarian Personality," Social Forces, XXXV (May, 1957), 334-338.
- Smith, M. Brewster, "An Analysis of Two Measures of 'Authoritarianism' Among Peace Corps Teachers," Journal of Personality, XXXIII (December, 1965), 513-535.
- Snyder, Eldon E., "Self-Concept Theory: An Approach to Understanding the Behavior of Disadvantaged Pupils," Clearing House, XL (December, 1965), 242-248.
- Steckler, George, "Authoritarian Ideology in Negro College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIV (May, 1957), 396-399.
- Steinmann, Anne, Joseph Levi and David Fox, "Self-Concept of College Women Compared with Their Concept of Ideal Woman and Men's Ideal Woman," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XI (Winter, 1964), 370-374.
- Stock, Dorothy, "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.
- Taylor, C. and A. W. Combs, "Self-Acceptance and Adjustment," Journal of Consulting Psychology, (Fall, 1952), 89-91.
- Trent, Richard D., "The Relation Between Expressed Self-Acceptance and Expressed Attitudes Toward Negroes and Whites Among Negro Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, XCI (September, 1957), 25-31.
- Vontress, Clemmont E., "The Negro Against Himself," Journal of Negro Education, XXXII (Summer, 1963), 237-242.
- _____, "The Negro Personality Reconsidered," Journal of Negro Education, XXXV (Summer, 1966), 210-217.

- Webster, H., N. Sanford and M. Freedman, "A New Instrument for Studying Authoritarianism in Personality," Journal of Psychology, XL (1955), 73-84.
- Wylie, Ruth C., "Some Relationships Between Defensiveness and Self-Concept Discrepancies," Journal of Personality, XXV (September, 1957), 600-616.
- Zuckerman, M., and I. Monashkin, "Self-Acceptance and Psychopathology," Journal of Consulting Psychology (Winter, 1957), 145-148.

Publications of Learned Organizations

- Bills, Robert, "Believing and Behaving: Perception and Learning," Learning More About Learning, Third Yearbook, Washington, D.C., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1959.

Unpublished Materials

- Atchison, Calvin, "A Comparative Study of the Self-Concept of Behavior Problem and Non-Behavior Problem High School Boys," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, 1958.
- Boston, Geneva N. and Katherine L. Kew, "The Self Concept of the Unmarried Mother in the Florence Crittendon Home, Nashville, Tennessee," unpublished master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1964.
- Congdon, C. S., "Self-Theory and Chlorpromazine Treatment," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, 1958.
- Havener, P. H., "Distortions in the Perception of Self and Others by Persons Using Paranoid Defenses," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, 1961.
- Huffman, T. B., "Relationships Between the Self Concept and Three Psychopathological Types," unpublished master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Nashville, Tennessee, 1964.
- Lefebber, James, "The Delinquent's Self-Perception," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1964, Nashville, Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.

Piety, K. R., "The Role of Defense in Reporting on the Self Concept," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, 1958.

Runyan, E. L., "The Relationship Between the Self-Concept and Adaptational Maneuvers in White and Negro College Students," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, 1958.

Thorne, R. B., "The Effects of Experimentally Induced Failure on Self Evaluation," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York, 1954.

Wayne, S. R., "The Relation of Self-Esteem to Indices of Perceived and Behavioral Hostility," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, 1963.