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ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP OF LEVEL OF SELF-ACTUALIZATION
TO FORMING IMPRESSIONS OF OTHERS

by

Ann Lenard

Master of Arts in Psychology

July, 1973

Maslow's theory of self-actualization suggests that people at different levels of self-actualization will differ in their social perceptions. Based on this theory, it was predicted that non-self-actualizing people would react to aspects of a person which could be classified when forming impressions, while self-actualizing people would attend to personality traits. Based on the findings of previous studies, it was also predicted that males would be perceived more favorably than females.

One hundred thirty-three undergraduate students were asked to form an impression of a person suggested by the traits "intelligent", "serious", "reserved", "tactful", "practical", "industrious". The sex of the stimulus person was varied for different groups of subjects. Half the male and female subjects were given Form A, in which sex of the stimulus person was "male"; the other half of the male and female subjects were given Form B, in which sex
of the stimulus person was "female". All subjects were then given the Time Competence and Synergy scales plus seven items of the Inner-Other Orientation scale from Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory as a measure of self-actualization. Subjects scoring high and subjects scoring low on self-actualization were chosen for statistical analysis.

For male subjects, results supported Maslow's theory. Low self-actualizing male subjects emphasized the sex trait in forming impressions, whereas high self-actualizing male subjects emphasized personality traits in their perceptions. Results for female subjects reversed the hypotheses. High self-actualizing female subjects emphasized sex in forming impressions; low self-actualizing female subjects emphasized the personality traits. Another reversal of the predictions was the tendency for high self-actualizing male and female subjects to rate the "female" stimulus person more favorably than the "male" stimulus person.
INTRODUCTION

Theoretical Background and Research

The present study investigated individual differences in level of self-actualization and their effects on forming impressions of others. Self-actualization has been defined by Maslow (1968) as:

ongoing actualization of potentials, capacities and talents, an increasing trend toward unity, integration, or synergy (p. 25).

According to Maslow, people who are self-actualizers are growth-motivated, while people who are non-self-actualizers are need-motivated. Growth-motivated and need-motivated persons have different perceptual styles. Maslow sees growth-motivated perception as more concrete, as less abstracted and less selective than need-motivated perception. It is an examination of experience, rather than a classifying or labeling of experience. Need-motivated perception, he states, is characterized by classes and concepts which have sharp boundaries and are mutually exclusive and incompatible; it "shapes" things in a purposeful way and imposes a set of expectations on the real world (Maslow, 1954).

We must treat the experience as if it were unique and unlike anything else in the world and our only effort must be to apprehend it in its own nature, rather than to try to see how it fits into our theories, our schemes, and our concepts (1954, p. 208).
It may be inferred from Maslow's views that in forming impressions of others, self-actualizing people would react to the personality of the person, whereas non-self-actualizing people would be likely to react to those aspects of the person by which he could be most easily classified, such as race or sex.

Forming an impression of another person is a dynamic process in which the various traits we observe are combined into a single unitary impression (Tagiuri, 1969; Asch, 1946). The basic processes involved in forming impressions were studied by Asch (1946). In a series of experiments, he demonstrated that there are lawful principles which determine the formation of such a unitary impression. The principle observed by Asch which is important to the present study is the fact that in forming impressions, some traits are more strongly emphasized than others. These strongly emphasized traits dominate the impression.

The present study investigated whether subjects who scored high and subjects who scored low on self-actualization would differ significantly in the extent to which they emphasized sex in forming impressions. Subjects were asked to form an impression of a hypothetical person based on a list of personality traits. The sex of the "person" was varied for different groups, otherwise the traits were identical. Low self-actualizing subjects, by attending to
that aspect of the "person" which could be classified and labeled, were expected to emphasize sex in forming an impression. High self-actualizing subjects, by examining the personality traits as well as the sex trait, were not expected to emphasize the sex of the person in their perceptions.

Research in the field of person perception began during the 1920's and 1930's and was concerned mainly with the accuracy of perceptions and judgments. This work grew out of interests in assessing personality traits, assessing characteristics of "good" judges of personality, and developing criteria for assessing accuracy. In the 1940's, due to influences from field theory, Gestalt psychology, and psychoanalytical concepts, the orientation of research changed to an emphasis on the processes involved in forming impressions. Asch (1946) was among the first psychologists to systematically investigate the basic processes involved in forming impressions. Following the Gestalt tradition, Asch demonstrated in a series of experiments that there are lawful principles which determine how we combine the traits we observe into a unified impression. Experiments I, III, IV, and VI (1946), which investigated differential emphasis, or weighting, of traits is pertinent to the present paper and will be reviewed in detail below. Other processes involved in social perception which were studied
during this time were: the tendency to maximize balance, to see a person as more homogeneously good or bad than he is seen when his traits are independently measured (this tendency is often referred to as the "halo effect"); the tendency to make inferences, given some trait information about a person, to attribute to him characteristics not included in the data given; and the tendency to stereotype, to place a person in a category according to a quickly identifiable trait such as age, sex, or ethnic group, and then to attribute qualities to him believed to be typical of that category.

Asch tested the hypothesis that we form unified impressions of personality in a pilot study. Subjects were read a list of seven personality traits, said to be the traits of an actual person. They were then asked to describe in a written sketch the impressions they had formed of the hypothetical person. Asch concluded from their responses that: 1) a normal adult forms a unified impression of personality even though he hears a list of discrete terms; 2) subjects infer personality traits not actually mentioned in the list from those given in the list; 3) the accounts of the subjects vary, although all were given the same list of traits to interpret.

In his first experiment (Experiment I, 1946), Asch investigated whether varying one basic or "central" trait
in a list of traits would change the impression formed of a hypothetical stimulus person. Asch gave two groups of college students a list of traits said to belong to an actual person. The lists were identical except that the first contained the trait "warm", the second contained the trait "cold". Subjects were asked to describe their impressions in a written paragraph, and then to indicate on a checklist of pairs of opposite traits the items that best fitted the impression they had formed. Results indicated that the two groups differed widely in their impressions. The "warm" person was seen as "generous", "happy", "good-natured", and "sociable", while the "cold" person was seen as "ungenerous", "unhappy", "irritable", and "unsociable". Asch concluded that a change in one quality had produced a basic change in the impression. However, there was not a tendency for subjects to rate the "warm" person more favorably in all respects. There was no difference between ratings of the "warm" and "cold" person on traits such as "honest", "strong", and "reliable". Therefore, Asch points out, his results cannot be interpreted as indicating a halo effect or mental set.

In Experiment III (1946), Asch predicted that varying a secondary trait, one which was not basic to the impression, would make little difference to the impression formed. Varying "polite" and "blunt", he found the
resulting impressions very similar. Asch concluded that not all traits have equal weights in determining an impression. Some, such as "warm" and "cold", are basic to the impression, while others, such as "polite" and "blunt", are secondary.

In Experiment IV (1946), Asch asked whether certain qualities, such as "warm", are always basic to an impression, or whether the context of a trait determines whether it will be basic or secondary. The effect of the trait "warm" was studied when embedded in two different lists of personality characteristics. The first list was: obedient -- weak -- shallow -- warm -- unambitious -- vain. The second list was: vain -- shrewd -- unscrupulous -- warm -- shallow -- envious. Results indicated that in both lists, the quality "warm" was secondary to the impression. Asch interpreted this as indicating that the meaning and, therefore, the weight of a particular trait depends on its context, on its relation to the set of surrounding traits:

... characteristics forming the basis of an impression do not contribute each a fixed, independent meaning, but ... their content is itself partly a function of the environment of the other characteristics, of their mutual relations (1946, p. 268).

In Experiment VI (1946), Asch asked whether it was possible to alter the impression without changing the particular traits, by changing the order in which they were presented to subjects. Results indicated that the
first trait set up a direction which had the effect of changing
the meaning of the latter traits. The latter
traits are not separate terms, Asch stated, but are re­
lated to the direction established by the first traits.
Asch emphasized the fact that the factor of primacy is not
to be understood in the sense of Ebbinghaus, but rather in
a structural sense:

It is not the sheer temporal position of the item which is
important as much as the functional relation of its
content to the content of the items following it (1946, p. 272).

To summarize, Asch concluded from his series of ex­
periments that a quality, whether "basic" or "secondary",
derives its meaning from the context of surrounding traits
and that traits which are "basic", or "central", will dom­
in ate the impression and provide the main direction, or
meaning of the impression:

... each trait is seen to stand in a particular rela­
tion to the others as part of a complete view. The
entire view possesses the formal properties of a struc­
ture, the form of which cannot be derived from the
summation of the individual relations (1946, p. 286).

The fact that we form a unified impression of a person is
due, Asch states, to the structural character of the im­
pression.

Asch (1946, 1952) points out that there are several
limitations in his studies. The conclusions were based
entirely on impressions based on descriptive materials.
However, he states, it was necessary to simplify the
experiment by using descriptions of people rather than actual people in order to study changes in impressions. Also, the observation of actual persons would have involved other processes not observable under the conditions of these experiments. For example, in observing an actual person, the selection of the traits on which the impression will be based is an important determinant of the impression. Another limitation, Asch states, is the fact that the studies dealt only with cognitive processes of the observer. Also important to the study of forming impressions are the effects of psychological processes of the observer, such as needs and expectations, and whether the observer arrives at a valid impression.

In the 1950's, researchers began to explore the influence of individual differences on the process of forming impressions. The studies investigated cognitive or motivational characteristics of the perceiver which influenced perception of others. The cognitive variable most often studied was the degree of conceptual differentiation with which a subject perceived others, the degree to which fine distinctions were made about another. Tagiuri (1969) states that due to methodological problems in measuring conceptual differentiation, such as confounding the concept of differentiation with verbal fluency, no conclusions can be reached about the effect of this variable on person perception. Studies investigating the effect of motivation
on person perception most frequently studied the variables dominance, hostility, and self-acceptance. These studies demonstrated that subjects scoring high on a particular trait, such as hostility, attributed that trait to others, while subjects scoring low on the trait did not.

During the 1960's there was a trend toward greater refinement of the definitions of the cognitive and motivational variables studied in person perception, as well as refinement in methods of measurement. For example, several different types of cognitive differentiation were defined. In research on motivational variables, Shrauger and Altrocchi (1964) emphasized the importance of measuring variables on more than one level of personality. For example, in studying the effect of hostility on perceptions of others, Leary (1957) used a "multilevel" design. He found that a person with a high level of fantasy hostility who was judged by others to be hostile, but who did not attribute hostility to himself, attributed hostility to others. Recent research has also suggested that cognitive and motivational variables may contribute differently to the formation of an impression (Shrauger and Altrocchi, 1964):

While the process of forming an impression may be perceived as an immediate, unitary phenomenon, this process can be usefully conceptualized as consisting of three phases (1964, p. 301).
The first phase is selection of cues, in which cognitive control variables are especially prominent; the second phase is interpretation of the cues selected, in which motivational variables are especially important; the third phase is translating the impression into an overt verbal response, in which situational variables are emphasized. Shrauger and Altrocchi point out that most experimental studies of impression formation confound individual differences in selection of cues with individual differences in interpretation of cues.

The motivational variable investigated in the present study, self-actualization, was based on Maslow's (1954) study of psychologically healthy individuals. His interest in psychological health grew out of his belief that the goals of therapy needed to be reevaluated. In studying psychologically healthy people, Maslow found that they were motivated by growth needs, as opposed to psychologically unhealthy people, who were motivated by deficiency needs. Healthy people had sufficiently gratified their "basic needs" for safety, love and respect so that they were motivated primarily by trends to self-actualization. Maslow defined healthy people (or growth-motivated, self-actualizing people) by describing their clinically observed characteristics. These characteristics were:

1. Superior perception of reality.
2. Increased acceptance of self, of others and of nature.
3. Increased spontaneity.
4. Increase in problem-centering.
5. Increased detachment and desire for privacy.
6. Increased autonomy, and resistance to enculturation.
7. Greater freshness of appreciation, and richness of emotional reaction.
8. Higher frequency of peak experiences.
9. Increased identification with the human species.
10. Changed (the clinical would say, improved) interpersonal relations.
11. More democratic character structure.
12. Greatly increased creativeness.
13. Certain changes in the value system.

Maslow points out that self-actualization is a dynamic process, active throughout life, rather than an ultimate goal. Growth is, then:

a progressive gratification of basic needs ... basic needs and self-actualization do not contradict each other ... one passes into the other and is a necessary prerequisite for it (1968, pp. 26-27).

While there have been no studies on the relationship between level of self-actualization and forming impressions of others, the relationship of self-acceptance and security to forming impressions has been investigated. Maslow (1954) states that self-acceptance and security are aspects of self-actualization. Berger (1952) and Phillips (1951) have studied the extent to which self-accepting people positively evaluate others; Bossom and Maslow (1957) studied the relationship between security and forming impressions. These investigators found that subjects scoring high on self-acceptance and security evaluated others more positively than subjects scoring low on these personality variables. However, the interpretations of
the studies by Berger and Phillips are questioned by Shrauger and Altrocchi (1964), who point out that:

acceptance of others is not the same as seeing them favorably. On the contrary, Rogers (1951) noted that the self-accepting person will more readily recognize negative aspects of others when this is justified, since he will not be threatened and will not distort his perceptions in order to defend himself (1964, p. 294).

Several studies have investigated the relationship between the non-self-actualizing personality and forming impressions of others (Maslow, 1943; Rokeach, 1960; Frenkel-Brunswik and Sanford, 1945; Secord et al, 1955). These studies emphasized the association between the authoritarian personality and "over-generalized" styles of perceiving.

Maslow (1954) points out that non-self-actualizing people have an authoritarian character structure, while the self-actualizing person has a democratic character structure. In his 1943 study, Maslow contrasted characteristics of the authoritarian and democratic personalities. He stated that the authoritarian sees the world as dangerous and threatening, and therefore forms impressions of others on the basis of "external" signs of strength, such as prestige or dominant status. He tends to classify others into two groups, those who are superior to him and those who are inferior to him. He overgeneralizes "superior" to mean that the person so regarded is superior in everything, whereas the person "inferior" to him is judged
to be likewise inferior in everything. The democratic person, being more secure, forms impressions of others based on "internal", or psychological, qualities of the person. His judgment of "superior" or "inferior" would refer to a particular quality, rather than to the individual as a whole.

Rokeach (1960) also investigated differences between the authoritarian and non-authoritarian personality and their relationships to perceiving others. Rokeach, like Maslow, believes that the person with an authoritarian character experiences the world as threatening. This results, Rokeach states, in a "closed belief system", in which the person evaluates others according to their agreement or disagreement with his beliefs. To the extent that threat is absent, a person will have an "open belief system", and will evaluate others on the basis of their own merits.

Frenkel-Brunswik and Sanford (1945), investigating characteristics of the authoritarian personality, concluded that their subjects had a "generally externalized orientation". For example, subjects scoring high on authoritarianism were more concerned with social standing and with social anxieties than subjects scoring low on this characteristic; the latter were more directed by "inner" than by conventional, or "outer", standards.
Frenkel-Brunswik concluded that for authoritarian subjects:

the conventional superego takes over the function of the underdeveloped ego, producing a lack of individuation and a tendency to stereotyped thinking (1945, p. 285).

Secord, Bevan and Katz (1955) studied the relationship between degree of ethnocentricism and perceptual accentuation. Using Bruner's concept of perceptual accentuation, in which accentuation is defined as a process of perceiving valued objects in a manner which enhances their value, they predicted that pro-Negro as well as anti-Negro subjects would perceive the Negro as more Negroid in physiognomic traits than neutral judges; in other words, both positively and negatively valued characteristics would be accentuated. Results of the study indicated that only the difference between the anti-Negro group and the neutral group was statistically significant; there was evidence of perceptual accentuation only when the Negro was negatively valued.

Shostrom (1964) developed a personality inventory, the Personal Orientation Inventory (P.O.I.) to measure level of self-actualization. The P.O.I. consists of 150 two-choice comparative value judgments. Items were based on clinicians' observations of the value judgments of clinically healthy and clinically troubled patients and on the theoretical writings of Maslow (1954), Perls (1947), May (1958) and Riesman (1950).

Maslow (1954) uses the word "value" to mean "preference" and "need". He does not use the word in its more
traditional sense to mean moral standards and obligations. Following Buhler, Shostrom (1966) defines the concept of value orientation as an existential judgment:

A value orientation may be defined as a generalized and organized conception, influencing behavior, of nature, of man's place in it, of man's relation to man, and of the desirable and nondesirable as they may relate to man (1966, p. 25).

Thus the P.O.I. reflects the existential meaning of "value", as opposed to the traditional use of the word.

The P.O.I. consists of twelve subscales. Each of the subscales measures a dimension of personality important in growth toward self-actualization. The Inner-Other Orientation scale measures whether reactivity orientation is basically toward others or toward oneself. The Time-Competence scale measures the extent to which a person lives in the here and now and his ability to relate the past and future to the present. The Self-Actualizing Value scale measures the extent to which a person holds self-actualizing values. The Existentiality scale measures the ability to react to a situation without rigid adherence to principles. The Feeling Reactivity scale measures responsiveness to one's own needs and feelings. The Spontaneity scale measures a person's freedom to express his feelings. The Self Regard scale measures affirmation of self because of worth; the Self Acceptance scale measures affirmation or acceptance of self in spite of weaknesses. The Nature of Man scale measures the
degree to which one's view of man is constructive. The Synergy scale measures the ability to see the opposites of life as meaningfully related. The Acceptance of Aggression scale measures the ability to accept one's aggressive feelings. The Capacity for Intimate Contact scale measures the ability to develop warm interpersonal relationships.

In addition to the importance of cognitive and motivational differences of the perceiver in the process of forming an impression, Shrauger and Altrocchi (1964) and Tagiuri (1969) emphasize the importance of sex differences in person perception. Although most studies of individual differences in person perception have not taken into account sex of the perceiver or sex of the person being perceived, Shrauger and Altrocchi (1964) suggest that there are probably significant differences to be found in interactions between sex of the perceiver, sex of the stimulus person, and the attributes to be judged. Shrauger and Altrocchi and Tagiuri emphasize that both in theory and in the design of research, sex of the perceiver and sex of the person being perceived should be taken into account. Tagiuri states that some of the complexities and inconsistencies in the person perception literature may stem from a failure to make this distinction.

Studies of the sex variable in person perception have investigated both the differential evaluation of the sexes
and the attribution of sex-role stereotypes. Differential evaluation of the sexes was studied by Fidell (1970), Sommers (1956), and Goldberg (1968). Fidell's subjects were the heads of psychology departments of colleges and universities. Sommers and Goldberg used college students as subjects. These researchers gave different groups of subjects character descriptions of hypothetical persons which were identical except for sex. Subjects were asked to indicate their impressions of the "person". Results indicated that the "male" stimulus person was evaluated more favorably than the "female" stimulus person. These studies demonstrated that sex of the stimulus person had a central, or dominating, influence on the impression formed.

McKee and Sherriffs (1957), Sherriffs and McKee (1957), and Fernberger (1948), using college students as subjects, and Broverman (1970), using clinical psychologists, asked both male and female subjects to list traits true of "males in general" and "females in general". Results of these studies indicated that the traits attributed to males were more socially desirable than those attributed to females; this tendency was especially true for female subjects. These studies indicate that for both male and female subjects, sex of the stimulus person dominated the impression.


Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the present study has been to investigate the influence of individual differences in level of self-actualization on the process of forming impressions. Would there be a difference between subjects scoring high and subjects scoring low on self-actualization in their evaluation of a hypothetical stimulus person when only sex was varied; i.e., would there be differences between high and low self-actualizing subjects in the extent to which sex of the stimulus person dominated the impression? In forming impressions of others, self-actualizing people would be expected to react to the personality of the person, and would thus evaluate similarly the personalities of males and females when the personalities of both were the same; thus, for high self-actualizing subjects, sex would be a secondary or peripheral trait. Low-self-actualizing subjects would be more likely to attend to the sex trait, by which they could label and classify the person, and would thus evaluate personalities of males and females differently, even when the personalities of both were the same; therefore for low self-actualizing subjects, sex of the stimulus person would be expected to dominate the impression.

Shrauger and Altrocchi (1964) and Tagiuri (1969) have noted the importance of sex differences, both of the
stimulus person and of the perceiver, in forming impressions of personality. Therefore, in addition to level of self-actualization of the perceiver and sex of the stimulus person, sex of the perceiver was included in the design and analysis of data.

The "stimulus person" in this study was a hypothetical person suggested by six personality traits: "intelligent", "serious", "reserved", "tactful", "practical", "industrious". These traits are suggestive of a highly competent person. Therefore it is important to note that different evaluations of the "male" and "female" stimulus person were made in the context of traits suggesting competence. A hypothetical person suggested by this list of traits was chosen instead of a real person or a picture of a person in an attempt to avoid confounding individual differences in selection of cues with individual differences in interpretation of cues.

Hypotheses

This study has attempted to test the following hypotheses:

I. Low self-actualizing males will rate the "male" stimulus person significantly more favorably than the "female" stimulus person.

II. Low self-actualizing females will rate the "male" stimulus person significantly more favorably than the
"female" stimulus person and to a significantly greater extent than the low self-actualizing male subjects.

III. High self-actualizing males will rate the "male" stimulus person more favorably than the "female" stimulus person, but not significantly so.

IV. High self-actualizing females will rate the "male" stimulus person more favorably than the "female" stimulus person, but not significantly so; however, there will be a greater difference between females' ratings of the male and female stimulus person than between those of the high self-actualizing males.
METHOD

Subjects and Materials

Subjects were 133 students in introductory classes in psychology at California State University, Northridge. The subjects were asked to form an impression of a male or female based on a list of six personality traits. The traits chosen ("intelligent", "serious", "reserved", "tactful", "practical", "industrious") were suggested by studies on sex discrimination (Fidell, 1970) and sex stereotyping (Sherriffs and McKee, 1957). Only traits considered equally applicable to both men and women were selected; traits such as "aggressive" and "dominant", which Sherriffs and McKee found to be strongly suggestive of males, and "emotional" and "patient" which were shown to be strongly suggestive of females, were not included in the trait list. After reading the stimulus-list, subjects were asked to rate the "stimulus person" on a forced-choice check-list of 16 bipolar pairs of traits. Subjects were then asked to indicate on a scale of 1 to 5 the degree to which each bipolar trait chosen was true of the impression he had formed. The check-list consisted of pairs of bi-polar traits having an evaluative connotation, for example "generous" - "ungenerous", "shrewd" - "wise"; it was the same as that used by Asch in his 1946 studies
with the exception that only 16 of the 18 pairs of traits listed by Asch were used in the present study. The "frivolous" - "serious" pair was not included, as "serious" is one of the traits in the stimulus-list; the "restrained" - "talkative" pair was not included, since "restrained" is considered a synonym for "reserved".

Subjects were then asked to respond to two scales from Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory (POI), the Time Competence and Synergy scales, as well as to seven items from the Inner-Other Orientation scale (an item analysis of the POI by Shostrom, 1964, indicated that these 7 items contributed most to test differences between clinically described self-actualizing and non-self-actualizing subjects; these items measured the extent to which subjects conformed to social pressures, expectations and goals). The complete Inner-Other scale, which consists of 123 items, was considered too time-consuming for the present study. (See Appendix B for the scales and items used in the present study.)

The reliability of the POI has been tested by Shostrom (1964), Klavetter and Mogar (1967), and Ilardi and May (1968). In his 1964 review of the POI, Shostrom reports having established reliability coefficients of .91 and .93 by test-retest methods. Klavetter and Mogar (1967), also using test-retest methods, administered the POI to
undergraduate students twice, a week apart. Reliability coefficients for the Time Competence and Inner–Other orientation scales were .71 and .77 respectively. Coefficients for the other scales ranged from .52 to .82. Shostrom (1966) states that in general the correlations obtained in this study are at a level commensurate with other personality inventories. Ilardi and May (1968), also using test-retest methods, examined the stability of the POI over a one-year period. Their subjects were student nurses. These writers reported reliability coefficients ranging from .32 to .74; these coefficients are, they state, within the ranges of comparable test-retest studies with the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

The validity of the POI has been investigated by Shostrom (1964), Knapp (1965), and Shostrom and Knapp (1966). Shostrom (1964) found that the scales which contributed most to test differences between clinically described self-actualizing and non-self-actualizing subjects were the Inner–Other Orientation, Time Competence and Synergy scales. Nine of the ten scales of the POI were found to discriminate between subjects nominated by clinicians as self-actualizing and non-self-actualizing. In a study by Knapp (1965), the POI was shown to differentiate between a group of undergraduate college students scoring high on neuroticism and a group of undergraduate
students scoring low on neuroticism as measured by the neuroticism scale of the Eysenck Personality Inventory. Shostrom and Knapp (1966) investigated the sensitivity of the POI in clinical settings. Both the POI and the MMPI were given to two groups of adult patients in therapy, one a beginning and the other an advanced group. Results indicated that as therapy progressed, pathology as measured by the MMPI decreased and self-actualization as measured by the POI increased.

Two pilot studies were done. The first was designed to test whether, when the sex variable was included in the paragraph preceding the list of personality traits, subjects would notice it. It was thought that to include "male" or "female" in the list of traits, as Asch (1946) included the personality variable "warm" or "cold" in a list of character traits, would make the hypothesis obvious to many subjects. Another objective of the first pilot study was to test whether the written instructions were clear to the subjects. Subjects were 33 students in introductory psychology. Although results were not statistically analyzed, investigation of the data indicated that there were differences between responses to the "male" and "female" descriptions, and also that subjects were able to follow the instructions as written.
The second pilot study tested the reliability of the Time Competence and Synergy scales and the 7 items of the Inner-Other Orientation scale when given separately from the complete POI. Subjects were 46 students in an introductory psychology class. A split-half internal consistency reliability study was done. Reliability coefficients were then adjusted by means of the Spearman-Brown split-half formula. Results indicated that for the Time Competence scale \( r = .50 \), for the Synergy scale \( r = .25 \), and for the Inner-Other Orientation items \( r = .58 \) (see Table I).

**TABLE I**

INTERNAL CONSISTENCY RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR THE POI (PILOT STUDY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>( r )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Competence Scale</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy Scale</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner-Other Orientation (7 items)</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results compare favorably with those of Ilardi and May (1968), who found a range of reliability coefficients from .32 to .71 (median \( r = .58 \)) using test-retest methods, which are expected to yield higher reliability coefficients than internal consistency methods (Guilford, 1956).
A second internal-consistency reliability study was done as part of the actual study, using 29 subjects who scored high on the POI and 31 subjects who scored low on the POI. The reliability coefficient for the Time Competence scale was $r = .56$, for the Synergy scale, $r = .23$, and for the 7 items of the Inner–Other Orientation scale, $r = .47$ (see Table II).

### Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Competence Scale</td>
<td>$r = .56$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy Scale</td>
<td>$r = .23$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner–Other Orientation (7 items)</td>
<td>$r = .47$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedure**

Subjects were tested in a classroom situation. In order to control for experimenter bias, a booklet containing instructions, the "impression formation" task, and the POI subscales were given to all subjects. Half the males in each class received a booklet in which the "stimulus person" was described as a male, the other half a booklet
in which the "stimulus person" was described as a female. The same was true for the female subjects; half received a "male" booklet, the other half a "female" booklet. Otherwise all booklets were identical. Since sex of the stimulus person was an important variable in the study, as a further control on experimenter bias both a male and a female experimenter passed out and collected the booklets.

Instructions to the subjects attempted to involve them in a role-playing situation. Instructions were as follows:

If you decide to major in psychology, one of the jobs you might be interested in when you graduate is working in personnel. Suppose for a few minutes that you are a personnel manager and a man (woman) with the personality traits listed below applies for a job. Please read the traits carefully and try to form an impression of the kind of person you think he (she) is. (There are no "right" or "wrong" answers.)

List of traits: intelligent serious reserved tactful practical industrious

Now that you have formed an impression of this man (woman), how would you evaluate him (her)? From the check-list below, please select one of each pair of traits, the one which is closest to the impression you have formed.

a. Circle the trait you have chosen in the check-list.
b. Then, indicate on the scale of 1 to 5 how generous or ungenerous this man (woman) seems to you. Circle the number you chose.

Example: If, according to the impression you have formed, you would rate this man (woman) extremely generous, circle "generous" in the check-list and "5" on the scale:
generous - ungenerous 1 2 3 4 5

c. Please circle one of every pair of traits, even if you feel that it is not closely related to your impression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHECK LIST</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ungenerous - generous</td>
<td>Not Very Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. shrewd - wise</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. unhappy - happy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. irritable - good-natured</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. humorous - humorless</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. sociable - unsociable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. unreliable - reliable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. important - insignificant</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ruthless - humane</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. good-looking - unattractive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. popular - unpopular</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. persistent - unstable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. self-centered - altruistic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. imaginative - hard-headed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. strong - weak</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. dishonest - honest</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions for the three POI subscales, which were also printed in the booklet, were:

Our impressions of others are often related to our own feelings. The following are some questions about your feelings and attitudes. There are no right answers, of course. The best answers are the ones you feel are true of yourself.

a. There are two statements given for each question. Circle either "a" or "b" to indicate which statement is true of you.

b. If neither statement is true of you, choose the one which most nearly applies to you.

An example from each subscale is given below.

**Inner-Other Orientation:**

a. I will continue to grow only by setting my sights on a high-level, socially approved goal.
b. I will continue to grow best by being myself.

Time Competence:
  a. I worry about the future.
  b. I do not worry about the future.

Synergy:
  a. Kindness and ruthlessness must be opposites.
  b. Kindness and ruthlessness need not be opposites.

**Design**

A self-actualization score for each subject was computed from his responses to the POI scales. Using the scoring percentiles for college students described in Shostrom's POI Manual (1966), subjects whose scores were in the upper 33rd percentile and subjects whose scores were in the lower 33rd percentile were selected for analysis. Twenty-five subjects scored above the 67th percentile. Four subjects who scored one point below the 67th percentile on the 38 POI items, but who scored in the 85th percentile on the Time Competence scale, were also included in the high self-actualizing group. Thirty-one subjects who scored below the 33rd percentile comprised the low self-actualizing group. Within the high and low groups, subjects were further divided into male and female subgroups; these subgroups were again divided into subgroups reacting to male and female stimulus persons, resulting in a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design.
RESULTS

Of the 133 subjects who were tested, 18 failed to complete either the POI or the trait check-list, 4 indicated a response set (by marking the same number of the rating scale for each trait). From the remaining 111 subjects, 29 subjects who scored high on the POI and 31 subjects who scored low on the POI were selected for an analysis of variance:

The average number of subjects in each of the 8 groups was 7.5. This number was too small to permit a 2 x 2 x 2 x 16 analysis of variance using the rating scale data; therefore, only the forced-choice check-list data were analyzed. Each subject was given one score for the 16 responses to the check-list by counting the number of positive traits chosen. Each score was transformed using an arcsin transformation for proportional data, $2 \arcsin \sqrt{1 - p}$, in order to achieve homogeneity of variance (see Appendix C). The data was then analyzed using a 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance (see Table III).

Results of the 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance indicated a significant ($F = 3.96$, $p = .049$) interaction effect for level of self-actualization and sex of stimulus person, as well as an interaction effect for sex of subject and sex of stimulus person which approached
### TABLE III

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATINGS OF CHECK-LIST TRAITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Subject (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.0301</td>
<td>0.8571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Self-actualization (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.7566</td>
<td>0.6075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Stimulus Person (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.8903</td>
<td>0.6480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.0832</td>
<td>0.7711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| B                               | 1  | 0.888 | 3.1587 | 0.0778 @
| C                               | 1  | 1.112 | 3.9580 | 0.0491 *
| A x B                           | 1  | 0.179 | 0.6366 | 0.5657|
| Error                           | 52 | 0.281 |        |       |

@ Approaches significance

* Significant at the .05 level
significance ($F = 3.16, p = .077$). The latter interaction effect was the result of the tendency of female subjects to rate the "female" more positively than the "male".

The significant interaction effect for level of self-actualization and sex of stimulus person was further investigated by means of Student's T tests for combined paired comparisons. Comparisons were done between mean ratings of the "male" and "female" stimulus for each of the four groups of subjects. Since four groups were being compared, it was necessary to use the .99 confidence level in order to test significance (the confidence level of each group being the fourth root of .99, which is .96. See Table IV). Although all four groups failed to reach the .96 confidence level, it can be seen from Table III that scores for low self-actualizing male subjects and high self-actualizing female subjects approached significance, indicating a tendency for these two groups to emphasize the sex trait in forming impressions. Hypothesis I stated that low self-actualizing male subjects would rate "males" significantly more favorably than "females"; results were in the direction predicted. Low self-actualizing male subjects emphasized the sex of the stimulus person in their perceptions and rated the "male" more favorably than the "female", although not to an extent which reached significance in the present study. Hypothesis II, which stated that low self-actualizing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Mean Ratings *</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mdiff</th>
<th>Paired Comparison Value Needed for Significance **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Stimulus</td>
<td>Female Stimulus</td>
<td>Male - Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-act.</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-act.</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Self-act.</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Self-act.</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean ratings based on arcsin transformations of check-list scores.

** Values of M_{diff} needed for significance at the .04 level.
reversed the hypothesis in rating "females" more favorably than "males"). The direction of the hypotheses was reversed by female subjects. Low self-actualizing female subjects did not emphasize sex in their perceptions, whereas high self-actualizing female subjects were found to emphasize sex of the stimulus person to an extent which approached significance.

An examination of the mean ratings of each group for each trait (Figures 1, 2, 3, 4) indicated that all subjects rated both the male and female stimulus person high on the traits "reliable", "honest", and "persistent". For high self-actualizing subjects, there was little variance between male and female subjects on their ratings of the "male" and "female" stimulus person on these three traits. For low self-actualizing subjects, the "male" stimulus person tended to be rated higher than the "female" on these three traits by both male and female subjects. For the remaining 13 traits on the check-list, each group of subjects indicated a consistent tendency to rate either the "male" or the "female" stimulus higher on all 13 traits. Low self-actualizing male subjects tended to rate the "male" higher than the "female" on all traits; low self-actualizing females and high self-actualizing males and females tended to rate the "female" higher than the "male" on all traits. Thus the overall mean ratings for each group used in the paired comparisons reflected a
Fig. 1. A comparison of mean ratings of check-list traits for "male" and "female" stimulus persons by low self-actualizing male subjects.
Fig. 2. A comparison of mean ratings of check-list traits for "male" and "female" stimulus persons by low self-actualizing female subjects.
Mean Ratings of Check-list Traits

Fig. 3. A comparison of mean ratings of check-list traits for "male" and "female" stimulus persons by high self-actualizing male subjects.
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Fig. 4. A comparison of mean ratings of check-list traits for "male" and "female" stimulus persons by high self-actualizing female subjects.
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tendency for each group to rate the "female" stimulus either consistently higher or consistently lower than the "male" stimulus.
DISCUSSION

An important part of the process of forming impressions of others is the weight, or emphasis, given to particular traits. As Asch (1946) demonstrated, "central" traits, those which are strongly weighted, dominate the impression that we form. It was the purpose of this study to demonstrate that there would be individual differences in the weight given to a trait such as sex, a trait which previous studies have shown to prejudice subjects' impressions of others. Based on Maslow's theory (1954) of levels of self-actualization and their effect on perception, it was predicted that low self-actualizing subjects would attend more to that aspect of a person which could be labeled and classified, such as sex, in forming impressions; and that high self-actualizing subjects would be more aware of personality traits in their perceptions of others.

Results of the present study supported the hypotheses for male subjects. Low self-actualizing male subjects, following the trends found in earlier research, emphasized the sex of the stimulus person in their perceptions and rated the "male" stimulus person more favorably than the "female" stimulus person. High self-actualizing male subjects emphasized personality traits in forming
impressions. Therefore the results for male subjects support Maslow's theory of the relationship between levels of self-actualization and perception of others.

According to Maslow (1954), low self-actualizing people feel more threatened by the world than "normal" or "self-actualizing" people. They perceive the world as dangerous and therefore form impressions of people based on qualities which can be labeled or classified, especially qualities which indicate "external" signs of strength, such as prestige or dominant status. Maslow calls perception in which a label or category, such as race or sex, is emphasized "stereotyped perception":

Perceiving may be something other than the absorption or registration of the intrinsic nature of the real event. It is more often a classifying, ticketing, or labelling of the experience rather than an examination of it. . . .

For instance, it is possible in being introduced to another human being to react to him freshly, to try to understand or to perceive this individual as a unique individual, not quite like anybody else living. More often what we do, however, is to ticket or label or place the man. We place him in a category or a rubric, regard him not as a unique individual, but as an example of some concept or as a representation of a category (1954, p. 209).

Thus in "stereotyped perceiving", not only do we miss the "true reality" of the person; in using only a person's classifiable characteristics to determine our perceptions, we are very likely to be mistaken about his character.

Self-actualizing people, being more secure and less threatened by reality, are able to be more aware of the
The uniqueness of the other person. Self-actualizing people are, according to Maslow, more likely to "truly perceive" the other person. In explaining what "true perception" is, Maslow states that:

The truest contrast with rubricizing attention is probably furnished by Freud's concept of "free floating attention." Observe that Freud recommends passive rather than active attending on the grounds that active attention tends to be an imposition of a set of expectations upon the real world. Such expectations can drown out the voice of reality, if it be weak enough. Freud recommends that we be yielding, humble, passive, interested only in finding out what reality has to say to us, concerned only to allow the intrinsic structure of the material to determine that which we perceive (1954, p. 207).

For female subjects, the hypotheses were reversed. It had been predicted that low self-actualizing female subjects would follow the trends found in earlier research, in which female subjects rated the "male" significantly more favorably than the "female", and that high self-actualizing female subjects would emphasize personality traits, rather than the sex trait, in their perceptions of others. Results indicated that low self-actualizing female subjects did not emphasize the sex trait in forming impressions, whereas for high self-actualizing female subjects, sex of the stimulus person dominated the impression. An explanation of this reversal of the hypothesis for high self-actualizing female subjects may be that this group of women was more aware of the sex trait due to the influence of the women's liberation movement. A study by
Gump (1972) suggests that high self-actualizing females are more concerned with women's liberation than low self-actualizing females. One effect of women's liberation has been the consciousness-raising of women with respect to their own worth. Perhaps this new awareness of their own worth explains why the sex of the stimulus person dominated the impressions formed by high self-actualizing women, as well as why these women rated the "female" more positively than the "male". An explanation of the reversal of the hypothesis for low self-actualizing female subjects may be that these subjects rated the "male" stimulus person positively, as predicted, but also being affected by the consciousness-raising aspects of women's liberation (although less so than the high self-actualizing female subjects), rated the "female" stimulus person positively also.

Another result of the present study was that both male and female high self-actualizing subjects rated the "female" stimulus person more favorably than the "male" stimulus person. This was a reversal of the trend found in earlier research toward favoring the male. An interpretation of this reversal is suggested by Gump (1972) and Gornick (1973). Gump investigated the relationship between inner orientation and changing values (inner orientation is a characteristic of high self-actualizing subjects, Shostrom, 1966). Results of the study indicated that
women scoring high on "Inner Orientation" showed a greater change in values than women scoring high on "External Orientation". The change in values for Gump's subjects was toward achievement-oriented values. Gornick (1973), reporting on changing values among eastern college students, quotes Grete Bibring and Jerome Kagan of Harvard as observing a change in their students:

the men of the last two years seeming weary and rather passive over "success", and the women newly involved in "ego gratification" and a hard-driving interest in their work (1973, p. 62).

If the high self-actualizing subjects in the present study represent students whose values are changing, the change in values may be toward esteeming the traditional values of success and competence for women, but not for men. For men, the change in values may be toward a rejection of values of competence and success. This interpretation may account for why high self-actualizing subjects rated the "competent female" (the list of traits used in the present study, intelligent -- serious -- reserved -- tactful -- practical -- industrious, suggests a competent person) more favorably than the "competent male".

Studies by Fidell (1970) and Spence and Helmreich (1972) also found that the competent woman was rated favorably. In Fidell's study, paragraphs describing the most competent women were rated more favorably than paragraphs describing less competent women. However, subjects
rated the most competent stimulus persons slightly more favorably when told that the person was male than when told that the person was female. In Spence and Helmreich's study, both male and female subjects rated the competent female higher than the incompetent female. The authors interpreted this as indicating that the attitudes of college students are changing toward women who achieve. However, the authors point out that the experimental situation was not one which encouraged close identification with the stimulus person. Thus for female subjects the favorable attitudes toward competence may have reflected only changing attitudes toward competence in other women. For male subjects, results may have reflected changing attitudes toward competent women with whom they were not personally involved.

The results of the present study, as well as the studies discussed above, suggest a need for the development of an attitude questionnaire on changing values. Such a questionnaire would add insight into whether the trends suggested by the present study are in fact due to changing values, and if so, what the changing values are. Gump's study suggested that the changing values for women are toward achievement goals. However, her study reflects only women's attitudes towards women's values. It is also important to know whether men are also undergoing a change in values and, if so, what these changing values are. As
the present study, as well as Gump's study, has indicated, it is necessary to include a measure of individual differences when investigating changing attitudes and values, as these changes will not be true for all subjects.
CONCLUSIONS

The conclusion can be drawn from the present study that there are individual differences in level of self-actualization which are related to social perception. Results supported Maslow's theory of the relationship between level of self-actualization and forming impressions of others for male subjects. Differences in levels of self-actualization and social perception were also found for female subjects; however the relationships predicted by Maslow's theory were reversed by female subjects in the present study. Results indicated that:

1. For low self-actualizing male subjects, sex of the stimulus person dominated the impression; these subjects rated the "male" stimulus person more favorably than the "female" stimulus person.

2. High self-actualizing male subjects attended to personality traits in forming an impression; this group of subjects rated the "female" stimulus person slightly more favorably than the "male" stimulus person.

3. For low self-actualizing female subjects, sex of the stimulus person did not dominate the impression; this group of subjects also rated the "female" stimulus person slightly more favorably than the "male" stimulus person.
4. High self-actualizing female subjects emphasized sex of the stimulus person in their impressions, and rated the "female" more favorably than the "male" to an extent which approached significance.

5. The trend found in earlier research to rate the "male" stimulus person more favorably than the "female" stimulus person was reversed in the present study by low self-actualizing female subjects and by both male and female high self-actualizing subjects. This reversal suggests a change in values among college students, which future research might investigate.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY*

The Personal Orientation Inventory consists of twelve scales. Shostrom (1964) found that of the twelve scales, those which contributed most to test differences were the Time Competence, Inner-Other Orientation and Synergy scales. Two of these scales, the Time Competence and Synergy Scales, and 7 items of the Inner-Other Orientation scale were used in the present study to measure level of self-actualization. The complete Inner-Other Orientation scale was considered too long for use in the present study; therefore only the seven items of the scale which Shostrom found to differentiate most between self-actualized and non-self-actualized subjects were used.

1. Time Competence Scale - This scale measures the extent to which a person lives in the here-and-now with full awareness. The "time competent" person is less burdened by guilts and resentments from the past and less worried about future plans and goals than the "time incompetent" person. The "time competent" person's past and future orientations reflect positive mental health to the extent

*Shostrom, 1966.
that his past is used for reflective thought and the future is tied to present goals.

2. **Synergy Scale** - This scale measures a person's ability to see the opposites of life as meaningfully related. A low score indicates that one sees the opposites of life as antagonistic.

3. **Inner-Other Orientation (7 items)** - These seven items measure a person's conformity to social expectations, goals, and pressures.
APPENDIX B

PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY QUESTIONNAIRE

Our impressions of others are often related to our own feelings.

The following are some questions about your feelings and attitudes. There are no right answers, of course. The best answers are the ones you feel are true of yourself.

A. There are two statements given for each question. Circle either a or b to indicate which statement is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE of you.

B. Please try to make some answer to every question. However, if you feel that neither statement applies to you, make no answer.

1.a. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is opposed to interest in others.

b. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others.

2.a. I often feel it necessary to defend my past actions.

b. I do not feel it necessary to defend my past actions.

3.a. I feel free to not do what others expect of me.

b. I do what others expect of me.
4.a. I strive always to predict what will happen in the future.
   b. I do not feel it necessary always to predict what will happen in the future.

5.a. For me, work and play are the same.
   b. For me, work and play are opposites.

6.a. I do not have feelings of resentment about things that are past.
   b. I have feelings of resentment about things that are past.

7.a. I must justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.
   b. I need not justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.

8.a. People need not always repent their wrong-doings.
   b. People should always repent their wrong-doings.

9.a. I worry about the future.
   b. I do not worry about the future.

10.a. Kindness and ruthlessness must be opposites.
   b. Kindness and ruthlessness need not be opposites.

11.a. I prefer to use good things now.
   b. I prefer to save good things for future use.

   b. I do not always need to live by the rules and standards of society.

13.a. The truly spiritual man is sometimes sensual.
   b. The truly spiritual man is never sensual.

14.a. Living for the future is as important as living for the moment.
   b. Only living for the moment is important.
15. a. Reasons are needed to justify my feelings.
   b. Reasons are not needed to justify my feelings.

16. a. Wishing and imagining can be bad.
   b. Wishing and imagining are always good.

17. a. I spend more time preparing to live.
   b. I spend more time actually living.

18. a. I feel free to express both warm and hostile feelings to my friends.
   b. I only feel free to express warm feelings to my friends.

19. a. I have a problem in fusing sex and love.
   b. I have no problem in fusing sex and love.

20. a. Living for the future gives my life its primary meaning.
   b. Only when living for the future ties into living for the present does my life have meaning.

21. a. I follow diligently the motto, "Don't waste your time."
   b. I do not feel bound by the motto, "Don't waste your time."

22. a. What I have been in the past does not necessarily dictate the kind of person I will be.
   b. What I have been in the past dictates the kind of person I will be.

23. a. It is important to me how I live in the here and now.
   b. It is of little importance to me how I live in the here and now.

24. a. I will continue to grow best by being myself.
   b. I will continue to grow by setting my sights on a high-level, socially approved goal.
25.a. I feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.
   b. I do not feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.

26.a. I suffer from memories.
   b. I do not suffer from memories.

27.a. People should always control their anger.
   b. People should express honestly-felt anger.

28.a. I like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.
   b. I do not like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.

29.a. I like to withdraw temporarily from others.
   b. I do not like to withdraw temporarily from others.

30.a. I regret my past.
   b. I do not regret my past.

31.a. Being myself is helpful to others.
   b. Just being myself is not helpful to others.

32.a. For me, the future usually seems hopeful.
   b. For me, the future often seems hopeless.

33.a. People are both good and evil.
   b. People are not both good and evil.

34.a. My past is a stepping stone for the future.
   b. My past is a handicap to my future.

35.a. "Killing time" is a problem for me.
   b. "Killing time" is not a problem for me.
36.a. For me, past, present and future is in meaningful continuity.
   b. For me, the present is an island, unrelated to the past and future.

37.a. My hope for the future depends on having friends.
   b. My hope for the future does not depend on having friends.

38.a. I can like people without having to approve of them.
   b. I cannot like people unless I also approve of them.
APPENDIX C

ARCSIN TRANSFORMATIONS OF CHECK-LIST SCORES
USED IN THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE *

Low Self-Actualizing Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male Subjects</th>
<th>Female Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Stimulus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female Stimulus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Number</td>
<td>Check-List Arcsin Score Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject Number</strong></th>
<th><strong>Check-List Arcsin Score Transformation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Subject Number</strong></th>
<th><strong>Check-List Arcsin Score Transformation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0472</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5708</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0944</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2395</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5708</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Hald, 1952.
### High Self-Actualizing Subjects

#### Male Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Check-List Score</th>
<th>Arcsin Transformation</th>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Check-List Score</th>
<th>Arcsin Transformation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1810</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2395</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.6911</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8338</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5708</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.6467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Female Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Check-List Score</th>
<th>Arcsin Transformation</th>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Check-List Score</th>
<th>Arcsin Transformation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1810</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8338</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.9606</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1810</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1810</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0944</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0944</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.6467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>