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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Few concepts in recent years have commanded more attention than that of guilt. The literature is replete, in fact and fiction, with accounts of people suffering from guilt. The concept has changed in meaning, however, as various disciplines have included it within their subject realm. Traditionally, guilt was the concern of the theologian, and it generally referred to an act of having transgressed or sinned against God. It was only recently that concern with guilt as a "feeling" arose, and then it became a central feature of psychoanalytic theory. The frequency of the use of the concept today attests to its significance.

The concept of anxiety is also common in the literature. The Latin meaning referred to "trouble of the mind." This meaning is still basic when defined, generally, as a state of apprehension or psychic tension. The time period in which we live has been referred to as the "age of anxiety" (8, 35) and most people would admit that anxiety manifestations are prevalent and protean.

Several authors (15, 17, 33, 41, 51) have called attention to the relatedness of guilt and anxiety. Symonds (51, p. 362) says that guilt
is a variety of anxiety and the nature of the feelings of emotions and their physiological concomitants are precisely the same in guilt as they are in anxiety. Assuming this relatedness, the concepts need to be studied simultaneously.

Psychoanalytic theory holds that the conscience, from which guilt feelings arise out of anxiety-producing situations, is formed through a developmental process beginning in early childhood. The child internalizes social attitudes and then directs them to the evaluation of his own conduct. When there is a discrepancy between the standards which he internalizes and his conduct, a painful emotion arises which is called “guilt.” Since this is a process there is an implication of change in the conscience and consequently changes in the intensity of guilt feelings. Numerous studies have been conducted pertaining to pathological guilt and anxiety but few have related the concepts of differential guilt feelings and anxiety to social variables.

There are some plausible reasons for this dearth of information, and Mosher has pointed out that one reason for the lack of empirical research has been the failure of psychologists to pursue actively the investigation of the theoretical relationships involving guilt because of the lack of suitable operations to define guilt. He states that “Quantitative measures of guilt have been slow to appear” (41, p. 2). It was only recently that a quantitatively scorable research instrument,
constructed specifically to measure guilt, was developed and validated. Now it is conceivable that guilt feelings can be assessed quantitatively; thus, this study sought to provide a conceptual linkage between feelings of guilt and anxiety and certain psychological and sociological variables.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine the relationship between guilt and anxiety as well as the relationship of these factors to certain psychological and sociological variables. The variables were sex, ordinal position, marital status, education, religious beliefs, church attendance, happiness of childhood, discipline from parents, happiness now, parental happiness, parental education, and parental occupation.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses which were investigated grew out of the problem stated above and were based on the psychoanalytical and sociological theories discussed in the "Theoretical Background and Related Studies" section of this chapter. They were

1. There will be a significant positive correlation between guilt and anxiety;

2. Females will have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than males;
3. The first and/or only child will have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than other-positioned children;

4. The never-married individuals will have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those of other marital classifications;

5. Those who have had a lower level of education will have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those who have had a higher level of education;

6. Those who profess a religious beliefs will have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those who profess religious beliefs;

7. There will be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those who profess conservative religious beliefs than among those who profess moderate or liberal religious beliefs;

8. Those who have a high rate of church attendance will have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those who have a low rate of church attendance;

9. There will be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those who consider their childhood as having been generally unhappy and moderately happy than among those who consider their childhood generally happy;
10. There will be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those who perceive their parental discipline as having overly-strict than among those who perceive their parental discipline as having been firm, very lenient, or inconsistent;

11. There will be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those who consider themselves to be generally unhappy and moderately happy than among those who consider themselves to be generally happy;

12. Those who consider their parents as having been unhappily married will have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those who consider their parents as having been happily married;

13. There will be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those whose parents are in the low educational level than among those whose parents are in the medium or high educational level;

14. There will be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those whose parents are in the low occupational level than among those whose parents are in the medium or high occupational level.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were applied:
Guilt: the painful feelings of self-blame, self-criticism, or remorse which result from deviation (real or imagined) from proper behavior (56, p. 219). For this study, guilt was operationally defined as the total guilt score on the Mosher Incomplete Sentences Test.

Anxiety: an unpleasant emotional state of dread, apprehension, or psychic tension. For this study, anxiety was operationally defined as the total anxiety score on the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire.

Conscience: the morally self-critical portion of the psyche wherein have developed and remained standards of behavior, performance, and value judgments.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to 313 students enrolled in freshman and graduate classes at North Texas State University during the 1966-1967 academic year. These subjects consisted of 162 males and 151 females; 124 of these were freshmen, 103 were graduates, and 86 were of other classifications. The 313 subjects were used for testing all the hypotheses except Hypothesis Five, in which case only those of freshman and graduate classification were used.

In this study analysis of the anxiety scores is limited to the total score on the IPAT Anxiety Scale since the Handbook for the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire (8, p. 16) points out that the subscale
scores are too brief and unreliable to stand by themselves in interpretation. In reference to the analysis of the guilt scores on the Mosher Incomplete Sentences Test, the total score and the three subscale scores will be used; however, in view of the lack of empirical data pertaining to the subscales, the discussion of the results, for the most part, is limited to the total guilt score.

For the purposes of this study anxiety which is described as general free-floating anxiety, as distinct from characteristics of general neurosis or psychosis, was studied.

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that the Mosher Incomplete Sentences Test and the IPAT Anxiety Scale would adequately and accurately measure feelings of guilt and anxiety.

It was assumed that, due to anonymity, the responses of the subjects would express their true feelings and beliefs.

It was also assumed that the sample used was an adequate representation of students at North Texas State University.

Theoretical Background and Related Studies

Guilt and Anxiety

One cannot long study human conduct without becoming aware of a painful emotion which arises from the discrepancy between one’s own
conduct and the standards, moral or ethical, which one sets for himself. This painful emotion has been called "guilt." Whiting and Child have described this emotion in these terms:

What we mean by guilt ... is painful feelings of self-blame, self-criticism, or remorse which results from deviation (real or imagined) from proper behavior (56, p. 219).

When the term "guilt feelings" is used in this study, reference is made to the emotional state which exists within the individual, and not to an intellectual consciousness of guilt which may exist without these painful feelings. A distinction is made between feelings of inadequacy, inferiority, embarrassment, shame and pride, although these feelings may be coexistent with feelings of guilt.

The literature is abundantly supplied with accounts of people with an overly-developed sense of guilt who are reacting to internal conflicts. It is often said that these people are "over-socialized"—meaning that they have introjected the societal norms as moral absolutes and they are laden with guilt. The literature also reflects attention paid to another group, to those people with an under-developed sense of guilt. They are the sociopaths and they have failed to respond to the internalization of the societal norms; thus they have formulated no strong feelings of guilt. They have come to our attention because they have not adhered to the social conditions of our society which
demand conformity. They have inadequate inhibitions, the conflict is external, and they are generally referred to as "under-socialized" or "amoral."

Occasionally reference is made to "normal" guilt, "average" guilt, and sometimes "rational" guilt, but the connotation of the word "guilt" is generally bad. Our language seems to be without a term for good guilt (40, p. 369), yet guilt has an important function in society: to redirect the conduct of the individual into a balance or harmonious state with his moral or ethical standards (24, p. 353). Mead states that we may speak of a "decent sense of shame" or "proper pride" but that we have no terminology for guilt that is good, "for the internalized sanctions in the individual who has been praised and loved for good behavior, rather than blamed and punished for bad" (40, p. 369).

Anxiety is a state of dread or apprehension. Symonds defines it as "mental distress with respect to some anticipated frustration" (51, p. 133). Recognition is made of the fact that a certain amount of anxiety, like guilt, is a necessary condition for healthy personality development. Anxiety then may range from mild states of being ill at ease to acute states of terror.

Several studies (33, 41, 51) have shown a close relationship between anxiety and guilt. Lowe feels that anxiety and guilt are essentially the same phenomenon. He concludes:
The data do not tell why guilt and anxiety are so closely related. In view of the lack of prior empirical work, the most parsimonious explanation is that self-respect measures of anxiety and guilt comprise the same psychological entity, whatever that construct should be called. Guilt and anxiety, as measured by self-report scales, are thus seen to be equivalent and the commonly held distinction between the two terms is held to lie more in the mind of the beholder than in the mind of the beheld (33, p. 554).

To participate satisfactorily in a society one must have reasonable control of his behavior. These controls must be adequately instilled by the socializing agents, primarily the family. The origin of guilt feelings is in the parent-child relationship. Hurlock points out that at birth the child is nonmoral.

Before he can behave in a moral way, he must learn what the group to which he belongs believes to be right or wrong. He learns this primarily from the parent-child relationship, for the foundations of moral development are laid before the child comes in contact with the peer group (22, p. 547).

Although this relationship is the most important source of guilt, it is not the only source from which guilt arises. Standards arise from a variety of sources; hence, guilt arises from the total set of values which an individual has absorbed from all his environment. Guilt in the adult is, however, determined almost completely by the standards that an individual holds for himself and it makes comparatively little difference what attitudes others hold toward him (51, p. 363).
When the young child has knowledge of parental acceptance and approval a sense of security is created, but when he senses disapproval and non-acceptance a feeling of insecurity is created. The child later recognizes the responses which bring on the disapproval of the parents and these responses become laden with anxiety. This anxiety is at first expressed in the presence of the parent, but through the psychological process of identification with the parent, the child gradually introjects and internalizes parental standards. These introjected standards are referred to by psychologists as the "conscience" portion of the superego. The sociologists refer to this total process of the internalization of the norms of society as socialization. In either event, conscience is a crucial agent in the growth of personality (1, p. 68).

Eysenck (14) interprets conscience as a conditioned anxiety response to certain types of situations and actions built up by pairing aggressive acts with punishment, which leads to fear and anxiety responses on the child's part. This then is a developmental process that begins with the child blindly accepting what he is taught out of fear of loss of love and/or fear of punishment. This is called an "infantile conscience." Guilt comes only after these teachings, the social norms, have been introjected and one then directs them to the evaluation of his own behavior, the personal norms. But the process of development
implies that the conscience should mature. Allport has pointed out that pathological anxiety and guilt in adult years may be nothing more than manifestations of unresolved infant and child distress (1, p. 33).

A mature conscience thus begins with insight, when one sees a purpose behind the restraints and ideals, and the purpose is no longer just to please the parents because of fear. Maturity continues as one discriminates the effects of his actions on everyone who is affected by judging them, judges his acts accordingly, and frees himself from the blind, literal obedience to a code. When the superego does not mature in this manner, it may remain a disturbing force within the personality, and the individual may be subjected to an unbearable sense of guilt (55, p. 177). If the introjected severe moral judgments are believed to be absolute then one may go through life trying to live up to these expectations, justifying his actions, and always feeling guilty that he should be doing something he is not doing, or not doing something he is doing (6, pp. 404-405). This process of a maturing conscience should include a shift, then, from fear of punishment to a feeling of obligation. When one is able to take the role of the other, he begins to form a "self-system." He changes his views from must to ought and from compulsion to obligation (6, p. 404; 39, p. 122). Anxiety and guilt that result from this self-system are viewed as good and necessary for the perpetuation of a normative social order.
Hurlock points out that the conscience develops with the transition from external to internal authority. How rigidly the conscience develops and consequently how much guilt is felt will be determined largely by the type of moral code which one learns and the way in which he learns it (31, p. 359). Parents and other family members influence the moral development of the child in four ways (22, pp. 553-554):

1. Their behavior serves as a model for him to imitate;
2. By approval (rewards) and disapproval (punishments) they teach the child to conduct himself in a socially desirable manner;
3. By planning the punishment to fit the misdeed, they teach the child to recognize the severity of his wrongdoing;
4. They can do much to encourage the child to do right.

A study of the literature, however, pertaining to the psychological and sociological factors contributing to feelings of guilt and anxiety reveals conflicting and often contradictory accounts. The particular methods used in the socialization process, such as child-rearing practices, for instance, provide the area of greatest controversy. These discrepancies can be attributed to many factors, for example, the following: the size of the sample, the criteria by which the sample was chosen, the age of the children at the time of the study, the time lapse between actual events and reported events, different measuring instruments, and many others. Another factor is the changing of
practices over a period of years. Bronfenbrenner (7) found, for instance, significant changes in child-rearing practices over a twenty-five year period. For example, mothers at all class levels seemed more flexible and permissive than was reported in the early thirties. These findings, among others, tend in many instances to invalidate conclusions that would have been accurate a few years ago.

With regard to child training practices, Baughman and Welch have concluded that

Although we speak of child training practices in the United States, closer examination reveals a considerable variability that makes it difficult to formulate accurate descriptive statements of a general nature (2, p. 183).

While there may be sub-cultural differences, the literature in general tends to support the hypotheses that guilt and anxiety are based, not on a single factor, or on a specific traumatic event, but rather on a constellation of factors within a family unit. The family environment provides a basic setting from which emanate interpersonal relations which may, and will, influence the moral development of children. While these factors are many and often interrelated and overlapping, the following listed ones seem to be among the most important, and they will be discussed in greater detail:

1. The methods of discipline,
2. The religious instruction,
3. The sex of the child,
4. The family milieu.

The Methods of Discipline

Countless studies in sociology, anthropology, and psychology have been made pertaining to child-rearing practices, with especial attention to disciplinary measures. It should be pointed out that discipline does not merely mean punishment, but it refers to the control exercised by a superior over a subordinate. Hurlock (22, pp. 559-560), discussing the need for discipline, elaborates:

There has never been a time when it was believed that a child did not need discipline, but there have been changes in attitudes toward the reasons for needing discipline. In the past, it was believed that a child needed discipline because society required him to behave in a certain way and would tolerate no deviations from the approved pattern. Now it is recognized that the child needs discipline if he is to be a happy, well-adjusted person.

Discipline fills certain needs for a child and thus adds to his happiness and adjustments:
1. Discipline gives the child a feeling of security by telling him how far he can go and what he may or may not do.
2. By living according to certain standards, the child is able to avoid frequent feelings of guilt. From time to time, he is bound to do something wrong and feel guilty, but frequent feelings of guilt lead to unhappiness and poor adjustments.
3. When a child does the right thing, it is possible for adults to praise him. Praise is interpreted as love, while scolding and disapproval are interpreted as rejection. The child needs love to develop successfully.
4. Discipline serves as an ego-bolstering motivation; it encourages the child to accomplish what is required of him.

5. Discipline helps the child to develop a conscience—the "internalized voice" that guides him in making choices of his own.

Many factors contribute to the attitudes which parents hold toward their children and the consequent control they exert, such as their education, their occupation, and their religious beliefs. Goldfarb (18) has stated that when the parental expectations are beyond the infant's level of development the constant failure and reproof may prove to be highly self-devaluing.

Coleman (10, p. 120) says, in reference to development of excessively high morals:

When parental attitudes are extremely rigid and punishment correspondingly severe, the internalization of such values leads one to be more critical and severe in evaluating his own behavior—to develop a severe conscience.

Levine states essentially the same point but he uses different terms. He says that when a child is in an anxiety-producing situation, and the parental training methods are based on anxiety, the defenses that the child develops are overly strenuous, overly rigid, or pathological (31, p. 259).

Hoffman and Hoffman (20, pp. 195-197) report that several studies, conducted by Sears, Watson, and Levin, suggest that more
neurotic-like conflicts, guilt, and anxiety are developed under a restrictive-hostile environment. Lehner and Kube (29, p. 143) feel that anxiety may be a result of stifled aggression. Coleman feels that rebellion against severe moral restrictions will lead to anxiety and feelings of guilt (10, p. 121).

Baughman and Welch report that parents punish their children more frequently for aggression than for any other behavior. They further point out that

An attitude of a society toward aggression tends to remain constant. That is, from the first sign of aggression in a child's behavior a society is inclined either to inhibit it or encourage it without any appreciable change in attitude as the child grows older. What is noteworthy is that such consistency is seldom the case with respect to other modes of behavior such as toilet activities and eating habits (2, p. 153).

Bergler says that every bit of aggression that the child cannot discharge will be turned upon himself, thus increasing the severity of his inner conscience (4, p. 6).

Studies of delinquent boys by Healy and Bronner (19) consistently showed a higher incidence of overly-strict discipline among fathers of delinquent boys; other fathers tended to be very lax. This is in keeping with studies by McCord and others (37, 38) that delinquents tend to come from both over-controlled and under-controlled homes.
Whiting and Child in a cross-cultural study of child-rearing practices in thirty-five societies found a small but significant relationship between severity of socialization and their cultural index of guilt which was the extent to which the people blamed themselves for becoming sick (56).

There are several factors which influence the choice of method of discipline. There is a strong tendency for parents to use discipline similar to that their parents used (22, p. 570). However, there may be a swing to the opposite extreme if they feel that the method their parents used was wrong (57). If parents feel that their unhappy childhood resulted from authoritarian discipline, they often use permissive discipline with their own children; on the other hand, parents brought up with permissive training often become authoritarian, especially if they feel that lack of guidance was a great handicap to them (9, 23). The lack of familiarity, in these instances, with the training methods they adopt, is likely to lead to anxiety in the parents.

In general, the better the parent understands the child and his needs, the more democratic discipline he will exert and the less authoritarian it will be (47, 50).

When there is disagreement between the parents as to the disciplinary methods to be employed, they tend to settle upon a strict rather than a permissive position. Putney and Middleton (44) suggest
two reasons for this: one, that each parent feels that he should be more strict than he is; and another, that each fears that the other will be jealous or resentful if he seems to be more lenient toward the children.

The socioeconomic status of the parents, although not as dominant a force as earlier, seems to still exert an influence in disciplinary methods. There is a lack of consensus in this area but some studies tend to indicate that parents of the middle socioeconomic class are stricter, more coercive, less tolerant, but more consistent than parents of the lowest classes. The people from the lower classes are more inconsistent, often swinging back and forth between authoritarian and permissive methods (32, 34, 54). In their interpretation of the moral concepts, the lower socioeconomic group tends to be more arbitrary and authoritarian while those of the upper groups tend to distinguish between degrees of seriousness of an act (27). Within-group differences have been noticed since parents in the middle class group who are better educated use more democratic discipline than those who are less well educated (12).

The occupation of the parent will also influence the type of discipline he will use. Mothers whose professions take them outside the home tend to be more authoritarian than those who remain at home, while fathers who hold executive positions tend to be more authoritarian than those who have less occupational authority (5, 53).
The different methods of discipline are bound to have differential effects upon the personality of the child. If the child is too strictly disciplined, he will be uncertain about his ability to conform to adult expectations and may develop anxieties and feelings of insecurity. In the older child a lack of confidence contributes to feelings of guilt and impedes social and emotional development.

The lower class children develop feelings of inadequacy and loss of self-confidence because their parents tend to be inconsistent in their disciplinary methods. Inconsistency seems to be more damaging than severity or laxity per se. The more consistent the discipline the happier and better adjusted the child will be (22, p. 562). It has been found (28) that first-born children are more likely to be subjected to inconsistent discipline than second-or-later-born children.

The Religious Instruction

Good religious instruction influences the child's moral development and helps him to internalize the controls for his conduct. From various sources, the home, the Sunday school, and the instruction of the church, the child learns attitudes of good and bad, right or wrong, with the concept of God.

While all cultures depend upon both individual and group pressures for social control, it is notable in the Judaic-Christian tradition
that emphasis is placed upon developing moral controls within the individual. The "Protestant Ethic" has tended to over-intensify feelings of guilt by

1. Preoccupation with conformity and negative good behavior;
2. An underdevelopment of the impulse life;
3. A tendency toward rigidity and intolerance;
4. An emphasis upon duty and sin;

Religious bodies will differ in their emphasis of punishment in this life and in the life after death. Sometimes the parents exploit God in the discipline of their children by saying "God is watching," or "God is keeping a record." McKenzie (39, p. 142) says this is a prolific source of subjective guilt feelings and adds further that this type of discipline is utilized more often by the fundamental groups. More guilt feelings are aroused where there is an emphasis upon punishment for wrongdoing rather than on rewards for good behavior since the children are more certain of what they should not do in a situation and less certain of what they should do (22, p. 551).

Reik (46, p. 32) considers that our whole civilization, including our education, is under the spell of "original sin" wherein the guilt feelings arose as a result of sexual transgression. This type of belief
fosters feelings within the individual of being unworthy and a sinner. Hurlock (22, p. 559) adds that more authoritarian methods of discipline are used when people believe that sinfulness is innate. Guirdham, in *A Theory of Disease* (39, p. 126), points out that the narrower sects are more subject to mental illness and psychosomatic disease. Bergel found that the lower class tended to be more fundamental and conservative in religious views, were more concerned about security, and had more racial and religious prejudice (3, pp. 378, 383). McKenzie (39, p. 124) draws attention to the dichotomy between the task of the psychotherapist and the evangelical theologian and preacher. While the task of the former is to reduce the intensity of the guilt feelings, it is the duty of the latter to produce "convictions of sin" by stimulating guilt feelings.

The Sex of the Child

Most of the studies that have been made pertaining to guilt and anxiety have supported the supposition that females have a higher anxiety level and more guilt feelings than males (8, p. 15; 10, p. 121; 22, p. 281; 43, p. 29). Several reasons have been advanced to explain this finding. Certainly our society shows more tolerance for males, particularly in the roles pertaining to sex and aggression. Kell and Aldous (26) report that parents are generally stricter with their
daughters than with their sons. They believe that "boys will be boys" and furthermore they do not want their boys to be regarded as "sissies."

Regardless of class, mothers give preferential treatment to boys. Hurlock (22, p. 557) has summarized the situation in this way:

There is no evidence that boys and girls differ in morality as a result of native factors, nor is there evidence that they differ if they receive similar moral training (13). On the other hand, as Jones (25, p. 720) has pointed out, "Our culture does not expect the same social patterns of girls that it expects of boys, and the training which it gives them is different."

The Family Milieu

The family is considered, by the sociologist, to be primary in two respects, primary in time since it is the first group into which the child is ordinarily inducted, and primary in its importance to the child's development. Here, in the total family milieu, the child's first environment, is where the patterns for his attitudes toward people, things, and life in general are established.

The family milieu, the resources and the limitations of the socio-cultural environment, is highly important in shaping the personality development.

In a home where parents are overanxious and overconcerned about their children, where discipline is inconsistent and where there is worry, anxiety, and lack of a sense of humor, children are likely to be highly emotional and subject to frequent outbursts of temper (22, p. 652).
Generally, the studies show that character and happiness are a function of satisfactory family adjustment (42, pp. 224-225). Levine points out that children whose early experiences have been happy ones have a much better chance to be free of symptoms of fear, guilt, and anxiety (31, pp. 250-251). Many authors, among them Freud, Fenichel, and Bergler, see guilt underlying the neuroses. Low self-esteem is associated with guilt (10, pp. 121, 135). Freud said that "... the price we pay for our advance in civilization is a loss of happiness through the heightening of the sense of guilt" (16, p. 135).

Radke (45, p. 103) has developed certain constellations of child behavior associated with conditions of insecurity. The characteristics of children from inharmonious homes are as follows: aggressiveness, hyperactivity, neuroticism, lying, jealousy, and delinquency.

Children from broken homes or homes where the parents are "emotionally divorced" tend to develop personality patterns of poor adjustment. Coleman found that homes that were tension-filled and/or broken created tension states within the child (11, p. 100). Other reports (20, p. 414; 22, p. 554) indicate that children who have been deprived of a stable family life have been found to show defects in moral attitudes. LeMasters feels that one of the major problems when marital tensions are present is that the parents are handicapped in their socialization of the child (30, p. 551).
The socioeconomic status of the family is a very influential factor in assessing the family milieu since behavior has been shown to be class conditioned (3, p. 383). Although class differences are less pronounced today, they can still be noted. Hurlock accords this to be of major importance in the formation of values. She states:

Because the socioeconomic status of the family establishes the developmental background of the child, it determines what moral values he will learn and what patterns of moral behavior will be available for him to imitate (22, p. 554).

It has been ascertained that the lower class is less successful, less secure, has much more anxiety (22, p. 281), is more authoritarian (36, pp. 461-466), and has more mental illness (21). There are special stresses associated with inadequate income and living in undesirable conditions in slum areas. Hollingshead and Redlich (21) found that the lower middle class live in a sub-culture of conformance and excessive repression which leaves little room for direct expression of anger and rebellion which contributes to feelings of guilt and anxiety.

It has long been believed by many that the lower class families are lax and irresponsible in their training of children. This popular myth was recently disproved by Bronfenbrenner. He found that the middle class parents were consistently more permissive toward the child’s expressed needs and wishes.
Over the 25 year period studied, parent-child relationships in the middle class are consistently reported as more acceptant and equalitarian, while those in the working class are oriented toward maintaining order and obedience (7, pp. 424-425).

Vernon (52, pp. 240-242) reports that the "desire to improve oneself" does not change as one moves from one social class to another. He also reports that "status anxiety" remains constant except at the upper-upper level.

A study by Sewell and Haller (48) showed that children of lower status parents tended to exhibit more concern over status, concern over achievement, rejection of family, and nervous symptoms than did children of higher status parents. They comment that the nervous symptoms may be thought of as behavior patterns which are at least in part products of the anxieties of the child. Stephenson (49) found no difference in aspirations for occupational achievement in the lower class children than higher class peers, but he did find a difference in plans.

The educational level of parents will be closely related to the educational aspirations of the children. Bergel found a difference in orientation toward education between classes. The lower class attitudes toward education are utilitarian, the upper lower class stresses vocational training, and the lower middle and upper middle classes realize the influence of education on maintaining or improving
status (3, p. 378). He found that the upper classes were more tolerant and understanding, largely because of the difference in education (3, p. 383).

The word conscience comes from the Latin word conscientia, meaning "with knowledge." McKenzie (39, p. 51) speaks of educating the conscience, an elicitation of sense of values, clarification of moral judgments and principles, and strengthening of duty and obligations. In the development of the conscience, it is stressed that it is the knowledge of the individual of the basic reasons why he acts as he does that is of importance to a mature person. It would follow that if the conscience can be "educated," that behavior can be changed and a person with more education would act more from internalized decrees than from external authority. In relation to anxiety, however, the IPAT Handbook by Cattell and Scheier (8, p. 15) indicates that there is a lack of any significant relation between anxiety and the educational level.

In summary, the essence of personality is based upon interpersonal relations, both to which the child is exposed and those to which the adult continues as long as he lives.
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CHAPTER II

METHOD

Description of Subjects

The subjects involved in the present study were 313 students enrolled in North Texas State University during the 1966-1967 academic year. They were selected from freshman sociology and psychology classes not necessarily related to their academic major and from graduate classes that included a cross section of majors.

Procedures for Collecting Data

The testing procedure was essentially the same for all subjects. They were administered a set of instruments in their classrooms during the regular class periods. Before the subjects were presented with the materials they were assured anonymity. The only identifying information was a number on each of the three instruments which meant only that the same person had responded to those three instruments. They were urged to answer all questions as truthfully as they could. No explanation was made to the subjects concerning the purpose of the study except to say it was part of a sociological research project in which several classes of students at the University were being asked to participate.
The instruments, the Student Questionnaire, the IPAT Anxiety Scale, and the Mosher Incomplete Sentences Test were passed out to the subjects and the instructions were read. The students were asked to complete the instruments in the order as listed above. None of the instruments was timed; however, they were asked to work as rapidly as they could.

Procedures for Analyzing Data

The tenability of the hypotheses of this study was determined by the following statistical treatment:

1. Hypothesis One was tested by a coefficient of correlation computed between the variables of guilt and anxiety.

2. Hypotheses Two, Three, Four, Five, Six, Eight, Nine, Eleven, and Twelve were tested for a significant difference between means of independent groups using Fisher's $t$ technique.

3. Hypotheses Seven, Ten, Thirteen, and Fourteen were tested by simple analysis of variance.

The .05 level of significance determined the acceptance or rejection of Hypotheses Two through Fourteen. The significance of the $t$ ratio results will be indicated in the following manner:

* $P \leq .05$
** $P \leq .01$
*** $P \leq .001$
For the analysis of data of this study the following listed groupings were made:

**Parent's educational level.**--The seven-position educational scale of the Index of Social Position (2, p. 391) was used to determine the educational level of the parents of the subjects. The ranking was as follows:

- 7 points - graduate professional training;
- 6 points - college or university degree;
- 5 points - partial college;
- 4 points - high school graduate;
- 3 points - partial high school;
- 2 points - junior high school;
- 1 point - less than seven years.

A composite score was rendered simply by adding the number of points representing the educational level of father and the number of points representing the educational level of mother. The composite score was then scaled into three groups:

- **High educational level:** 12 - 14 points;
- **Medium educational level:** 7 - 11 points;
- **Low educational level:** 1 - 6 points.
Parent’s occupational level.—The occupational scale used in the Index of Social Position (2, p. 391) is a modification of the Alba Edwards system used by the Bureau of the Census. It was given a seven-point rating as follows:

7 points - executive and proprietors of large concerns and major professionals;

6 points - managers and proprietors of medium-sized businesses and lesser professionals;

5 points - administrative personnel of large concerns, owners of small businesses, and semi-professionals;

4 points - owners of little businesses, clerical, sales workers, and technicians;

3 points - skilled workers;

2 points - semi-skilled workers;

1 point - unskilled worker.

A composite score was rendered simply by adding the number of points representing the occupational level of father and the number of points representing the occupational level of mother. The composite score was then scaled into three groups:

High occupational level: 12 - 14 points;

Medium occupational level: 7 - 11 points;

Low occupational level: 1 - 6 points.
Church attendance.--High and low scores were based on the frequency of attendance and were identified as follows:

High church attendance: three or more times per month;
Low church attendance: fewer than three times per month.

Religious preference.--Those who described themselves as agnostic, atheistic, or as having no religious affiliation were considered as professing no religious beliefs. Those who identified themselves as Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or as preferring some other religious group were considered as professing religious beliefs.

Student's educational level.--High and low scores were based on the completed years of college classroom work as follows:

High education - those students who have attained graduate standing;
Low education - those students who were classified as freshmen.

Description of Measuring Instruments

The Mosher Incomplete Sentences Test (MIST) was administered to each of the subjects as a measure of guilt. A specimen copy of the instrument is presented in Appendix A. The MIST was developed by Donald L. Mosher at Ohio State University in 1961. It is a fifty-stem sentence completion blank to which numerical values can be assigned.
to each of the sentence completions on the basis of general scoring principles, scoring categories, and scoring examples specific to each sentence stem for each sex. Numerical values range from a score of zero, indicating an absence of guilt, through a score of five which indicates guilt accompanied by very strong affect. The MIST yields a total guilt score and three sub-scale scores, hostile guilt, sex guilt, and morality-conscience guilt. These four scores were used in the analysis of the data.

The split-half reliability of the MIST provides ample evidence for the internal consistency of its scoring categories. Split-half reliability coefficients for thirty male MIST protocols were as follows: hostile guilt, .54; sex guilt, .72; morality-conscience guilt, .49; and total guilt, .92. All of the above coefficients of correlation were significantly different from zero at the $P < .01$ level. Split-half reliability coefficients for thirty female MIST protocols were as follows: hostile guilt, .38; sex guilt, .06; morality-conscience guilt, .43; and total guilt, .59. The coefficients for hostile guilt and morality-conscience guilt were significantly different from zero at the $P < .05$ level and total guilt at the $P < .01$ level. It should be noted that computations for the females were based on a fewer number of stems; therefore, the reliability coefficients were smaller than would be the case with a longer test.
Interrater reliability coefficients for the scoring of a random sample of sixty MIST protocols are listed as follows for males and females, respectively: total guilt, .97 and .99; hostile guilt, .90 and .94; sex guilt, .92 and .95; and morality-conscience guilt, .93 and .80 (3, p. 62).

The largely positive findings of two experiments provided tentative empirical evidence of the construct validity of the MIST as a measure of guilt. The experimental results have suggested that the measure of guilt has some predictive utility. An examination of the discriminant validity revealed no gross imperfection in the measure as a function of social desirability or intelligence (3, p. 125).

The MIST was selected to measure guilt in this study for the following reasons: (1) it is a quantitatively scorable research instrument and constructed specifically to measure guilt; (2) it is designed for group administration; (3) the scoring categories can be reliably scored by trained raters familiar with the scoring manual; (4) it is based on psychoanalytic theory as are many of the hypotheses of the present study; and (5) initial attempts to provide evidence for its validity have been largely successful.

The MIST required approximately thirty minutes for administration.
The **IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire**, designated as the **IPAT Self Analysis Form (SAF)** for administration to subjects, was developed by Raymond B. Cattell and Ivan H. Scheier of the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing. It is designed as an assessment of general free anxiety whether it be situationally-determined or relatively independent of the immediate situation as distinct from characteristics of general neurosis or psychosis (1, p. 13). The questionnaire is composed of forty items which are scored as "true" or "false." The SAF yields a total anxiety score and five sub-scale anxiety scores: self-sentiment development, ego strength, protension of paranoid trend, guilt proneness, and ergic tension. For this study, however, only the total anxiety score was used for the analysis of data.

The construct (internal) validity for the total scale is estimated at .85 to .90, depending upon different tests. The external concrete validity, based on the criteria of psychiatric evaluation of anxiety correlates from .30 to .40. Recent studies show that skilled diagnosticians, working to the same definition of anxiety may agree on diagnosed anxiety level only to the extent of a reliability coefficient of 0.2 or 0.3 (1, p. 15). The dependability-reliability yielded a coefficient correlation of .93 on a test-retest of one-week interval and .87 after a two-week interval. The split-half reliability was .84.
The SAF was selected for this proposed research to measure anxiety for the following-listed reasons: (1) it is a brief, objective, and quantitatively scorable research instrument; (2) it is designed for group administration; and (3) the intensive research background commends it for use as an overall measure of anxiety.

The SAF required from five to ten minutes for administration. A copy is included in Appendix B.

A "Student Questionnaire" constructed by the investigator was designed to provide objective fact and subjective opinion in reference to various biographical, psychological and sociological information. The questions were compiled from information in the literature which indicated that these data might be an influence in contributing to feelings of guilt and anxiety. The questionnaire consisted of eighteen fixed-alternative and fill-in-the-blank items.

The Student Questionnaire required from five to ten minutes for administration. A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix C.


CHAPTER III

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The data accumulated as a result of the procedures described in Chapter II were analyzed statistically on the basis of their relevance to the hypotheses presented in Chapter I. The analyses of the results were made utilizing three statistical techniques: simple correlation, Fisher's $t$ technique, and analysis of variance.

In Hypothesis One it was predicted that there would be a significant positive correlation between guilt and anxiety. Pearson product-moment coefficients of correlation ($r$) were computed between the total guilt scores, the three guilt sub-scale scores (hostile guilt, sex guilt, and morality-conscience guilt), and the total anxiety scores and the five anxiety sub-scale scores (self-sentiment development, ego strength, protension of paranoid trend, guilt proneness, and ergic tension). The results of the Pearson $r$'s computed to test this hypothesis are shown in Table I.

The obtained $r$ between the Mosher Incomplete Sentences Test, the total guilt scores, and the Self Analysis Form, the total anxiety
TABLE I
A CORRELATION MATRIX OF GUILT AND ANXIETY COEFFICIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>MIST</th>
<th>MIST-HG</th>
<th>MIST-SG</th>
<th>MIST-MC</th>
<th>SAF</th>
<th>SAF-Q-3</th>
<th>SAF-C-</th>
<th>SAF-L</th>
<th>SAF-O</th>
<th>SAF-Q-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIST</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.76(^d)</td>
<td>.83(^d)</td>
<td>.74(^d)</td>
<td>.38(^d)</td>
<td>.23(^d)</td>
<td>.16(^c)</td>
<td>.16(^c)</td>
<td>.41(^d)</td>
<td>.37(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-HG</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.39(^d)</td>
<td>.34(^d)</td>
<td>.32(^d)</td>
<td>.20(^d)</td>
<td>.17(^c)</td>
<td>.18(^d)</td>
<td>.32(^d)</td>
<td>.30(^d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-SG</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.51(^d)</td>
<td>.27(^d)</td>
<td>.16(^c)</td>
<td>.12(^b)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.31(^d)</td>
<td>.27(^d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-MC</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.29(^d)</td>
<td>.17(^c)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.33(^d)</td>
<td>.30(^d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.70(^d)</td>
<td>.71(^d)</td>
<td>.61(^d)</td>
<td>.85(^d)</td>
<td>.89(^d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF-Q-3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.38(^d)</td>
<td>.29(^d)</td>
<td>.47(^d)</td>
<td>.53(^d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF-C-</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.45(^d)</td>
<td>.50(^d)</td>
<td>.52(^d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF-L</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.40(^d)</td>
<td>.47(^d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF-O</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.69(^d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF-Q-4</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Based on a total of 313 scores.
\(^b\) \(P \leq .05\)
\(^c\) \(P \leq .01\)
\(^d\) \(P \leq .001\)
scores, was .38, which was significant at the .001 level. In accordance with this finding Hypothesis One was sustained.

In the present study the $P < .05$ level of significance was accepted as the basis upon which the hypotheses would be accepted. Therefore, in this chapter, when an $r$ or a $t$ ratio of a magnitude sufficient to be significant at the $P < .05$ level was obtained, the hypothesis was accepted.

It was stated in Hypothesis Two that there would be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among females than among males. The means, standard deviations, and $t$ ratios are shown in Table II.

### TABLE II

A COMPARISON OF MEAN GUILT AND ANXIETY SCORES BETWEEN FEMALES AND MALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Female (N=151)</th>
<th>Male (N=162)</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST</td>
<td>125.74</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>115.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-HG</td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>44.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-SG</td>
<td>41.01</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>33.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-MC</td>
<td>38.81</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>36.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>30.66</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>27.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P < .05$

** $P < .001$
Table II reveals that the \( t \) ratio between the mean MIST scores for females and males approached the .001 level of significance. The table also reveals that the \( t \) ratio for the SAF mean scores was at the .05 level of significance. On the basis of these ratios, Hypothesis Two was sustained.

In reference to the guilt sub-scale scores, the females had significantly higher mean sex guilt and morality-conscience guilt scores than did the males. The mean hostile guilt scores for the females was also higher than that for the males, although not at a level of significance.

Although the guilt sub-scales of the MIST were not fully treated in this study, it was noted in the analysis of the data on all the hypotheses that the sex guilt score seemed to reach a level of significance on the variables more often than the other guilt scores. The morality-conscience guilt score was next, and the hostile guilt score was last. This would seem to be related to the different socialization patterns we have for males and females in our society.

In Hypothesis Three it was specified that the first and/or only children would have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than other-positioned children. Table III presents the results of a comparison of these mean scores.
TABLE III
A COMPARISON OF MEAN GUILT AND ANXIETY SCORES BETWEEN ONLY CHILDREN AND OTHER-POSITIONED CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>First and/or Only Children (N=152)</th>
<th>Other-positioned Children (N=161)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST</td>
<td>118.66</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>121.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-HG</td>
<td>45.32</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>44.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-SG</td>
<td>36.17</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>38.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-MC</td>
<td>37.17</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>38.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>28.66</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P ≤ .05

The t ratios between means for both the MIST and the SAF did not reach an acceptable level of significance. Actually the mean scores for the other-positioned children were slightly higher than those for the first and/or only children, although not at an acceptable level. Hypothesis Three was thus not sustained.

In reference to the MIST sex guilt sub-scale, the t ratio of the means between only children and other-positioned children reached the .05 level of significance, although it was an inverse relationship to the predicted direction of the total guilt score. The mean of the
hostile guilt sub-scale was the only one in which the first and/or only children had higher scores than the other-positioned children, but it did not reach a level of significance.

In Hypothesis Four it was predicted that never-married individuals would have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those of other marital classifications. The results are presented in Table IV.

**TABLE IV**

A COMPARISON OF MEAN GUILT AND ANXIETY SCORES BETWEEN NEVER-MARRIED INDIVIDUALS AND THOSE OF OTHER MARITAL CLASSIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Never-married (N=200)</th>
<th>Other Marital Classifications (N=113)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST</td>
<td>125.35</td>
<td>19.51</td>
<td>111.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-HG</td>
<td>46.83</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>42.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-SG</td>
<td>39.53</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>33.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-MC</td>
<td>38.99</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>35.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>23.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .001

The difference between the means yielded a t ratio of 6.17 on the **MIST** and 6.85 on the **SAF**, both of which were significant at the .001 level. Hypothesis Four was thus sustained.
The three guilt sub-scales also reached a .001 level of significance, indicating that the never-married individuals had higher degrees of guilt and anxiety than did those individuals of other marital classifications.

In Hypothesis Five it was predicted that the individuals who had a lower level of education would have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those individuals who had a higher level of education. For the testing of this hypothesis, the low education group consisted of 124 freshmen and the high education group consisted of 103 graduate students. Table V shows the comparison of mean guilt and anxiety scores.

**TABLE V**

A COMPARISON OF MEAN GUILT AND ANXIETY SCORES BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS OF DIFFERENT LEVELS OF EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Low Education (N=124)</th>
<th>High Education (N=103)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST</td>
<td>124.77</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td>110.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-HG</td>
<td>45.77</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>41.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-SG</td>
<td>40.45</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>33.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-MC</td>
<td>38.54</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>35.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>31.69</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>23.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .001
The difference between the means of the low education group and the high education group yielded a $t$ ratio of 5.58 for the MIST and 5.79 for the SAF, both of which were significant at the .001 level. It might be noted that the difference between means for the two groups yielded scores which were significant at the same level for the three guilt sub-scales. Hypothesis Five was sustained.

In Hypothesis Six it was stated that there would be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those who professed areligious beliefs than those who professed religious beliefs. The results, indicated in Table VI, did not sustain the hypothesis.

**TABLE VI**

A COMPARISON OF MEAN GUILT AND ANXIETY SCORES BETWEEN THE ARELIGIOUS AND THE RELIGIOUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Areligious Beliefs (N=26)</th>
<th>Religious Beliefs (N=287)</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST</td>
<td>102.15</td>
<td>17.79</td>
<td>121.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-HG</td>
<td>42.96</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>45.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-SG</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>38.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-MC</td>
<td>32.12</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>38.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>30.08</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P \leq .001$
While the \( t \) ratio of the mean scores of the SAF did not reach the chosen level of significance, the \( t \) ratio for the MIST was significant at the .001 level; however, the mean guilt scores were higher for the religious than for the areligious. This same relationship held for all the guilt sub-scales and the difference was significant at the .001 level on the hostile guilt and the sex guilt sub-scales.

In Hypothesis Seven it was predicted that there would be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those who professed conservative religious beliefs than among those who professed moderate or liberal beliefs. Table VII shows the summary of the analysis of variance of mean guilt scores among these groups. There were 303 subjects used for the testing of this hypothesis; 10 of the 313 checked "other" than the three categories listed.

**TABLE VII**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN GUILT SCORES AMONG THREE LEVELS OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>7870.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3935.25</td>
<td>10.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>116405.80</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>388.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124276.30</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( P < .001 \)
An F ratio of 10.14 was obtained which was acceptable at the .001 level of significance, thus permitting a t test between pairs of mean scores of the groups. These t ratios are seen in Table VIII.

**TABLE VIII**

| t RATIOS BETWEEN PAIRS OF MEAN GUILT SCORES FOR THREE LEVELS OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Intensity of Religious Beliefs   | MIST                            | t               |
|                                 | Mean | SD  |     |
| Conservative (N=52)             | 120.50 | 21.72 | -1.81 |
| Moderate (N=126)                | 126.37 | 17.29 |      |
| Conservative (N=52)             | 120.50 | 21.72 | 1.64  |
| Liberal (N=125)                 | 115.17 | 20.83 |      |
| Moderate (N=126)                | 126.37 | 17.29 | 4.50* |
| Liberal (N=125)                 | 115.17 | 20.83 |      |

* P < .001

It will be noted that the hypothesis was not sustained since it was those who held moderate religious beliefs who had the highest degree of guilt.

Summary of the analysis of variance of mean guilt sub-scale scores (hostile guilt, sex guilt, and morality-conscience guilt) and the t ratios between pairs of mean sex guilt scores and mean morality-conscience scores are shown in Tables IX, X, XI, XII, and XIII.
### TABLE IX

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN HOSTILE GUILT SCORES AMONG THREE LEVELS OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>323.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>161.98</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>26245.99</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>87.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26569.94</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE X

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN SEX GUILT SCORES AMONG THREE LEVELS OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>2125.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1062.97</td>
<td>11.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>26727.69</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>89.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28853.62</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P \( \leq .001 \)
### TABLE XI

**t** Ratios Between Pairs of Mean Sex Guilt Scores for Three Levels of Religious Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity of Religious Beliefs</th>
<th>MIST</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative (N=52)</td>
<td>37.94</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (N=126)</td>
<td>40.33</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative (N=52)</td>
<td>37.94</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal (N=125)</td>
<td>34.52</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>2.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (N=126)</td>
<td>40.32</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal (N=125)</td>
<td>34.52</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>4.87**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .01  
** P < .001

### TABLE XII

Analysis of Variance of Mean Morality-Conscience Guilt Scores Among Three Levels of Religious Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>705.96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>352.98</td>
<td>7.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>13273.82</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>44.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13979.78</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .001
TABLE XIII

**t** RATIOS BETWEEN PAIRS OF MEAN MORALITY-CONSCIENCE GUILT SCORES FOR THREE LEVELS OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity of Religious Beliefs</th>
<th>MIST</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative (N=52)</td>
<td>38.29</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (N=126)</td>
<td>39.57</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative (N=52)</td>
<td>38.29</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal (N=125)</td>
<td>36.23</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (N=126)</td>
<td>39.57</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>3.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal (N=125)</td>
<td>36.23</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P<.001

It will be noted that for both the sex guilt scores and morality-conscience guilt scores, those holding moderate religious beliefs had the highest guilt scores. While the F ratio for the mean hostile guilt scores did not reach a significant level, the mean scores of the moderate group were higher than for the conservative and liberal group. These sub-scale findings are consistent with the total guilt scale.

Table XIV presents the summary of the analysis of variance of mean anxiety scores among those of conservative, moderate, and liberal religious beliefs.
TABLE XIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN ANXIETY SCORES AMONG THREE LEVELS OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>51.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>43364.50</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>144.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43415.99</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F ratio did not reach the acceptable level of significance; therefore, Hypothesis Seven, which stated that those who held conservative religious beliefs would have higher anxiety scores than those holding moderate or liberal beliefs, was not sustained.

In Hypothesis Eight, it was predicted that those who had a high rate of church attendance would have a higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those with a low rate of church attendance. For the purposes of this study a high rate of attendance meant attending church three or more times a month and a low rate of attendance meant attending church less than three times a month. Five of the 313 subjects did not respond to the question; thus, the hypothesis was tested with 308 subjects. The data, as revealed in Table XV, sustained the hypothesis for the MIST scores but not for the SAF scores.
### TABLE XV

A COMPARISON OF MEAN GUILT AND ANXIETY SCORES BETWEEN THOSE WITH HIGH AND LOW CHURCH ATTENDANCE RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>High Attendance (N=149)</th>
<th>Low Attendance (N=159)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST</td>
<td>124.81</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>115.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-HG</td>
<td>45.64</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>44.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-SG</td>
<td>39.52</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>35.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-MC</td>
<td>39.65</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>36.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>30.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05

**P < .001

A t ratio of 3.91, which was significant at the .001 level, indicated that there was a difference in guilt scores between the high church attendance group and the low church attendance group. This significant difference was also maintained in the scores of the sex guilt and the morality-conscience guilt sub-scales. Although the means of the hostile guilt sub-scale were not significantly different for the groups, the mean for the high attendance group was slightly higher than the mean for the low attendance group.
The _t_ ratio of \(-2.23\) on the \textit{SAF} indicated that there was a difference in anxiety between the high attendance group and the low attendance group which was significant at the .05 level. However, the minus sign calls attention to the fact that the mean of the low attendance was higher than the mean for the high attendance group. Thus Hypothesis Eight was sustained for the \textit{MIST} but was not sustained for the \textit{SAF}.

In Hypothesis Nine it was stated that there would be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those who considered their childhood as having been generally unhappy and moderately happy than among those who considered their childhood as having been generally happy. Testing of this hypothesis was made on the basis of 312 scores; one subject did not answer the question. Table XVI gives the results of the analysis of this data.

As indicated in Table XVI, the difference between the means of the \textit{MIST} for the generally unhappy and moderately happy yielded a \textit{t} ratio of 0.53 which did not reach the accepted level of significance. However, a \textit{t} score of 4.14 on the \textit{SAF} indicated that there was a difference between the two groups which was significant at the .001 level. It can be concluded therefore, that Hypothesis Nine was not sustained for the \textit{MIST} but was sustained for the \textit{SAF}. 

TABLE XVI

A COMPARISON OF MEAN GUILT AND ANXIETY SCORES BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS EXPRESSING VARIOUS DEGREES OF HAPPINESS IN CHILDHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Unhappy-Moderately Happy (N=73)</th>
<th>Generally Happy (N=239)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST</td>
<td>121.38</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>119.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MIST-HG | 47.58| 10.10 | 44.36 | 8.97 | 2.59*
| MIST-SG | 36.11| 10.35 | 37.68 | 9.71 | -1.19|
| MIST-MC | 37.70| 6.82  | 37.88 | 6.89 | -0.20|
| SAF   | 34.08 | 13.18 | 27.64 | 11.08 | 4.14**|

* P ≤ .01
** P ≤ .001

Further variations in the mean scores may be noted in the three guilt sub-scales. Those who considered themselves to be generally unhappy and moderately happy had significantly higher hostile guilt scores while those who were generally happy had higher mean scores on the sex guilt and morality-conscience guilt scales, although the difference was not significant.

In Hypothesis Ten it was stated that there would be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those who perceived their
parental discipline as having been overly-strict than among those who perceived the discipline as having been firm, very lenient, or inconsistent. Table XVII presents the summary of the analysis of variance of mean guilt scores among the four types of discipline.

**TABLE XVII**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN GUILT SCORES AMONG FOUR TYPES OF PERCEIVED PARENTAL DISCIPLINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>167.60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55.87</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>129778.60</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>420.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129946.20</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F ratio did not reach the acceptable level of significance; therefore, there was no justification for further testing.

Tables XVIII, XIX, and XX present the summary of the analysis of variance of the mean guilt sub-scales among the four studied types of perceived discipline.
TABLE XVIII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN HOSTILE GUILT SCORES AMONG FOUR TYPES OF PERCEIVED PARENTAL DISCIPLINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>159.59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>27122.03</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>87.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27281.62</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XIX
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN SEX GUILT SCORES AMONG FOUR TYPES OF PERCEIVED PARENTAL DISCIPLINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>228.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76.25</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>30253.30</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>97.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30482.06</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN MORALITY-CONSCIENCE GUILT SCORES AMONG FOUR TYPES OF PERCEIVED PARENTAL DISCIPLINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>99.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.06</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>14635.52</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>47.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14734.69</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, as with the mean MIST scores, the F ratio of the sub-scale scores did not reach the .05 level of significance.

Table XXI presents the F ratio from the analysis of variance of mean anxiety scores among the four types of discipline.

TABLE XXI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN ANXIETY SCORES AMONG FOUR TYPES OF PERCEIVED PARENTAL DISCIPLINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>605.11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>201.70</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>44041.21</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>142.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44646.32</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The F ratio was not significant at the .05 level of significance; therefore, it can be considered from the above-mentioned results that Hypothesis Ten was not sustained, either on the MIST or the SAF.

In Hypothesis Eleven it was predicted that there would be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those who considered themselves to be generally unhappy and moderately happy than among those who considered themselves to be generally happy. Table XXII presents the comparison of the mean guilt and anxiety scores.

**TABLE XXII**

A COMPARISON OF MEAN GUILT AND ANXIETY SCORES BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS EXPRESSING VARIOUS DEGREES OF HAPPINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Unhappy-Moderately Happy (N=788)</th>
<th>Generally Happy (N=225)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST</td>
<td>125.03</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>118.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-HG</td>
<td>47.77</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>44.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-SG</td>
<td>39.24</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>36.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-MC</td>
<td>38.02</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>37.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>35.80</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>26.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P ≤ .05
** P ≤ .01
***P ≤ .001
In regard to the MIST and SAF scores it will be noted that the hypothesis was sustained by \( t \) ratios which reached the .01 and the .001 levels of significance, respectively. The hostile and the sex guilt sub-scales were also significant at the .01 and the .05 levels of significance, respectively. Thus Hypothesis Eleven was sustained by both the MIST and the SAF.

In Hypothesis Twelve it was stated that those who considered their parents as having been unhappily married would have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those who considered their parents as having been happily married. Table XXIII presents the comparison of mean guilt and anxiety scores between these two groups.

**TABLE XXIII**
A COMPARISON OF MEAN GUILT AND ANXIETY SCORES BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS WHOSE PARENTS WERE HAPPILY AND UNHAPPILY MARRIED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Parents Unhappy (N=67)</th>
<th>Parents Happy (N=246)</th>
<th>( t )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIST</td>
<td>120.42</td>
<td>120.25</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-HG</td>
<td>45.55</td>
<td>45.02</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-SG</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>37.45</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-MC</td>
<td>38.03</td>
<td>37.78</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>31.37</td>
<td>28.47</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The _t_ ratios of the two groups did not reach the .05 level of significance; therefore, Hypothesis Twelve was not sustained.

None of the MIST sub-scales, hostile guilt, sex guilt, or morality-conscience guilt, reached a level of significance, thus remaining in keeping with the total MIST score.

Another comparison of mean guilt and anxiety scores was made between those whose parental homes had been broken by death or divorce and those whose homes had not been broken. The results are presented in Table XXIV.

### TABLE XXIV

A COMPARISON OF MEAN GUILT AND ANXIETY SCORES BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS WHOSE HOMES WERE BROKEN AND NOT BROKEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Home Broken (N=74)</th>
<th>Home Not Broken (N=239)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST</td>
<td>120.76</td>
<td>21.46</td>
<td>120.03</td>
<td>20.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-HG</td>
<td>46.36</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-SG</td>
<td>36.72</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>37.51</td>
<td>9.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIST-MC</td>
<td>37.68</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>37.89</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>29.72</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>28.90</td>
<td>11.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It will be observed that none of the t ratios of the MIST, its three sub-scales, or the SAF reached a level of significance, thus indicating no difference between the two groups.

An analysis of variance was made to determine whether there was a significant difference in mean guilt and guilt sub-scale scores and anxiety scores among those whose parental homes were broken when they were twelve years of age or younger, those whose homes were broken when they were thirteen years of age or older, and those whose homes were not broken. This information is presented in Tables XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, and XXIX. Analysis of the hypothesis was based on 312 scores as one subject did not respond.

**TABLE XXV**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN GUILT SCORES AMONG THOSE WHOSE HOMES WERE BROKEN AT TWELVE YEARS OR YOUNGER, THIRTEEN YEARS OR OLDER, OR NOT BROKEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>627.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>313.95</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>128138.90</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>414.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128766.80</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXVI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN HOSTILE GUILT SCORES AMONG THOSE WHOSE HOMES WERE BROKEN AT TWELVE YEARS OR YOUNGER, THIRTEEN YEARS OR OLDER, OR NOT BROKEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>252.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>126.18</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>26734.88</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>86.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26987.24</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XXVI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN SEX GUILT SCORES AMONG THOSE WHOSE HOMES WERE BROKEN AT TWELVE YEARS OR YOUNGER, THIRTEEN YEARS OR OLDER, OR NOT BROKEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>96.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48.48</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>30278.26</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>97.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30375.21</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXVIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN MORALITY-CONSCIENCE GUILT SCORES AMONG THOSE WHOSE HOMES WERE BROKEN AT TWELVE YEARS OR YOUNGER, THIRTEEN YEARS OR OLDER, OR NOT BROKEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>58.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.21</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>14629.39</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>47.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14687.81</td>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XXIX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN ANXIETY SCORES AMONG THOSE WHOSE HOMES WERE BROKEN AT TWELVE YEARS OR YOUNGER, THIRTEEN YEARS OR OLDER, OR NOT BROKEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>124.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62.29</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>44375.05</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>143.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44499.62</td>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The F ratio did not reach the .05 level of significance on any of the measures; thus, further testing was not permitted.

Hypothesis Thirteen predicted a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those whose parents were of a low educational level than among those whose parents were of a medium or high level. These results are presented in Tables XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII, and XXXIV.

TABLE XXX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN GUILT SCORES AMONG THREE LEVELS OF PARENTAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>790.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>395.10</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>129156.00</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>416.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129946.20</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXXI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN HOSTILE GUILT SCORES AMONG THREE LEVELS OF PARENTAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>27281.04</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27281.62</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XXXII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN SEX GUILT SCORES AMONG THREE LEVELS OF PARENTAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>518.62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>259.31</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>29963.44</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>96.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30482.06</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXXIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN MORALITY-CONSCIENCE GUILT SCORES AMONG THREE LEVELS OF PARENTAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>14712.31</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>47.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14734.69</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XXXIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN ANXIETY SCORES AMONG THREE LEVELS OF PARENTAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>119.34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59.67</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>44526.98</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>143.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44646.32</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the $F$ ratios of the **MIST** and **SAF**, as presented in these tables, did not reach the .05 level of significance, Hypothesis Thirteen was not sustained. Additionally, the $F$ ratios of the **MIST** sub-scales did not reach a level of significance.
In Hypothesis Fourteen it was predicted that there would be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those whose parents were in a low occupational level than among those whose parents were in a medium or high occupational level. These results are presented in Tables XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, and XXXIX. It will be noted that analysis was made on the basis of 311 responses; two subjects did not respond.

**TABLE XXXV**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN GUILT SCORES AMONG THREE LEVELS OF PARENTAL OCCUPATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>1764.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>882.45</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>127839.90</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>415.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129604.80</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XXXVI

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN HOSTILE GUILT SCORES AMONG THREE LEVELS OF PARENTAL OCCUPATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>125.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62.59</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>27130.02</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>88.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27255.20</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XXXVII

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN SEX GUILT SCORES AMONG THREE LEVELS OF PARENTAL OCCUPATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>375.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>187.75</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>29993.98</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>97.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30369.48</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXXVIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN MORALITY-CONSCIENCE GUILT SCORES AMONG THREE LEVELS OF PARENTAL OCCUPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>136.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68.18</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>14582.24</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>47.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14718.60</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XXXIX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN ANXIETY SCORES AMONG THREE LEVELS OF PARENTAL OCCUPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>99.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.90</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within means</td>
<td>44252.10</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>143.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44351.90</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results, as presented in the tables above, indicate that the F ratio did not reach an acceptable level of significance for the MIST and SAF scores; therefore, Hypothesis Fourteen was not sustained.
It will be noted that none of the MIST sub-scale F ratios reached an acceptable level of significance for further testing.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

This discussion is restricted to the implications of the statistical results presented in Chapter III. The format of the “Theoretical Background and Related Studies” section of Chapter I will be followed insofar as possible to preserve integration of the results.

Guilt and Anxiety

The theoretical literature reflects a relationship between guilt and anxiety but few if any empirical studies have tested this. Guilt is equated with painful feelings of blame, criticism, or remorse which the individual feels when he has deviated, or feels he has deviated, from proper behavior. Anxiety is a state of dread or apprehension, a feeling of mental distress with respect to some anticipated frustration.

Hypothesis One of this study pertained to the relationship of guilt and anxiety. The findings in connection with this hypothesis indicated that there was a significantly positive correlation between guilt scores and anxiety scores, not only on the total MIST and SAF scores, but also on the eight sub-scales.
The Methods of Discipline

It is in the area of parental discipline that there is the greatest discrepancy in the literature regarding child-rearing practices. Hypothesis Ten pertained to various degrees of severity of parental punishment as related to guilt and anxiety. The results did not indicate that any one type of parental discipline increased the guilt and anxiety levels of the individuals. Four types of discipline were investigated: overly-strict, firm, very lenient, and inconsistent. While the literature tends to support that the child who grows up under severe disciplinary measures will have more guilt and anxiety, this hypothesis was not sustained.

In light of the great amount of attention given to this subject in the literature, it seems that rather than accept the conclusion that parental disciplinary measures have no effect on the degree of guilt feelings and anxiety, it would be more useful to look for refinements of the variables and hypotheses. The literature bears out the within-social-group differences of disciplinary measures; for instance, the amount of parental education, whether mothers work outside the home, the ordinal position of the child, the sex of the child, the age of the parents, and the intensity of parental religious belief. None of these factors was considered in this hypothesis. It is believed that such a
study in which the hypotheses honored these discriminations would reflect a difference in the type of discipline used.

There should be recognition of the memory factor as it may pertain to perceived parental discipline. For example, there may be differences in age groups, for the intervening years may have dulled the remembered intensity of discipline experienced by the older group, or those who are happy now may not have remembered the severity of their early discipline. Also, it is conceivable that the younger subjects were more inhibited in expressing their feelings than were the older ones. Finally, it is also possible that changes in the parental disciplinary measures over the years may have produced changes which would account for the lack of subgroup differences. It would seem to be useful, therefore, to study types of parental discipline using the freshman and the graduate groups in order to control for the time element.

Religious Instruction

Three hypotheses were made that pertained to religious beliefs: Hypotheses Six, Seven, and Eight. Hypothesis Six pertained to areligious beliefs. Very little empirical information exists regarding the individuals who profess areligious beliefs, but it is generally assumed that they would be more “lonely” and “alienated” because of their “freedom,”
as it is so often reflected in the language themes of today. The results showed just the opposite, however, on the guilt scores. In other words, the guilt scores of the religious group were higher than those of the a-religious, and at a level of significance of .001 on all but one scale. There was no significant difference in the degree of anxiety between the two groups.

It was predicted, in Hypothesis Seven, that those holding conservative religious beliefs would have higher levels of guilt and anxiety than those of moderate or liberal beliefs. This hypothesis was not confirmed since it was the moderates, at a .001 level of significance, who held the highest guilt scores. There was no significant difference in anxiety among the three groups.

The findings of this study, as pertains to Hypothesis Seven, are generally inconsistent with the literature. One major factor which may have contributed to this inconsistency is that the connotation of the words had an influence on the subjective evaluation of religious beliefs. There were only 52 out of 303 subjects, or 17 per cent, who identified themselves as conservative, while 126, or 42 per cent, identified themselves as moderate, and 125, or 41 per cent, identified themselves as liberal. These percentages are not typical of denominational classifications, either nationally or locally, into conservative, moderate, or liberal.
In view of some of the other variables tested in this study, and the high level of significance of difference, it is felt that a further refinement of these variables pertaining to religious beliefs could be more meaningful. Some questions that arise are the following: is there a difference in church attendance rates among the conservative, moderate, and the liberal? is there a relation between the never-married and the intensity of religious beliefs? is there a difference in the level of education and the intensity of religious beliefs? These variables proved to have a relationship to guilt and anxiety, as mentioned later in this chapter.

However, in consideration of the findings, there are other plausible explanations. One might be that the conservatives and the liberals feel more secure in their subjective evaluations of their religious beliefs, while the moderates may be experiencing more anxiety in trying to establish their belief system.

The relative security or insecurity with which these types of persons hold their religious beliefs cannot, of course, be determined from these data, but would seem to be worthy of investigation in itself.

Hypothesis Eight pertained to guilt and anxiety in relation to rates of church attendance. It was hypothesized that those with high rates of attendance would have a higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those with a low rate of attendance.
The hypothesis was supported by the MIST but not by the SAF. In other words, those who had a high rate of church attendance had significantly higher guilt scores but they had significantly lower anxiety scores. This conflict in results is not clearly understood since the MIST and the SAF scales are significantly positively correlated. A possible explanation might be that those who attend church more often are entreated more to feel guilt and thus attend church more often in hopes of expiating their guilt, while those who do not attend as often may not be entreated with guilt but feel anxious because they do not attend.

Sex of the Child

It was predicted, in Hypothesis Two, that there would be a higher degree of guilt and anxiety in the females than in the males, and it was confirmed. These findings are consistent with the prevailing theory and do not require elaborate discussion.

The Family Milieu

It was predicted, in Hypothesis Three, that the first and/or only child would have more guilt and anxiety than other-positioned children. This study did not confirm the hypothesis. Actually, on all the scales except the hostile guilt scale, the other-positioned children had higher guilt and anxiety scores than the first and/or only children. Only
one of these scales reached the .05 level of significance, however, and that was the sex guilt scale.

The results of this hypothesis might be explained in the same terms as those in reference to types of parental discipline, that the attitudes of the parents toward the children may reflect social class differences. Again, the educational difference, the disparity in age levels, the marital status, etc., reflect the need for a refinement of variables.

However, a possible reason for this finding is that the other-positioned children have siblings with whom they can and may participate in sex talk and play. Generally, the first and/or only children are more closely supervised and are more in contact with adults than with peer groups. Thus there is at least the possibility that sex guilt feelings may be heightened by siblings. It is also possible that these circumstances could lead to more severe criticism by the parents. In any event, this matter would seem to merit further investigation.

It was predicted, in Hypothesis Four, that the never-married individuals would have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those of other marital classifications. These differences were confirmed on the MIST, its three sub-scales, and the SAF at the .001 level of significance. These findings are consistent with the literature.
Hypothesis Five pertained to the educational level of the subjects. A low level of education identified those of a freshman level, and a high level identified those of a graduate classification. All the scales, the MIST, its three sub-scales, and the SAF sustained this hypothesis at the .001 level of significance. These findings are significant in themselves since the literature does not reflect a consensus on this point. In other words, there has not been substantial proof that a relationship exists between guilt and anxiety and the educational level.

Hypothesis Nine pertained to the subject’s perceived state of childhood happiness. It was felt that those whose childhood had been generally unhappy or only moderately happy would have higher degrees of guilt and anxiety than those whose childhood had been happy. This supposition held for the hostile guilt sub-scale at the .01 level of significance and for the SAF at the .001 level of significance, but there was no significant difference in other scores.

A memory factor pertaining to the perceived childhood happiness may be involved here. There may be differences in age groups; for instance, the intervening years may have dulled the extent of unhappiness more for the older group than for the younger group, or the young may have more inhibitions about admitting unhappiness than the older group.
Hypothesis Eleven was similar to the previously mentioned hypothesis, except that it referred to the subject's happiness now rather than his happiness in childhood. The prediction was that those who were unhappy and moderately happy would have more guilt and anxiety than those who are generally happy. This prediction was sustained at a significant level of difference on all scales except the morality-conscience scale, although here the trend was in the same direction. According to this study, the happiness in childhood has little part to play in contributing to adult guilt, but happiness now does play a part in contributing to their present guilt feelings. Apparently childhood happiness and happiness now both contribute to present anxiety feelings.

It was hypothesized, by Hypothesis Twelve, that the happiness of the subject's parents would be related to their feelings of guilt and anxiety. Results of the comparison of mean guilt and anxiety scores between the group who perceived their parents as happily married and those who perceived their parents as unhappily married revealed no significant difference in any of the scales. The memory factor, as previously discussed, may be present here too, and may indicate why there is no relationship.

A further comparison was made of guilt and anxiety between individuals whose parental homes were broken and those whose
homes were not broken. Again there was no significant difference between the mean scores.

An analysis of variance was made among those whose parental homes had been broken when they were twelve years old or younger, thirteen years or older, and those whose parental homes had never been broken. The F ratio did not reach a significant level on any of the scales to justify further testing.

Taking the results together, it seems that an individual's state of happiness is much more of an influence in contributing to guilt and anxiety than the parent's state of marital happiness. Although the results of this study tend to indicate that a broken home plays no significant part, it would be advisable to consider other factors; for instance, do individuals in happy but broken homes tend to have more guilt and anxiety than individuals in those homes considered to be unhappy but not broken? Other factors to be considered are as follows: the age of the child when the break came, sex of the child, whether the break was by death or divorce, the relationship of the child to the parent, which parent was missing, remarriage and the factors related to it, and sex of the step-parent. In other words, perhaps this variable was too broad to be considered properly.

Hypotheses Thirteen and Fourteen pertained to the social class variables of education and occupation. It was predicted that those
subjects who had parents in the low educational and occupational groups would have higher degrees of guilt and anxiety than those in the medium or high levels. Neither of these hypotheses was sustained. The mean MIST and SAF scores of the groups were higher in the medium educational, next high in the low educational level and lowest in the high educational group. Although there was very slight difference in mean MIST and SAF scores, the means were in the predicted direction for the parental occupational groups; i.e., highest in the lowest occupational level, next highest in the middle occupational level and lowest in the highest occupational level.

Perhaps by considering the composite score, the combination of father's and mother's educational score and a combination of father's and mother's occupational score, there was a "leveling out" which did not produce a significance between the scores. One point was observed which would bear further investigation and that was the many cases where the educational level of the mother was higher than that of the father. Many studies have called attention to the high correlation between mother's interests, intelligence quotient, etc., and the child's. This could partially explain the "leveling out."
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The primary purpose of the present study was to determine the relationship between guilt and anxiety as well as the relationship of these factors to certain psychological and sociological variables. These variables were as follows: sex, ordinal position, marital status, education, religious beliefs, church attendance, happiness of childhood, discipline from parents, happiness now, parental happiness, parental education, and parental occupation.

The hypotheses of the present study were as follows:

1. There will be a significant positive correlation between guilt and anxiety.

2. Females will have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than males.

3. The first and/or only child will have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than other-positioned children.

4. The never-married individuals will have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those of other marital classifications.
5. Those who have had a lower level of education will have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those who have had a higher level of education.

6. Those who profess areligious beliefs will have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those who profess religious beliefs.

7. There will be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those who profess conservative religious beliefs than among those who profess moderate or liberal religious beliefs.

8. Those who have a high rate of church attendance will have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those who have a low rate of church attendance.

9. There will be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those who consider their childhood as having been generally unhappy and moderately happy than among those who consider their childhood as having been generally happy.

10. There will be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those who perceive their parental discipline as having been overly-strict than among those who perceive their parental discipline as having been firm, very lenient, or inconsistent.

11. There will be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those who consider themselves to be generally unhappy
and moderately happy than among those who consider themselves to be generally happy.

12. Those who consider their parents as having been unhappily married will have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than those who consider their parents as having been happily married.

13. There will be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those whose parents are in the low educational level than among those whose parents are in the medium or high educational level.

14. There will be a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety among those whose parents are in the low occupational level than among those whose parents are in the medium or high occupational level.

The subjects employed were three hundred and thirteen students enrolled at North Texas State University during the 1966-67 academic year. They were selected from freshman sociology and psychology classes not necessarily related to their academic major and from graduate classes that included a cross section of majors.

All the subjects responded to three instruments. A Student Questionnaire was administered to obtain personal data about the subject. The IPAT Anxiety Scale was administered to all subjects as a measure of generalized or free-floating anxiety. This
questionnaire was composed of forty items which were to be answered “true” or “false.” It rendered five indices of anxiety: self-sentiment development, ego strength, protension of paranoid trend, guilt proneness, and ergic tension. The sub-scales, however, were utilized in this study only in the correlation between guilt and anxiety.

The Mosher Incomplete Sentences Test was administered as a measure of guilt. The MIST is a fifty-stem sentence completion blank designed for group administration which can be scored quantitatively to obtain a total guilt score and three sub-scale scores: hostile guilt, sex guilt, and morality-conscience guilt. The scoring referents of the MIST are based upon psychoanalytic literature.

Following the collection and tabulation of the data, the results were analyzed by three statistical techniques: simple correlation, Fisher's $t$ technique, and analysis of variance.

The statistical analysis of the data revealed the following findings:

Hypothesis One was confirmed. A significant positive correlation was found between guilt and anxiety. The correlations were made on the basis of 313 scores.

Hypothesis Two was sustained. The females were found to have a significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety than males.

Hypothesis Three was not confirmed. No significant difference was found in guilt and anxiety scores between the first and/or only children and the other-positioned children.
Hypothesis Four was sustained. A significantly higher degree of guilt and anxiety was found among the never-married individuals than those of other marital classifications.

Hypothesis Five was confirmed. Those who had a low level of education were found to have scores of guilt and anxiety, significantly different at the .001 level, higher than those who had a high level of education.

Hypothesis Six was not sustained. It had been predicted that the areligious would have higher degrees of guilt and anxiety than those who professed religious beliefs. On the MIST the religious were found to have higher degrees of guilt and the difference was significant at the .001 level. There was no significant difference between the groups on the SAF.

Hypothesis Seven was not confirmed. It had been specified that those who professed conservative religious beliefs would have higher degrees of guilt and anxiety than those of moderate or liberal beliefs. An analysis of variance indicated that those holding moderate religious beliefs had the highest degrees of guilt, and the difference was significant at the .001 level. The SAF revealed no significant differences among the groups.

Hypothesis Eight was partially confirmed. This hypothesis stated that those who had a high rate of church attendance would have
higher degrees of guilt and anxiety than those with low rates of attendance. The difference in MIST scores was significant at the .001 level, thus confirming this portion of the hypothesis. The anxiety scores, however, were higher for the low attendance group and the difference was significant at the .05 level. This portion of the hypothesis, therefore, was not confirmed.

Hypothesis Nine was partially confirmed. It had been predicted that those who considered their childhood as having been generally unhappy and moderately happy would have higher degrees of guilt and anxiety than those whose childhood had been generally happy. There was no significant difference between the two groups on the MIST scores; thus, this portion of the hypothesis was not sustained. There was a significant difference on the SAF scores, however, sustaining this portion of the hypothesis.

Hypothesis Ten was not confirmed. The hypothesis pertained to types of perceived parental discipline. It was stated that those who perceived their parental discipline as having been overly-strict would have higher degrees of guilt and anxiety than those who had perceived the discipline as firm, very lenient, or inconsistent. The scores on the MIST and the SAF revealed no significant difference among the groups; thus, Hypothesis Ten was not sustained.
Hypothesis Eleven was concerned with the degree of guilt and anxiety and the perceived happiness of the individual now. Those who are generally unhappy and moderately happy were hypothesized to have significantly higher degrees of guilt and anxiety than those who are generally happy. This hypothesis was confirmed by both the MIST and the SAF.

Hypothesis Twelve pertained to the parental marital status. It has been stated that those who considered their parents as having been unhappily married would have significantly higher degrees of guilt and anxiety than those who considered their parents to have been happily married. This hypothesis was not sustained, either on the MIST or on the SAF.

Hypothesis Thirteen pertained to the level of parental education. It had been predicted that those whose parents were in a low educational level would have higher degrees of guilt and anxiety than those in the medium or high levels. An analysis of variance did not indicate a significant difference among the groups on either the MIST or SAF; thus, this hypothesis was not sustained.

Hypothesis Fourteen pertained to the level of parental occupation. It was felt that those whose parents were in the low occupational levels would have significantly higher degrees of guilt and anxiety than those whose parents were in a medium or high level. An analysis
of variance did not indicate that a significant difference existed among the groups on either the MIST or on the SAF; thus, Hypothesis Fourteen was not confirmed.

Conclusions

While the findings of the present study apply only to the population studied, they do have certain general implications for other similar populations.

It may be concluded that guilt and anxiety are definitely related. And it may be concluded that guilt and anxiety are related to certain psychological and sociological factors: sex, marital status, level of education, and state of happiness now.

In addition, it can be said that guilt is related to the rate of church attendance, although anxiety is not. And further, anxiety is related to the happiness of childhood while guilt is not.

Utilizing the criteria defined in this study, it was concluded that guilt and anxiety were not related to the following factors: ordinal position, conservative religious beliefs, discipline from parents, parental happiness, parental education, and parental occupation.

Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of the present study, it is recommended that
1. Additional studies be conducted utilizing the MIST in order to further validate the instrument. Since the guilt proneness sub-scale scores of the IPAT Anxiety Scale were correlated with the total MIST scores and all of the sub-scale scores at the .001 level of significance, it would be advisable to study them together.

2. Further research be made utilizing more refined criteria for the variables of this study which did not indicate a significant relationship to guilt and anxiety; namely, ordinal position, parental discipline, parental happiness, parental education, and parental occupation.

3. Further study be conducted to determine why certain hypotheses were sustained only in part in view of the significantly positive correlation found between the guilt and anxiety scores.

4. Study be made in regard to the individual responses to the MIST stems. It was observed that there were many instances of disordered language patterns, such as strephosymbolia, mirror reversal and possibly dyslexia. Another area of major interest would be the slips of the pen. Further studies might concern themselves with masculine-feminine responses, subjective-projective responses, and inconsistent thought patterns.

5. Further research be made in the interrelationship of variables that were found to be significant in this study.
6. These two scales be administered to clinically-diagnosed psychopaths. It is felt that these scales would contribute greatly in the diagnosis and classification since two of the characteristics of a psychopath are an absence of guilt and an absence of anxiety.
APPENDIX A

MOSHER INCOMPLETE SENTENCES TEST
MOSHER INCOMPLETE SENTENCES TEST

Instructions: Complete these sentences to express your real feelings. Do every one. Be sure to make a complete sentence.

1. People _____________________________.
2. When I tell a lie _____________________________.
3. The idea of murder _____________________________.
4. When I have sexual dreams _____________________________.
5. My father _____________________________.
6. I tried to make amends _____________________________.
7. When someone swears at me _____________________________.
8. Masturbation _____________________________.
9. I punish myself _____________________________.
10. After a childhood fight, I felt _____________________________.
11. If in the future I committed adultery _____________________________.
12. I could not do it because _____________________________.
13. Most women _____________________________.
14. "Dirty" jokes in mixed company _____________________________.
15. After an argument _____________________________.
16. Back home

17. I should have been punished for

18. When I was a child, sex

19. To kill in war

20. Sex relations before marriage

21. Sin and failure

22. Other people

23. Petting

24. Arguments leave me feeling

25. Unusual sex practices

26. I detest myself for

27. If I had sex relations, I would feel

28. If I robbed a bank

29. I

30. As a child, sex play

31. When caught in the act

32. When anger builds up inside me

33. Men
34. A guilty conscience ________________________________.
35. If I felt like murdering someone ____________________________.
36. One should not ________________________________________.
37. I hate ________________________________________________.
38. A mother ________________________________________________.
39. After an outburst of anger ________________________________.
40. When I have sexual desires ________________________________.
41. When I was younger, fighting ________________________________.
42. I regret ________________________________________________.
43. Women who curse ________________________________________.
44. The idea of incest is ________________________________________.
45. Capital punishment ________________________________________.
46. If I hated my parents ________________________________________.
47. Obscene literature ________________________________________.
48. If I committed a homosexual act ________________________________________.
49. Prostitution ________________________________________________.
50. If I killed someone in self-defense, I ________________________________.
APPENDIX B

IPAT SELF ANALYSIS FORM
Inside this booklet you will find forty questions, dealing with difficulties that most people experience at one time or another. It will help a lot in self-understanding if you check Yes, No, etc., to each, frankly and truthfully, to describe any problems you may have.

Start with the two simple examples just below, for practice. As you see, each inquiry is actually put in the form of a sentence. By putting a cross, X, in one of the three boxes on the right you show how it applies to you. Make your marks now.

1. I enjoy walking

   Yes  Occasionally  No

   A middle box is provided for when you cannot definitely say Yes or No. But use it as little as possible.

2. I would rather spend an evening:

   (A) talking to people, (B) at a movie

   A  In between  B

   About half the items inside end in A and B choices like this. B is always on the right. Remember, use the "In between" or "Uncertain" box only if you cannot possibly decide on A or B.

Now:

1. Make sure you have put your name, and whatever else the examiner asks, in the place at the top of this page.

2. Never pass over an item but give some answer to every single one. Your answers will be entirely confidential.

3. Do not spend time pondering. Answer each immediately, the way you want to at this moment (not last week, or usually). You may have answered questions like this before; but answer them as you feel now.

Most people finish in five minutes; some, in ten. Hand in this form as soon as you are through with it, unless told to do otherwise. As soon as the examiner signals or tells you to, turn the page and begin.

STOP HERE—WAIT FOR SIGNAL
1. I find that my interests, in people and amusements, tend to change fairly rapidly. 
   True  In between  False

2. If people think poorly of me I can still go on quite serenely in my own mind.
   True  In between  False

3. I like to wait till I am sure that what I am saying is correct, before I put forward an argument.
   Yes  In between  No

4. I am inclined to let my actions get swayed by feelings of jealousy.
   Sometimes  Seldom  Never

5. If I had my life to live over again I would:
   (A) plan very differently, (B) want it the same.
   A  In between  B

6. I admire my parents in all important matters.
   Yes  In between  No

7. I find it hard to “take ‘no’ for an answer”, even when I know what I ask is impossible.
   True  In between  False

8. I doubt the honesty of people who are more friendly than I would naturally expect them to be.
   True  In between  False

9. In demanding and enforcing obedience my parents (or guardians) were: (A) always very reasonable, (B) often unreasonable.
   A  In between  B

10. I need my friends more than they seem to need me.
    Rarely  Sometimes  Often

11. I feel sure that I could “pull myself together” to deal with an emergency.
    Always  Often  Seldom

12. As a child I was afraid of the dark.
    Often  Sometimes  Never

13. People sometimes tell me that I show my excitement in voice and manner too obviously.
    Yes  Uncertain  No

14. If people take advantage of my friendliness I:
   (A) soon forget and forgive, (B) resent it and hold it against them.
   A  In between  B

15. I find myself upset rather than helped by the kind of personal criticism that many people make.
    Often  Occasionally  Never

16. Often I get angry with people too quickly.
    True  In between  False

17. I feel restless as if I want something but do not know what.
    Very rarely  Sometimes  Often

18. I sometimes doubt whether people I am talking to are really interested in what I am saying.
    True  In between  False

19. I have always been free from any vague feelings of ill-health, such as obscure pains, digestive upsets, awareness of heart action, etc.
    True  Uncertain  False

20. In discussion with some people, I get so annoyed that I can hardly trust myself to speak.
    Sometimes  Rarely  Never

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE.
. Through getting tense I use up more energy than most people in
getting things done..................................................................................................................  

. I make a point of not being absent-minded or forgetful of details..................................................  

. However difficult and unpleasant the obstacles, I always stick to
my original intentions..................................................................................................................  

. I tend to get over-excited and "rattled" in upsetting situations......................................................  

. I occasionally have vivid dreams that disturb my sleep...................................................................  

. I always have enough energy when faced with difficulties............................................................  

. I sometimes feel compelled to count things for no particular purpose.............................................  

. Most people are a little queer mentally, though they do not like to
admit it...........................................................................................................................................  

. If I make an awkward social mistake I can soon forget it.................................................................  

. I feel grouchy and just do not want to see people:
(A) occasionally, (B) rather often......................................................................................................  

. I am brought almost to tears by having things go wrong.................................................................  

. In the midst of social groups I am nevertheless sometimes over-
come by feelings of loneliness and worthlessness...........................................................................  

. I wake in the night and, through worry, have some difficulty in
sleeping again .....................................................................................................................................  

. My spirits generally stay high no matter how many troubles I meet.................................................  

. I sometimes get feelings of guilt or remorse over quite small matters.............................................  

. My nerves get on edge so that certain sounds, e.g., a screechy hinge,
are unbearable and give me the shivers.........................................................................................  

. If something badly upsets me I generally calm down again quite 
quickly................................................................................................................................................  

. I tend to tremble or perspire when I think of a difficult task ahead..................................................  

. I usually fall asleep quickly, in a few minutes, when I go to bed.......................................................  

. I sometimes get in a state of tension or turmoil as I think over my
recent concerns and interests..........................................................................................................  

STOP HERE.  BE SURE YOU HAVE ANSWERED EVERY QUESTION.

B Score
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Examiner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Scores:</th>
<th>B Score (Overt, manifest, sympt.) (p. 3 score)</th>
<th>Overt-Covert Ratio ( \frac{B}{A} )</th>
<th>TOTAL, STANDARD STEN SCORE (from Table 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( Q_6(-) ), ( C(-) ), ( L ), ( O ), ( Q_6 )</td>
<td>( Q_6(-) ), ( C(-) ), ( L ), ( O ), ( Q_6 )</td>
<td>( Q_6(-) ), ( C(-) ), ( L ), ( O ), ( Q_6 )</td>
<td>( Q_6(-) ), ( C(-) ), ( L ), ( O ), ( Q_6 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Observations:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostic Summary:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

TOTAL RAW SCORE \( (A + B) \)
APPENDIX C

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
The following questions have blank spaces on the left in which you are to place a check mark (X) on the line which best represents your answer. Mark only one answer. A few questions call for written answers; be as specific as you can. Answer all questions. Do not leave any blank. Work as rapidly as you can.

1. Sex:
   1. Male
   2. Female

2. I am the:
   1. Only or first child
   2. Second or later child

3. Marital status:
   1. Unmarried
   2. Married
   3. Separated
   4. Divorced and remarried
   5. Divorced, not remarried
   6. Spouse deceased, remarried
   7. Spouse deceased, not remarried

4. College classification:
   1. Freshman
   2. Sophomore
   3. Junior
   4. Senior
   5. Graduate
   6. Other (specify) ______________________

5. Religious preference:
   1. Protestant
   2. Catholic
   3. Jewish
   4. Other (agnostic, atheist, no religious affiliation, etc.) Specify: ______________________

6. In regard to my religious beliefs, I consider myself to be:
   1. Liberal
   2. Moderate
   3. Conservative
   4. Other (specify) ______________________

7. I attend church:
   1. 3 or more times a month
   2. Less than 3 times a month

8. Do you consider that your childhood was:
   1. Generally happy
   2. Moderately happy
   3. Generally unhappy

9. In disciplinary matters were your parents generally:
   1. Overly strict
   2. Firm but not harsh
   3. Very lenient
   4. Inconsistent

10. Do you now consider yourself to be:
    1. Generally happy
    2. Moderately happy
    3. Generally unhappy

11. Do you consider that your parents have been happily married:
    1. Yes
    2. No

12. Was your parental home broken:
    1. By divorce Age: ______
    2. By death Age: ______
    3. Not broken

13. Indicate the highest level of formal education completed by your father:
    1. Graduate professional training (Masters, Doctoral degree, or equivalent)
    2. Undergraduate degree (Bachelors degree or equivalent)
    3. Partial college (at least one year but not a degree)
    4. High school graduate
    5. Partial high school (completed 10th or 11th grade)
    6. Junior high school (completed 7th, 8th, or 9th grade)
    7. Less than 7 years

14. Indicate the highest level of formal education completed by your mother:
    1. Graduate professional training (Masters, Doctoral degree, or equivalent)
    2. Undergraduate degree (Bachelors degree or equivalent)
    3. Partial college (at least one year but not a degree)
    4. High school graduate
    5. Partial high school (completed 10th or 11th grade)
    6. Junior high school (completed 7th, 8th, or 9th grade)
    7. Less than 7 years

15. Occupation of father (or male with whom you have lived most):
    1. Executive, proprietor of large concern, or major professional
    2. Manager or proprietor of medium-sized business, or lesser professional
    3. Administrative personnel of large concern, owner of small business, or semi-professional
    4. Owner of little business, clerical, sales worker, or technician
    5. Skilled worker
    6. Semi-skilled worker
    7. Unskilled worker

16. Father's occupation: (list specific job title)

17. Occupation of mother (or female with whom you have lived most):
    1. Executive, proprietor of large concern, or major professional
    2. Manager or proprietor of medium-sized business, or lesser professional
    3. Administrative personnel of large concern, owner of small business, or semi-professional
    4. Owner of little business, clerical, sales worker, or technician
    5. Skilled worker
    6. Semi-skilled worker
    7. Unskilled worker

18. Mother's occupation: (list specific job title)
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