

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF  
COLLEGE MAJOR AND SELF-CONCEPT  
TO YIELDING TO DEPENDENCY

808-7350

A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF REQUIREMENTS IN  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE  
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

BY

ROSA LEE LANDRUM WEILER

B.A.

Denton, Texas

May, 1974

## IN APPRECIATION

For their consideration and support, I wish to express appreciation to my family, Bill, Leigh, and Robin, and to my Chairman, Dr. Robert P. Littlefield. Each individual has contributed to the achievement of my goal, earning the Master of Arts degree, and to my personal growth.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	iii
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem .....	3
Research Hypotheses .....	4
Null Hypotheses .....	5
Assumption .....	6
Limitations .....	6
Specific Limitations .....	6
Definitions of Terms .....	7
Justification for the Study .....	8
Organization of Remainder of Study .....	9
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	10
Explanations of Yielding to Dependency ..	10
Norm of Social Responsibility .....	11
Norm of Reciprocity .....	12
Conformity .....	12
Choice as a Necessary Condition .....	13
Relevant Variables .....	14
Cost .....	14
Personal Characteristics .....	15
Models .....	16
Sex .....	16
Relevance of Sex Role Behavior .....	17
Literature Relevant to Majors	
Studied .....	19
Literature Relevant to Self-concept .....	20
Summary .....	21
III. METHODOLOGY .....	23
Subjects .....	23
Instrumentation .....	24
Procedures .....	26

Chapter	Page
Description of the Experimental Task..	28
Statistical Analysis .....	30
Two-way Analysis of Variance .....	31
Correlation Coefficients .....	31
IV.    RESULTS .....	33
Two-way Analysis of Variance .....	33
Correlation Coefficients .....	34
Post-experiment Questionnaire .....	36
V.    DISCUSSION .....	41
College Major .....	41
Self-concept .....	43
Dependent Measure .....	44
Significant Correlations .....	45
Implications of Findings .....	47
Recommendations For Further Study .....	48
Conclusions .....	50
REFERENCES .....	51
APPENDIXES	
A.    General Instructions .....	60
B.    Biographical Data Sheet .....	62
C.    Response to External Dependency Test, Answer Sheet, and Instructions .....	64
D.    Post-experiment Questionnaire .....	71
E.    Verbal Instructions for Raters .....	73
F.    Rating Sheet .....	76
G.    Appeal For Volunteers .....	78

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Means and Standard Deviations Of The Four Groups on REDT .....	37
2.	Two-way Analysis of Variance Using Unweighted Means Technique For REDT....	38
3.	Correlation Coefficients Between REDT And TSCS Subscale Scores .....	39
4.	Correlation Coefficients Between REDT Scores And Am Scale of OPI Scores .....	40

## CHAPTER I

### Introduction

Psychologists have long been concerned with dependency as an enduring personality trait. Clinicians emphasize the ineffectiveness of a passive-dependent adult personality (Kisker, 1964). However, most people exhibit dependent behaviors at one time or another, and in fact, many dependent behaviors are thought of in terms of social attachment and of socialization (Wiggins, 1971).

Kelly (1955) has argued that everyone is dependent and that an important question is on whom are they dependent and for what. He appears to be asking a relevant question since brief observation of social interactions, business transactions, or any number of daily activities will reveal many dependent-independent relationships of a situational nature. For instance, a worker in a factory who may be quite independent by nature must necessarily wait for his supervisor's consent before he changes assembly line procedure. Consequently the more intriguing questions to ask seem to be of what importance are personality variables of the independent person in responding to dependent requests and in what way does this dependent worker exert influence upon the supervisor.

The general purpose of this research was to study specific characteristics of independent persons in relation to their behavior directed toward dependent persons. On the basis of research already conducted, the specific variables of self-concept or self-esteem and college major seemed to be relevant ones to explore.

Although in our society we rarely think of dependency as having any elements of power or dominance, much has already been done toward answering the question of whether a dependent individual can exert any degree of influence upon an independent individual. Several studies have illustrated that, indeed, dependency, under certain conditions, can be instrumental in affecting the behavior of others (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1963, 1964; Schopler & Bateson, 1965; Midlarsky, 1968; Wheeler & Wagner, 1968; Schaps, 1972). Although these studies do little to contribute to the body of literature concerned with dependency as an enduring personality trait, they do contribute to our knowledge of situational dependency by focusing upon short-term states and situations of an external nature.

Krebs (1970) has cited evidence that externally caused dependency in an individual elicits more altruism from others than does internally caused dependency. Schopler and Matthews (1965) conducted a study to test the hypothesis that a powerful or independent person who perceives his

partner's dependence to be caused by external environmental factors will help more than a powerful person who perceives his partner's dependency to be caused by internal or personal factors. This hypothesis was supported by their findings. Horowitz (1968) found his subjects gave more help to externally dependent persons than to internally dependent persons in situations where they were not free to choose whether to help or not to help. Therefore, to study situational dependency appeared relevant.

#### Statement of the Problem

This study sought to determine whether or not females differ from one another in their reactions to dependent persons. Two independent variables, college major and self-concept, were studied. Specifically, the variable of self-concept was employed to determine whether or not the strength of this personality variable is related to female subjects' yielding to dependent persons. The variable of college major was employed to determine whether female subjects' willingness to act in accordance with the female sex-role stereotype is related to yielding to dependent persons.

The dependent measure was subjects' scores on the Response to External Dependency Test, a forced-choice instrument. Subjects were divided into four groups: nursing majors with high self-concepts, nursing majors with low

self-concepts, physical education majors with high self-concepts, and physical education majors with low self-concepts. Differences between these groups on the dependent measure were explored.

An additional purpose of the study was to compare each group's scores on the dependent measure and scores on the individual scales of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. A comparison was also made between each group's scores on the dependent measure and scores on the Altruism Scale of the Omnibus Personality Inventory.

### Hypotheses

Several hypotheses were tested in this study. They are stated in research and null form.

#### Research Hypotheses

There will be measurable differences between the four groups to be used in this study. Nursing majors with low self-concepts will yield to dependent persons more than nursing majors with high self-concepts. Both of these groups will yield to dependent persons more than physical education majors with low self-concepts, and physical education majors with low self-concepts will yield more than physical education majors with high self-concepts. There will be significant correlations between scores on the Response to External Dependency Test and other test scores.

Null Hypotheses

1. There will be no significant difference between nursing majors and physical education majors in yielding behavior as measured by the Response to External Dependency Test.
2. There will be no significant difference between high self-concept and low self-concept persons in yielding behavior as measured by the Response to External Dependency Test.
3. There will be no significant interaction effect of college major and self-concept.
4. There will be no significant correlation between subjects' yielding scores as measured by the Response to External Dependency Test and their scores on the Altruism Scale of the Omnibus Personality Inventory.
5. There will be no significant correlation between subjects' yielding scores as measured by the Response to External Dependency Test and their scores on specific scales of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

### Assumption

The general assumption of this study was that the results of a pencil and paper task is indicative of actual behavior.

### Limitations

The general limitation of this study was that no predictive statements or generalizations can be made about the total population of females. Conclusions necessarily center around whether or not college major and self-concept are related to yielding behavior in the sample of females employed and for the particular task used. Specific limitations were listed before beginning the study. These are outlined below:

#### Specific Limitations

1. If a significant correlation between the Altruism Scale of the Omnibus Personality Inventory and the Response to External Dependency Test is found, all that can be concluded is that there is a relationship between a test which has some validity data compiled for it and one that has no validity data compiled for it.
2. Potential variations among nursing majors may limit the effective use of an independent variable based on the larger field of nursing. For example, it is conceivable that a young woman planning to

be a surgical nurse would differ from one planning to be an obstetrical nurse in her response to dependent persons.

3. Subjects' reactions to taking a personality test in close conjunction with the experimental task may be evaluation apprehension.

#### Definition of Terms

Several terms utilized throughout the study either have unique meanings or have been operationally defined.

Cost: the degree of sacrifice an independent person must make in the form of fatigue, boredom, exertion of energy, or financial loss in order to yield to a dependent person (Schopler & Bateson, 1965).

Dependency: a condition in which one individual must rely upon another for his maintenance and for making decisions (Chaplin, 1968).

Dependent person: one who must rely upon another person to help him so that the outcome will benefit him, the dependent person (Schopler & Bateson, 1965).

External dependency: a state in which one person must rely upon another for an outcome of some type; this may also be referred to as situational dependency (Schopler & Bateson, 1965).

Independent person: one who decides what the outcome of a situation will be (Schopler & Bateson, 1965; Chaplin, 1968).

Self-concept: the individual's evaluation of himself; this may also be referred to as self-esteem (Chaplin, 1968).

Yielding behavior: when the independent person decides to optimize the outcome of a situation in favor of the dependent person rather than in favor of himself, he engages in yielding, helping, or altruistic behavior (Schopler & Bateson, 1965).

### Justification for the Study

While studying only two college majors was a very small beginning toward isolating differences in yielding behavior among females, the procedure did seem to be a more effective way of studying these differences than using tests which measure feminine interests. Certainly, there are varying degrees of self-concept other than high and low, but it was believed that should the study reveal a difference in yielding behavior between these two groups, a beginning would be made toward explaining yielding behavior in terms of personality variables rather than solely in terms of social norms, especially in regards to females.

If the finding of this study was that females respond differently among themselves to dependent persons, a contribution to the literature concerned with altruistic behavior would be made, for the more one knows about all facets of dependency and yielding behavior, the more one

can understand what occurs in any particular relationship involving external dependency. The more one knows about the characteristics of the yielder, the more nearly prepared one is to predict and to solve problems that may arise because of the influence of dependency. For example, applications of this study's findings might be made in therapeutic, marital, or co-worker relationships, for the influence of dependency raises questions as to whether manipulation of the more independent person in any dyadic relationship occurs through this mode with both partners being quite unaware of what is occurring.

#### Organization of Remainder of Study

Chapter II consists of a review of the literature relevant to yielding to dependency. Chapter III includes the methods and procedures used in the proposed study and the statistical methods used in analyzing the data. Chapter IV includes the results. Chapter V consists of a discussion of the results, the implications, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.

## CHAPTER II

### Review of Literature

The review of literature is divided into 1) major studies seeking to provide explanations for yielding to dependency, 2) studies concerned with a necessary condition for yielding behavior, 3) studies dealing with variables which have been found to be relevant to yielding, and 4) literature relevant to the independent variables to be studied.

#### Explanations of Yielding to Dependency

There is considerable evidence to lend support to Schopler's apropos phrase, "the power of dependency" (1965), yet, to date there seems to be no conclusive statement as to why an independent person yields to a dependent person. Thibaut and Kelley (1967) have suggested that a norm may be viewed as exerting power because the predicament of the dependent person creates a range of outcomes through which the powerful person can be moved. Refusing to help the dependent person would cause the individual to experience guilt and anxiety because he deviated from an important social norm.

### Norm of Social Responsibility

Specifically, many researchers rely upon the norm of social responsibility as a basic explanation for a dependent person's influence upon a more powerful individual. It is because of this norm that the powerful individual takes responsibility for the dependent person and makes the outcome better for him by yielding to him (Schopler & Bateson, 1965).

Berkowitz and Daniels (1963) believed that the perception of a dependency relationship presumably aroused feelings of responsibility to dependent persons which resulted in a heightened willingness to help them achieve their goals. In a later study Berkowitz and Daniels (1964) suggested that a prior help treatment may have heightened subjects' awareness of the social responsibility norm.

Berkowitz and Conner (1966) considered help given to a dependent person to be a special case of conformity to a social responsibility norm, but they found that subjects who had been exposed to prior frustrations were less willing to conform to this norm than those who had prior success experiences. Schaps (1972), in discussing the results of his study with shoe salesmen, also relied upon the social responsibility norm as an explanation for the salesmen's helping behavior.

### Norm of Reciprocity

Other researchers rely upon the norm of reciprocity to explain yielding to dependency. Homans (1961) has argued that social relationships are governed by a desire for distributive justice; i. e., a person wants not only as much from a relationship as he gives, but also, as much as he believes he deserves. Gouldner (1960) has said that the norm of reciprocity, one he believes to be universal, requires people to help those who have helped them.

Berkowitz and Friedman (1967) found that adolescent members of the entrepreneurial middle class were more likely to act in accordance with the norm of reciprocity than were adolescent members of the bureaucratic middle class or adolescent members of the working class in their helping behavior. Goranson and Berkowitz (1966) found subjects who had been refused prior help to be less willing to work for this refusing person when he became a dependent supervisor.

### Conformity

While Berkowitz, Klanderman, and Harris (1964) relied upon both social responsibility and reciprocity norms as an explanation for their subjects' helping behavior, they also suggested that in actual social interaction, the actions of other people around the individual being asked to help another can affect the probability of his acting in an

altruistic manner. This is supported by the experiments which involved the use of models to be discussed later, but for the present, it raises the question of whether or not conformity to many norms is a possible explanation for altruistic behavior. Similarly, this raises the question of whether or not need states present within the independent person are possible explanations for altruistic behavior.

Conformity is too complicated a behavior to thoroughly discuss here, for it necessarily must be discussed in terms of many norms or standards. The ambiguity of the situation, tolerance for ambiguity present within the individual, and the degree of conflict arising from deciding between goals or behaviors are only a few of the factors which affect conformity (Walker & Heyns, 1962). In other words, much may depend upon the specific factors involved in each experimental situation when one is faced with deciding to which norm the subject is conforming. In conjunction with this, one must necessarily raise the question of whether or not the degree of particular needs or of specific personality traits present in the individual are the more basic cause of the response he makes toward dependent persons which is in accordance with any particular norm.

#### Choice as a Necessary Condition

Whatever the appropriate explanation for altruistic behavior, a necessary condition for this behavior's

occurrence appears to be choice. Horowitz (1968) found that his subjects gave more help to dependent persons under high-choice than under no-choice conditions. Brehm (1966) has stated that the social responsibility norm dictates that help be given, yet if one has little choice but to help, he will be less helpful than he would if he has a choice.

In the present study, even though the experimental task is a forced choice instrument, subjects were allowed to choose whether to help or not to help. Other measures taken to insure subjects freedom to choose included the use of females as dependent persons, the use of suggestions that the independent and dependent persons are equal in status outside of the external dependency situation, and the use of anonymity.

### Relevant Variables

There are a number of variables which previous research has shown to be relevant to this type of study. A concerted effort was made to control as many of these variables as possible.

#### Cost

Cost or the degree of sacrifice a powerful person must make in the form of fatigue, boredom, exertion of energy, or financial loss in order to yield to a dependent person has

been shown to be an important consideration. Several studies (Schopler & Bateson, 1965; Wagner & Wheeler, 1969; Schaps, 1972) revealed that a person in power will yield more to a dependent person when the costs involved are low. Generally, as the costs incurred increase, helping behavior decreases.

### Personal Characteristics

There is some evidence that personal characteristics of the dependent person influence the helping behavior of the powerful person. Daniels and Berkowitz (1963) found that subjects with a relatively strong liking for the person whose chances for goal attainment depended upon their productivity expended greater effort on behalf of this person than did subjects who had less liking for the dependent peer. Feldman (1968) found subjects less willing to help foreigners in Paris and Boston than compatriots but more willing to help foreigners in Athens than compatriots. This suggests that personal characteristics of the dependent person are important, but it also suggests that cultural variations occurring within subjects may exert an influence upon their altruism. Bryan and Test (1967) found subjects less willing to contribute money to a Negro solicitor than to a Caucasian solicitor. The present study used as far as possible neutral stimuli in an effort to control for negative reactions to the dependent persons.

### Models

The use of helping models in studies of altruism is another variable. Helping behaviors are increased through observation of others' helpfulness (Bryan & Test, 1967; Hornstein, Fisch & Holmes, 1968; Wagner & Wheeler, 1969). To control this variable in the present study, models were not employed.

### Sex

Another relevant consideration pertaining to yielding is the sex of the yielder. Schopler and Bateson (1965) demonstrated in three experiments that an interaction effect between sex and dependency was significant. Females yielded more when their partner was highly dependent than when he was less dependent while the reverse was true of males.

Walker and Heyns (1962) cited an experiment in which subjects believed that they were competing on an encoding task. Female subjects responded to partners' requests to slow down, but male subjects did not.

Earlier studies of Berkowitz and Daniels (1964) failed to obtain a sex effect. In a later study (1967) a series of experiments was conducted by the same researchers in which the final study found a sex difference. Schopler (1967) also confirmed again the hypothesis that males would yield less than females to dependent persons. In fact, under

pressure for more help, males decreased their yielding behavior while females increased their yielding behavior.

In Gruder and Cook's study (1971), dependency, sex of the potential helper, and sex of the dependent person were all varied factorially, and an interaction of dependency and sex of the dependent person was obtained. Dependency made no difference in the help given to males, but females who were dependent received significantly more help than females who were not dependent, and they also received marginally more help than males who were dependent.

Gruder and Cook's results suggest that any investigator wishing to study the influence of dependency needs to be aware of the possible effect of the sex of the dependent person. On the other hand, Wyer and Malinowski (1972) have stated that females may try to retain a nondominant role by behaving altruistically in order to behave consistently with social role expectations. However, the present study has dealt with both of these possibilities by using only females as dependent persons and by acknowledging that the result may have been an increase in total yielding scores, but that this increase was balanced across subjects.

#### Relevance of Sex-Role Behavior

Since so much of the literature containing results with sex differences in helping behavior involves explanations of sex-role behavior differences, it is relevant to review some

of the current literature concerning sex roles. Sex roles conform, in general, to the influence of society (Hartley, 1970). They vary widely in different times and different cultures, (Marmor, 1971) so that differences can hardly be attributed solely to biological attributes. It is the roles built around the biological distinction of sex that makes maleness and femaleness matters of degree (Brown, 1965).

There appears, however, to be an agreement among psychologists concerning the general patterns of behavior of males and females. Lindgren (1969) has supplied a typical description. Males are apparently more adventurous, aggressive, interested in violence, and task-oriented, whereas females are usually more cautious, accepting, passive, interested in initiating and maintaining social contacts, unwilling to behave negatively toward others, and inclined to evoke positive responses from others.

Paul Rosenkrantz and his colleagues (1968) found submissiveness to be among the traits designated as being characteristic of females. From birth parents raise children in accordance with this popular stereotype. Girls are rewarded for being passive and dependent (Mischel, 1971; McNeil, 1973). By the time they reach adulthood, they accept this stereotype themselves.

Though slowly, we are changing our views of women's roles, as well as our conceptualizations concerning feminine

behavior in our society. Today women behave in many different ways. It was with this in mind that this researcher accepted Schopler's challenge (1967) and sought to answer his question of under what conditions will females react differently to dependent persons. Studying the college major of females seemed to be a logical approach to discovering females' orientation toward behaving in accordance with the female sex-role stereotype.

#### Literature Relevant to Majors Studied

According to Wilson (1971), a great deal of emphasis is placed upon nurturing and mothering in the nursing profession. Mauksch (1965) has stated that the hospital is the last remaining example of the nineteenth century relationship between men and women. Schools of nursing, according to Wilson (1971), endorse the subservient concept that doctors, generally male, are better than nurses, generally female.

Duggan (1937) found physical education majors to differ significantly from non-majors in their patterns of interests allied with work, recreation, and social relationships. The majors preferred exciting, vigorous, competitive, outdoor activities both in work and in recreation, while the non-majors preferred activities of a quieter, slower, non-competitive, and indoor nature. This same orientation was

reflected in their reactions to characteristics of people. Apparently, there was some justification for expecting nursing majors as a group to be measurably different from physical education majors as a group in some of their behaviors.

### Literature Relevant to Self-Concept

The remaining independent variable studied in the present study is self-concept. Generally, self-concept or self-esteem is defined as the individual's evaluation of himself (Chaplin, 1968). Fitts (1965) has stated that the individual's concept of himself has been demonstrated to be highly influential in much of his behavior. Similarly, Thompson (1972) in summing up his report on numerous studies concerning the self-concept has stated that this construct is an index of many aspects of personality and behavior.

Cohen (1968) has said that the self-concept affects one's interactions with others and that persons with high self-esteem may be less susceptible to influence or to others' expectations. Even though dependency does exert influence upon a more powerful individual and even if altruistic behavior is directed to the dependent person because of some societal norm, rather than because of the independent person's personality traits, it seemed as though one could expect those individuals with a favorable self-concept

to differ in their behavior from those with an unfavorable self-concept.

### Summary

From the review of literature concerned with situational dependency it can be seen that there are a number of relevant variables which relate to yielding to dependent persons. Cost incurred, sex of the helper, sex of the dependent person, presence of a helping model, presence of choice, and the personal characteristics of the dependent person are of demonstrable importance.

It is apparent, too, that, despite numerous studies, there is still some degree of controversy over the basic explanation concerning the occurrence of yielding behavior. Most studies rely upon the social responsibility and reciprocity norms for explanations of yielding behavior. While either of these explanations seem valid, it is also conceivable that there may be specific characteristics which prompt an individual to respond in accordance with any particular norm. Thus, this study sought to determine whether or not the personality variable of self-concept is related to the yielding behavior of females.

There is also some degree of controversy over whether or not the sex of the yielder is actually of any importance.

This study did not seek to deal with the controversy concerning sex differences. Instead, this study sought to determine if there are differences among females in their responses to dependency.

This review of the literature on the influence of dependency and the variables relevant to yielding reveals that the topic has already received considerable attention. Beneficial knowledge may have been obtained, however, from investigating differences among females through studying self-concept and college major.

## CHAPTER III

### Methodology

The present study investigated the relationship of college major and self-concept to yielding to dependency. The techniques employed to collect and analyze the data are presented in this chapter.

#### Subjects

Subjects included 56 female undergraduate nursing majors and 56 female undergraduate physical education majors between the ages of 17 and 24 years. All nursing majors were volunteers from Texas Woman's University. All physical education majors were volunteers from Texas Woman's University and North Texas State University. Racial balance was not crucial in this study since the race of the dependent person was not identified.

Volunteers were tested and subsequently divided into four groups: Group One, 29 nursing majors with high self-concepts, Group two, 27 nursing majors with low self-concepts, Group Three, 22 physical education majors with high self-concepts, and Group Four, 34 physical education majors with low self-concepts.

While soliciting volunteers did not allow for a completely random selection of subjects, all volunteers obtained were used as subjects except for two individuals whose majors did not fit the criteria, one individual who responded after the deadline, two individuals who did not complete all tests as instructed, and one individual whose Total Positive score was suspect because it was extremely high and was accompanied with a Self Criticism subscale score two standard deviations below the mean of the TSCS norm group. All volunteers received the same appeal (Appendix G), instructions, and treatment.

### Instrumentation

The Total Positive score of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) was used to determine the level of the independent variable, self-concept. The TSCS has been standardized on a broad sample of 626 people (Fitts, 1965), and Bentler (1972) has stated that the norms are adequate. Retest reliabilities are generally in the high .80's (Bentler, 1972), and Crites (1965) has stated that the TSCS validity data are promising. Vacchiano and Strauss (1968) in studying the construct validity of the TSCS concluded that the instrument does provide a measure of self-concept when all factors are considered together. Vincent (1968) has reported similarity in construct definition and validity for some of

the individual scales of the TSCS and those of other personality inventories. One drawback concerning the use of the TSCS was reported by Greenburg and Frank (1965), who found evidence of response sets. This is usually a possible risk when using any test of this nature. Suinn (1972) has stated, however, that the TSCS ranks among the better measures which combine scales to yield self-concept information.

The Altruism (Am) scale of the Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI) Form F was correlated with yielding scores on the experimental task, the Response to External Dependency Test (REDT), to determine if there is a relationship between the two instruments, one having some validity data compiled on it and the other having no validity data. Siegel (1970) has stated that the OPI is most appropriately regarded as a research instrument. Norms for the scales of the OPI are based on 2,390 freshmen who were attending the University of California and San Francisco College. Kuder-Richardson reliabilities range from .71 to .93 (Wallen, 1970). Although the reported correlations between the Am scale and other test scales which measure apparent similar constructs are only in the moderate range (Heist & Yonge, 1968), the relative newness of this scale is an advantage. For instance, the A-S Reaction Study (Allport & Allport, 1939) would be a more useful instrument to employ here, but the content and relevant statistical data are quite old.

## Procedures

Instructors and professors of physical education classes for majors and psychology and philosophy classes largely filled with nursing majors were asked to read the same announcement in order to solicit volunteers (Appendix G). All testing of volunteers from both groups, nursing and physical education majors, occurred within a three-week interval. Volunteers took all the necessary tests at one sitting which required no longer than one hour for any subject.

The subjects were told that the experimenter was conducting research which concerned the field of social psychology and that the experimenter was only interested in how different groups of people react in certain situations (Appendix A). They were assured that they would not be identified other than by number unless they chose to be, nor would they be studied independently or judged in any way. They were encouraged to perform as honestly and as accurately in accordance with their own individual experiences as they possibly could to insure accurate data collection within each group.

Subjects were given the opportunity to sign their names on a separate sheet of paper with their assigned numbers if they desired feedback on either the tests or the experimental results (Appendix A). Other than this feedback,

no remuneration was offered to them. The researcher did not refer to these signed papers until after the results of the study were compiled.

Subjects first filled out a short biographical data sheet (Appendix B). Next they did the experimental task and then took the TSCS and the Am scale of the OPI in that order. It is believed that this order served to reduce the biasing effects of evaluation apprehension, for if subjects had already done the experimental task before taking tests that obviously have something to do with personality, they would be more likely to make their decisions on the basis of what they feel they would actually do rather than on the basis of what would make them appear more favorable. Since fine distinctions were not made on the basis of these personality tests other than to divide subjects into high and low self-concept groups, and since the tests have, to some extent, built-in controls, faking on these tests in this case was not as crucial as it was on the experimental task.

After all volunteers completed the tests, including the experimental task, the researcher scored the tests and divided subjects into groups. The mean of the TSCS norm group's Total Positive scores is 345.57, and this was used as the division point between high and low self-concepts.

### Description of the Experimental Task

The task, the Response to External Dependency Test (REDT), is a battery of 15 hypothetical situations involving females in which subjects are asked to choose by indicating in the appropriate blank of an answer sheet whether they will yield to the dependent person or whether they will decide in favor of themselves (Appendix C). Written instructions were attached on the front of the booklet, and these directed subjects to refrain from turning to the back of the booklet before finishing the task. The last page was a postexperiment questionnaire which subjects answered with either yes or no (Appendix D). Its purpose was to determine if subjects experienced deciding in favor of the hypothetical persons as being similar to what they would actually do if the situations were real.

The situations used in the REDT were originated by the experimenter from making observations of actual situations in which one could either choose to optimize an outcome for a dependent person or for oneself. It seemed feasible to use previously observed situations or variations of these to devise a pencil and paper task of a forced-choice nature. The experimenter administered a preliminary set of 26 situations to 15 female undergraduate Developmental Psychology students during the spring semester of 1973 and conducted individual post interviews in which each student was given

the opportunity to state her reactions to the situations. Although the general reaction of the participating students to this type of task was favorable, all stated that the variations in cost from situation to situation influenced their decisions and that in cases where the cost was neither too high or too low, they had to engage in some degree of deliberation with themselves before making a decision. Consequently, a condition of moderate cost was selected in an effort to obtain responses from subjects which might be indicative of yielding or not yielding on some other basis than degree of cost involved.

In an effort to hold cost constant at a moderate level, the hypothetical situations used in the proposed study were selected in the following manner. Forty-three situations were presented to a group of 30 undergraduate female students ranging in age from 17 to 37 years, the majority being under age 24. These students were enrolled in an undergraduate Social Psychology class at Texas Woman's University during the second summer term of 1973, and they were asked to participate in the development of an instrument that is relevant to research in social psychology. They were then asked to pretend that they had already decided in favor of the other individual in each situation and to rate the cost involved in yielding to the other person. Verbal instructions were given which contained an explanation of what is meant by

cost (Appendix E), as well as an explanation of the numerical scale they used.

After a 17-day interval, the same students again read and rated the situations using the same instructions. The experimenter computed a reliability coefficient for those situations judged to be of moderate cost by the raters, and those situations with a coefficient of .55 and above were used as the experimental task in the present study. Situations judged to be of high and low cost were dropped entirely.

It is expected that the error term in the statistical analysis controlled for the effect of differences in the situations not related to cost and of differences in the reactions of subjects to any cues contained within these. As far as possible, the situations were kept neutral in their content, so that subjects would not attribute negative characteristics to the females in the situations. Authority figures were not used in order to provide subjects a choice, and females were used as the dependent persons in an effort to limit the possibility of female subjects yielding purely on the basis of the prevalence of male dominance in our society.

#### Statistical Analysis

The two independent variables in this study were college major and self-concept. The dependent measure was scores on

the REDT. Two statistics employed were two-way analysis of variance and correlation coefficients.

### Two-way Analysis of Variance

Answers to the hypothetical situations which favored the dependent persons were scored as one point. Answers which favored the subjects were scored as zero. A total yielding score was computed for each subject. A two-way analysis of variance with independent groups was then used to compare the difference in the effects of the two levels of each of the two independent variables upon the dependent variable. The unweighted means technique was used to deal with unequal cell sizes. The .05 level of significance was used, and the significance of the difference between the groups was determined by means of the F test.

### Correlation Coefficients

A simple correlation was computed to determine the relationship between yielding scores and scores on the Am scale of the OPI. Correlations were computed for each individual scale score on the TSCS and the yielding scores of each of the four groups in an effort to determine post-experimentally if there are other personality variables which might be fruitful to study in future research. For the same reason, correlations were computed using individual

scale scores of the TSCS and the yielding scores of all nursing majors together and all physical education majors together.

## CHAPTER IV

### Results

The results of this study may be generalized to a restricted population of female nursing and physical education majors between the ages of 17 and 24 years of age. In general, the results of this study are largely non-significant. The potential range for scores on the REDT is zero through 15, and the means and standard deviations reflected little difference among the four groups as can be seen in Table 1.

Subjects' Total Positive scores on the TSCS ranged from 351 to 400 among nursing majors with high self-concepts and from 260 to 344 for those with low self-concepts. For physical education majors with high self-concepts, scores ranged from 346 to 396 and from 265 to 344 for those with low self-concepts.

#### Two-way Analysis of Variance

A two-way analysis of variance (College Major X Self-concept) using the unweighted means technique for unequal cell sizes was computed with subjects' scores on the REDT. No significant main effects for the two independent variables were found, for a comparison of the computed F ratio of

.1581 for the variable, college major, and the table value revealed a non-significant difference ( $F=3.936$ ,  $df=1,108$ ,  $p < .05$ ), as did a comparison of the computed F ratio of .0909 for the variable, self-concept ( $F=3.936$ ,  $df=1,108$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The college major and self-concept variables did not reveal a significant interaction effect, for a comparison of the computed F ratio of 1.6170 to the table value reveals a non-significant effect ( $F=3.936$ ,  $df=1,108$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Table 2 summarizes the results of the two-way analysis of variance.

The results of the analysis of variance may be interpreted in this manner. In this study, college major, self-concept, or the interaction of these two variables did not significantly affect yielding to dependency as measured by the REDT, and no significant differences occurred between the four groups studied. These non-significant findings made it unnecessary to employ a test of differences between means.

### Correlation Coefficients

Using subjects' scores on the subscales of the TSCS and on the REDT, 66 correlation coefficients were computed. Table 3 summarizes these findings which were in most cases non-significant. However, there were seven significant correlation coefficients.

The Self Criticism subscale was significantly correlated most frequently with REDT scores. A  $-.4796$  correlation

between nursing majors with high self-concepts scores on the Self Criticism subscale and the REDT was significant (Pearson's  $r=.3557$ ,  $df=27$ ,  $p < .05$ ), as was a  $-.4580$  correlation between these same variables for physical education majors with low self-concepts (Pearson's  $r=.3395$ ,  $df=32$ ,  $p < .05$ ). When all nursing majors' scores were considered, a  $-.3065$  correlation was found to be significant (Pearson's  $r=.2639$ ,  $df=54$ ,  $p < .05$ ), as was the  $-.3648$  correlation found when all physical education majors' scores were considered (Pearson's  $r=.2639$ ,  $df=54$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Although these correlations are significant and appear to indicate a negative relationship between the variables, which is in accordance with what was expected, it should be noted that these fall into a range designated as moderate to slight (Turney & Robb, 1968).

A significant  $-.4716$  correlation between REDT scores and Total Conflict scores on the TSCS was found for nursing majors with high self-concepts (Pearson's  $r=.3557$ ,  $df=27$ ,  $p < .05$ ). A significant  $.4480$  correlation between REDT scores and Total Variability scores on the TSCS was found for nursing majors with low self-concepts (Pearson's  $r=.3809$ ,  $df=25$ ,  $p < .05$ ). A significant  $.3623$  correlation between Personal Self subscale scores and REDT scores for physical education majors with low self-concepts was obtained, also (Pearson's  $r=.3395$ ,  $df=32$ ,  $p < .05$ ). While these correlations are significant, these also reveal only a moderate to slight degree

of relationship between the two variables being considered in each case.

Subjects' scores on the Am scale of the OPI were correlated with their REDT scores. Correlations were computed for each of the four groups and for all subjects combined. No significant correlations were found as can be seen in Table 4, so that there appears to be no significant relationship between subjects' responses to a test with some validity data already compiled on it, the Am scale of the OPI, and one which has no validity data compiled on it, the REDT.

#### Post-experiment Questionnaire

On the dichotomous post-experiment questionnaire, 107 subjects answered yes and five answered no. Breaking this into group percentages, it was found that 96.6% of the nursing majors with high self-concepts said that they answered the REDT according to how they would actually behave if they encountered real situations in which only the given alternatives were available. Answering in this manner also were 100% of the nursing majors with low self-concepts, 90.9% of the physical education majors with high self-concepts, and 94.1% of the physical education majors with low self-concepts.

TABLE 1

Means and Standard Deviations Of The Four Groups On REDT

Groups	$\bar{X}$	SD
Nursing Majors With High Self-concepts	10.0345	2.4854
Nursing Majors With Low Self-concepts	9.5926	2.3739
Physical Education Majors With High Self-concepts	9.6364	2.3000
Physical Education Majors With Low Self-concepts	10.3529	2.3469

TABLE 2  
Two-way Analysis of Variance Using Unweighted  
Means Technique For REDT

Source	df	MS	F
College Major	1	.8963	.1581 N S
Self-concept	1	.5154	.0909 N S
Interaction	1	9.1679	1.6170 N S
Within	108	5.6698	

P < .05

TABLE 3

Correlation Coefficients Between REDT And TSCS Subscale Scores

Groups	1**	2**	3**	4**	5**	6**	7**	8**	9**	10**	11**
Nursing Majors With High Self-concepts	-.4796*	-.2403	.2150	-.1503	-.1183	.0955	-.2082	.1966	-.1393	-.0272	-.4716*
Nursing Majors With Low Self-concepts	-.0756	.0803	-.2085	-.0526	.0503	-.0667	-.1435	-.1132	.0460	.4480*	.2753
All Nursing Majors	-.3065*	.0146	.0660	-.0025	.0325	.0644	-.0613	.0874	.0230	.1942	-.0906
Physical Education Majors With High Self-concepts	-.3708	.0710	.0232	-.1016	-.3441	.1552	-.0013	.1161	.0689	-.0310	-.1611
Physical Education Majors With Low Self-concepts	-.4580*	.1948	.1863	.3116	.2068	.0759	.3623*	.1416	.1641	-.2175	-.2328
All Physical Education Majors	-.3648*	-.0053	-.0265	-.0031	-.1104	-.0278	.0774	-.0096	.0015	-.1273	-.1823

\* P &lt; .05.

\*\* 1. Self-Criticism; 2. Identity; 3. Self Satisfaction; 4. Behavior; 5. Physical Self; 6. Moral-Ethical Self; 7. Personal Self; 8. Family Self; 9. Social Self; 10. Total Variability; 11. Total Conflict

TABLE 4  
 Correlation Coefficients Between REDT  
 Scores And Am Scale Of OPI Scores

Groups	df	r
Nursing Majors With High Self-concepts	27	-.0204
Nursing Majors With Low Self-concepts	25	-.0902
Physical Education Majors With High Self-concepts	20	.3215
Physical Education Majors With Low Self-concepts	32	.2203
All subjects	110	.1015

P > .05

## CHAPTER V

### Discussion

There are a number of reasons why the analysis of variance findings may have been non-significant. In explaining these, the researcher will discuss the two independent variables, the possible reasons why these were not maximized, and the REDT, the instrument used to measure the dependent variable. A brief discussion will follow on the significant correlations obtained, the implications of the findings of the study, the recommendations for further study, and finally, the conclusions.

#### College Major

In explaining the sex differences they found in yielding behavior, Schopler and Bateson (1965) depended heavily upon sex-role behavior. The findings of the present study appear, in one respect, incompatible with this explanation. If sex-role behavior were the correct explanation for differences among males and females in yielding behavior, it would seem that the females pursuing vigorous and active careers in the field of physical education would differ in their yielding responses from those pursuing careers in nursing. Since they did not, the assumption that variations from the

stereotype of the feminine sex role actually affects yielding behavior may be invalid. For the same reason, the present study's findings may support Gruder and Cook's conclusions that sex differences in previous research were probably due to the sex of the person receiving help rather than to the sex of the person giving it (1971).

On the other hand, the two majors used in the present study may not be polar orientations. Individuals who plan a teaching career in physical education, despite their interests in sports and physical activity generally viewed as masculine, were as altruistically inclined as those who plan a nursing career. Perhaps, both majors are help oriented, but even if this is the case, differences among these individuals were still present because of the introduction of a second independent variable, self-concept. For example, nursing majors with high self-concepts differed, at least descriptively, from physical education majors with low self-concepts. Therefore, the failure to find significant differences between individuals who differ from one another on at least one dimension suggests that Schopler and Bateson's (1965) explanation of sex role behavior is possibly appropriate.

One can readily see, then, that there are two ways to view the findings concerning the independent variable, college major. Either the two majors studied are too similar

to isolate differences among females, or females, in fact, do not differ in their yielding behavior.

### Self-concept

In the present study there were no significant differences between individuals with high and low self-concepts in yielding behavior. The original assumption was that high self-concept individuals would yield less because of a greater self-assurance. In view of the analysis of variance results, the obvious conclusion is that this was an invalid assumption. However, when one considers that significant negative correlations were obtained between scores on the REDT and the Self Criticism scale of the TSCS, drawing this conclusion appears precipitate. High scores on this scale generally are indicative of a normal, healthy openness and capacity for self-criticism (Fitts, 1965). Thus, a negative correlation between these two variables, although a moderate one, is necessarily interpreted as meaning that there is a relationship between individuals having enough self-assurance to look at themselves honestly and their having low yielding scores. On the other hand, there is a relationship between individuals having low scores which range toward defensiveness and their having high yielding scores.

There are other reasons for looking at the non-significant findings skeptically. Primarily, this occurs because

of the fact that the Self Criticism scale score is not a part of the Total Positive score used to divide subjects into groups, so that its influence is not a part of the ANOVA findings. The Total Positive score is a result of many variables being combined, so that using such a global score as an independent variable may be misleading.

Secondly, the original assumption is in line with Krebs and Whitten's findings (1972). Their subjects who had been exposed to a prior condition of failure donated more money than those who were exposed to a prior success condition. They concluded that subjects who had negative images of themselves may have felt ashamed and used altruistic opportunities to present more favorable images. These researchers also suggest that while dependency may serve as an influence strategy, there is a more basic power in giving help. In other words, helping is often a means of establishing status and power.

#### The Dependent Measure

Because of the divergent explanations which present themselves in looking at the results in terms of the independent variables, attention is necessarily turned toward the REDT. The instrument appears to have face validity, and participants were assured privacy. Still, in any instrument of this nature, the problem of self-report exists and subjects may have found it simpler to say they would yield in

a forced-choice situation and feel positive about themselves in doing so than not to yield. After all, no one was going to put them in a real situation and force them to behave in accordance with their answers, so that they may have had nothing to lose in yielding on a pencil and paper task. Thus, the fact that so many answered in the affirmative on the post-experiment questionnaire may provide little or no information. Consequently, the instrument may not have been the most effective discriminator between highly yielding and less yielding individuals that could have been used. The ANOVA findings may reflect the ineffectiveness of the REDT to some degree.

It should be pointed out, however, that there are reasons to believe that the REDT was a useful experimental task. If one places subjects in a real laboratory situation under the auspices of a university department, it is possible that subjects could be influenced by their apprehension over being observed and evaluated. In other words, they might perceive social pressure to help that does not actually exist. Although the pencil and paper task is in a sense only a role-playing situation, it does not seem that taking the REDT would arouse as much of this type of apprehension as a real situation would.

#### Significant Correlations

Three other significant correlations were obtained which have not been discussed as yet. The fact that a moderate,

negative relationship existed in this study between the scores on the REDT and Total Conflict scores on the TSCS for nursing majors with high self-concepts appears to add to the evidence that the Total Positive score on the TSCS is too global for use in applying an independent variable. High Total Conflict scores indicate confusion, contradiction, and general conflict in self perception, and they are not part of the Total Positive score (Fitts, 1965). Consequently, if a negative relationship exists, this means that as confusion and conflict in self perception rises, yielding scores may be lowered for nursing majors with high self-concepts. While these individuals' high self-concepts apparently did not affect their REDT scores, one wonders if other factors might have if these had been considered in the ANOVA.

A slight positive correlation between scores on the REDT and the Total Variability scores on the TSCS for nursing majors with low self-concepts may support this view, too, as does the slight positive correlation between scores on the REDT and scores on the Personal Self subscale of the TSCS for physical education majors with low self-concepts. Total Variability scores provide a measure of the amount of inconsistency from one area of self perception to another, while the Personal Self score reflects an individual's sense of personal worth and his evaluation of his personality apart from his body or his relationship to others (Fitts, 1965).

The Total Variability score is not a part of the Total Positive score. The Personal Self score is included in the Total Positive score, but its influence on the ANOVA is probably overpowered by its combination with other scales.

As can be seen, there are a number of factors which may have affected the findings of this study. One last factor should be mentioned. There is the possibility that samples from a restricted population of females may differ from a completely random sample drawn from the total population of females.

#### Implications of Findings

Despite the foregoing discussion, the results of the present study, taken as they are, carry with them several implications. Although caution must be used in generalizing the finding concerning a restricted population to a larger population of females, the implication is that females in this study were influenced by dependency. A possible ramification of this tendency is that these individuals could be influenced by feigned dependency. If they successfully fulfill their career plans to become nurses and physical education teachers, they will work with people daily who will be their patients or students and who will by the nature of the situation be dependent upon them. If a decision is to be made in the interest of their patients or students, they

may not make the best decision because of yielding to patients' or students' requests which may not be in their best interest. If they should become supervisors, their decisions may be based upon the dependency of individuals they supervise; it is conceivable that their effectiveness as decision-makers could be undermined by employees' strategy of dependency.

Not only are there larger social implications for these findings, but these appear to have personal implications for the individuals studied. The findings appear to support Adams' stance (1971). She believes that women subordinate their individual needs in order to provide for others' needs. In doing so, Adams believes, they prevent the occurrence of changes for the better that they could make in the social order. She states that women need to examine the "...psychological contribution they make to the collusive pattern that ... perverts their judgment" (Adams, 1971, p. 72). Indeed, it appears that women need to be aware of the influence of dependency upon them.

#### Recommendations For Further Study

The recommendations for further study may be divided into three areas. These are: 1) those pertaining to the experimental task, 2) those pertaining to the types of subjects to be used, and 3) those pertaining to independent variables.

### Experimental Task

1. Research needs to be done which places females in an actual situation in which they must choose to yield or not yield.
2. An item analysis using all of the original REDT situations needs to be done on the responses of a large random sample. It may be that this would be a better way to select items which will discriminate between high and low yielders than the rater method. Then, research could be done using the items selected in this manner as the experimental task.

### Selection of Subjects

1. Research needs to be done using the REDT in which there are an equal number of males and females chosen by random sampling.
2. Research needs to be done using females with many different college majors rather than only the two used in the present study.

### Other Possible Independent Variables

1. Research needs to be done using a more effective way to measure females' willingness to act in accordance with the feminine sex-role stereotype than college major.

2. Research needs to be done using several of the TSCS subscale scores in an ANOVA, particularly the Self Criticism score.
3. Age of females may be a relevant independent variable for further study.
4. In a study using males and females as subjects and as dependent persons in the REDT, the two independent variables could be sex of the helper and sex of the dependent person.

### Conclusions

Taking into account all of the factors that possibly influenced this study, one may still assert that on the experimental task with the restricted population of females used, participants were found to react very similarly to dependent persons. Perhaps, the major reason for this is the sex-role behavior females are taught through the socialization process. If this be the case, this researcher is inclined to agree with Adams' call for an assessment of which of the feminine characteristics have useful social ends (1971). However, as Krebs and Whitten (1972) have stated, as yet most of the research on altruistic behavior has failed to appraise the motives of its subjects.

## REFERENCES

## References

- Adams, M. The compassion trap. Psychology Today, 1971, 5, 70-72, 100-103.
- Allport, G. & Allport, F. The A-S reaction study manual. Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1939, 2-16.
- Bentler, P. Tennessee self concept scale. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), The seventh mental measurements yearbook. New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1972, 366-367.
- Berkowitz, L. Effects of perceived dependency relationships upon conformity to group expectations. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 350-354.
- Berkowitz, L. Judgemental standards in situational and sex differences in helping behavior. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D. C., September, 1967.
- Berkowitz, L. & Connor, W. Success, failure, and social responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 664-669.
- Berkowitz, L. & Daniels, L. Responsibility and dependency. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 429-436.
- Berkowitz, L. & Daniels, L. Affecting the salience of the social responsibility norm: effects of past help on

- the response to dependency relationship. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 275-281.
- Berkowitz, L. & Friedman, P. Some social class differences in helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 217-225.
- Berkowitz, L., Klanderma, S., & Harris, R. Effects of experimenter awareness and sex of subject and experimenter on reactions to dependency relationship. Sociometry, 1964, 27, 327-337.
- Brehm, J. A theory of psychological reactance. New York: Academic Press, 1966.
- Brown, R. Social psychology. New York: The Free Press, 1965, 161-173.
- Bryan, J. & Test, M. Models and helping: naturalistic studies in aiding behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7, 400-407.
- Chaplin, J. Dictionary of psychology. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1968, 127, 236, 444.
- Cohen, A. Some implications of self-esteem for social influence. In The self in social interaction. C. Gordon & K. Gergen (Ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968, 383-384.
- Crites, J. Test reviews: tennessee self concept scale. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 330-331.

- Daniels, L. & Berkowitz, L. Liking and response to dependency relationships. Human Relations, 1963, 16, 141-148.
- Duggan, A. A comparative study of undergraduate women majors and non-majors in physical education with respect to certain personal traits. The Research Quarterly of The American Association For Health and Physical Education, 1937, 8, 38-45.
- Feldman, R. Response to compatriot and foreigner who seek assistance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 202-214.
- Fitts, W. Tennessee self concept scale manual. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965, 1-31.
- Goranson, R. & Berkowitz, L. Reciprocity and responsibility reactions to prior help. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1966, 3, 227-232.
- Gouldner, A. The norm of reciprocity: a preliminary statement. American Sociological Review, 1960, 25, 161-178.
- Greenberg, G. & Frank, G. Response set in the tennessee department of mental health self concept scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1965, 21, 287-288.
- Gruder, C. & Cook, T. Sex, dependency, and helping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 19, 290-294.
- Hartley, R. American core culture: changes and continuities. In G. Seward & R. Williamson (Ed.), Sex roles in changing society. New York: Random House, 1970, 126-149.

- Heist, P. & Yonge, G. Omnibus personality inventory manual.  
New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1968, 1-61.
- Homans, G. Social behavior: its elementary forms. New  
York: Harcourt & Brace, 1961.
- Hornstein, H., Fisch, E., & Holmes, M. Influence of a model's  
feeling about his behavior and his relevance as a com-  
parison on other observers' helping behavior. Journal  
of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 222-226.
- Horowitz, I. Effect of choice and locus of dependence on  
helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social  
Psychology, 1968, 8, 373-376.
- Kelly, G. The psychology of personal constructs. New York:  
Norton, 1955.
- Kisker, G. The disorganized personality. New York: McGraw-  
Hill, 1964, 227.
- Krebs, D. Altruism--an examination of the concept and a  
review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 1970,  
73, 258-302.
- Krebs, D. & Whitten, P. Guilt-edged giving. Psychology  
Today, 5, 1972, 50-52, 76-77.
- Lindgren, H. An introduction to social psychology. New York:  
John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1969, 165-170.
- Marmor, J. Changing patterns of feminity. In A. Skolnick  
& J. Skolnick (Ed.), Family in transition, rethinking

- marriage, sexuality, child rearing, and family organization. Boston: Little Brown & Company, 1971, 210-221.
- Mauksch, H. Becoming a nurse: a selective view. In Social interaction and patient care. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1965.
- McNeil, E. Being human: the psychological experience. New York: Harper & Row, 1973, 182-185.
- Midlarsky, E. Some antecedents of aiding under stress. Proceedings of the 76th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1968, 3, 385-386.
- Mischel, W. Introduction to personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1971, 286-288.
- Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I., & Broverman, D. Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1968, 32, 287-295.
- Schaps, E. Cost, dependency, and helping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 21, 74-78.
- Schopler, J. An investigation of sex differences on the influence of dependence. Sociometry, 1967, 30, 50-63.
- Schopler, J. & Bateson, N. The power of dependency. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 247-254.
- Schopler, J. & Matthews, M. The influence of the perceived causal locus of partner's dependence on the use of interpersonal power. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 600-612.

- Siegel, L. Omnibus personality inventory. In O. Buros (Ed.) Personality tests and reviews. New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1970, 1140.
- Suinn, R. Tennessee self concept scale. In O. Buros (Ed.) The seventh mental measurements yearbook. New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1972, 367-369.
- Thibaut, J. & Kelley, H. The social psychology of groups. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967, 100-125.
- Thomas, E. Effects of facilitative role interdependence on group functioning. Human Relations, 1957, 10, 347-366.
- Thompson, W. (Ed.) Correlates of the self concept. Nashville: The Dede Wallace Center, 1972, 79-80.
- Turney, B. & Robb, G. Simplified statistics for education and psychology. Scranton: International Textbook Company, 1968.
- Vacchiano, R. & Strauss, P. The construct validity of the tennessee self concept scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1968, 24, 323-326.
- Vincent, J. An exploratory factor analysis relating to the construct validity of self-concept labels. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1968, 28, 915-921.
- Wagner, C., Manning, S., & Wheeler, L. Character structure and helping behavior. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1971, 5, 37-42.

- Wagner, C. & Wheeler, L. Model, need, and cost effects in helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 12, 111-116.
- Walker, E. & Heyns, R. An anatomy for conformity. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962, 54-68.
- Wallen, N. The omnibus personality inventory. In O. Buros (Ed.) Personality tests and reviews. New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1970, 1139.
- Wheeler, L. & Wagner, C. The contagion of generosity. Paper presented at the 39th annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Washington, D. C., April, 1968.
- Wiggins, J., Renner, K., & Rose, R. The psychology of personality. California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1971, 150-218.
- Wilson, V. An analysis of femininity in nursing. American Behavioral Scientist, 1971, 15, 213-220.
- Wyer, R. & Malinowski, C. Effects of sex and achievement level upon individualism and competitiveness in social interaction. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1972, 8, 303-314.
- Wylie, R. The self concept. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

## APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A  
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Although this research is not timed, you are encouraged to work at a rate that allows you to finish within one hour. Answer the questions according to what you feel is or would be most typical of you. It is important that you answer every question in each part of the research.

This research concerns the field of social psychology, so that the experimenter is only interested in how different groups of people react to certain situations. Therefore, you will not be identified by name unless you choose to be, nor will you be evaluated individually. It is necessary, however, that you answer honestly, so that group data will be accurate.

If you desire feedback on the results of the tests you are taking and a further explanation of this research, sign your name and assigned number to a blank sheet of paper. The experimenter will supply you with a written explanation of your test results and her experimental findings at the end of the semester. Because of the numbers of people involved in this research, the feedback will necessarily be very general and brief. Your test results will be kept confidential.

Thank you for your participation and cooperation in this research. It is greatly appreciated.

APPENDIX B  
BIOGRAPHICAL DATA SHEET

## BIOGRAPHICAL DATA SHEET

Complete all of the following items according to the family in which you were raised. Then, if you are married, at the bottom of the sheet, please state the number of children and the income of your present family. Please do not sign your name.

1. Age \_\_\_\_\_
2. Year in school \_\_\_\_\_
3. Occupation of father \_\_\_\_\_
4. Occupation of mother \_\_\_\_\_
5. Annual family income \_\_\_\_\_
6. Number in family: \_\_\_\_ brothers: \_\_\_\_ sisters
7. College major \_\_\_\_\_
8. How would you rate your desire to finish college?

Check one.

\_\_\_\_\_ Low      \_\_\_\_\_ Moderate      \_\_\_\_\_ High

9. Do you like to be alone or with only one friend most of the time, or do you prefer to be with many friends most of the time? \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX C

RESPONSE TO EXTERNAL DEPENDENCY TEST,  
ANSWER SHEET, AND INSTRUCTIONS

## INSTRUCTIONS

You do not need to identify yourself on this paper. Your answers to all facets of this research will be kept confidential.

Please do not look to see how others are answering their questions. Please do not turn ahead in your booklet. Answer each situation as you come to it. Read carefully each situation. Make no marks in the test booklet, but on the separate answer sheet, check the appropriate blank to indicate what you think you would do if the situations were real. Be certain that the number on the answer sheet corresponds with the situation number.

Try to respond only on the basis of the information given and on the basis of how you feel about the situations when you first read them. Of course, you might think of other alternatives, but you are asked to choose from the alternative provided. Please try not to change answers unless you make a mistake in marking.

1. You and a classmate are planning a project assigned by an instructor. You have been able to settle most of the planning disputes by making an equal number of compromises. One final decision is to be made. The decision is important to both of you, as you feel doing this part of the project your way will result in a better grade for both of you. She feels that doing the last part of the project her way will result in a better grade for both of you. Both of you have equally good reasons for believing as you do. What will you do?

Do it her way \_\_\_\_\_

Do it your way \_\_\_\_\_

2. You and another student are both graduate teaching assistants. The chairman of your department has told you to decide among yourselves which one of you will teach which undergraduate course next term. Both of you want to teach the same course, as both of you find the course very interesting. What will you do?

Let the other girl teach the favored course \_\_\_\_\_

Teach the favored course yourself \_\_\_\_\_

3. This Saturday night there will be a very entertaining event on campus which will include a concert by a very popular group. You and another girl are both supposed to work the dormitory switchboard that night, but both of you would like to go to the concert and neither of you need the money more than the other at this time. The housemother is willing to let one of you be away from the switchboard that night if you will decide among yourselves which one. What will you do?

Let the other girl go \_\_\_\_\_

Go yourself \_\_\_\_\_

4. You are very anxious to be on time for an important appointment. You start to step on the bus at the same time another girl steps on the bus. The driver says because of a city ordinance, he can allow only one more person on, as the bus is already quite full. Both of you feel that your reasons for needing to get on this bus are equally important. What will you do?

Let her on the bus \_\_\_\_\_

Get on the bus yourself \_\_\_\_\_

5. You are planning a large party for this Saturday night. The girl next door tells you that she has just found out that her parents are coming to visit her for the weekend, and she is afraid that they will demand that she move back home since she is under age if they think that loud and wild parties are

a regular occurrence at these apartments. She tells you the apartment complex recreational room is available for that night, but does not come right out and ask you to hold your party there. You prefer holding your party in your own apartment, but you sympathize with her concerning her parents. What will you do?

Move your party \_\_\_\_\_  
 Hold your party in your apartment \_\_\_\_\_

6. You and a fellow dorm resident live in the same town, and together you have located a ride to go home for the holidays. When you contact the person with the car, she tells you she has room for only one more rider. Whoever does not get to go in the car will have to pay twice as much to fly or to ride the bus. Neither of you have much money to spare. What will you do?

Let the other girl ride in the car \_\_\_\_\_  
 Ride in the car \_\_\_\_\_

7. Mary, a co-worker, and you have come out of your office building together. You both mention that because you had to work late, you are going to be late for appointments. Just as you get to the parking lot, Mary discovers she has a flat tire. If you take her to the garage, you will be even later; if you do not take her, she will be even later. What will you do?

Take her \_\_\_\_\_ Don't take her \_\_\_\_\_

8. Your fellow dorm resident asked you to deliver a message for her to the Administration Building because she is late for work. If you do this, you will be late for a class; if you don't do this, she will not get the message to the Administration Building before it closes. What will you do?

Take the message \_\_\_\_\_ Don't take the message \_\_\_\_\_

9. You and your girlfriend want to celebrate finishing your finals, so that you decide to try out a new "in" restaurant. When you get there you find it is quite crowded, and a wait will necessitate your missing a movie you want to see. Two other girls have the same problem, and the maitre d' is not sure who is first in line. What will you do?

Let the other party go first \_\_\_\_\_  
 Suggest that your party go first \_\_\_\_\_

10. You have heard of a chance to submit your photo to a modeling agency representative. He will accept photos from the first twenty girls to arrive. You find that you and another girl have tied for the number twenty position by arriving at the same time. This girl tells you that she needs a job badly; you feel that you need the job badly. What will you do?

Let the other girl submit her photo \_\_\_\_\_  
Submit yours \_\_\_\_\_

11. A classmate and you both need a book for a class. There is only one left in the bookstore, so that you decide to purchase it jointly. If you use the book first, she may not have enough time with the book before the test; if she uses the book first you may not have enough time with the book before the test. What will you do?

Let her use it first \_\_\_\_\_ Use it first \_\_\_\_\_

12. A friend has called to ask you to come to her dorm room so that you can study for a test together. She does not want to leave her room because she is expecting a call from a new boyfriend. You want to study with her, for you have made better grades by doing this before, but you think you might miss a call from your new boyfriend if you go to her room, so that you ask her to come to your room. Neither of you can decide what to do; she asks you to make the final decision. What will you do?

Go to her room \_\_\_\_\_ Ask her to come to your room \_\_\_\_\_

13. You and your partner have an interior decorating business. Your firm has been selected to decorate an office building, and to cut costs, one color for the walls will be used throughout the building. Your partner wants to use a color you do not want. She does not want to use the color you want. What will you do?

Use the color your partner has chosen \_\_\_\_\_  
Use the color you have chosen \_\_\_\_\_

14. Your roommate likes one kind of music; you like another. There is to be a program on TV featuring some of the musicians she likes. You have a favorite radio program at this same time. Both of you need to be in your room at that time, or one of you could catch your program somewhere else. What will you do?

Let her watch her program \_\_\_\_\_ Listen to your program \_\_\_\_\_

15. As a surprise you bought tickets to a play for yourself and a friend. Not knowing about this, your friend bought tickets to another play for the same night. Neither set of tickets can be returned for a refund, and another night for seeing one of the plays is out of the question because final exam week is about to begin. What will you do?

Use her tickets \_\_\_\_\_ Ask that she go to your play \_\_\_\_\_

## ANSWER SHEET

1. Do it her way \_\_\_\_\_  
Do it your way \_\_\_\_\_
2. Let the other girl teach the favored course \_\_\_\_\_  
Teach the favored course yourself \_\_\_\_\_
3. Let the other girl go \_\_\_\_\_  
Go yourself \_\_\_\_\_
4. Let her on the bus \_\_\_\_\_  
Get on the bus yourself \_\_\_\_\_
5. Move your party \_\_\_\_\_  
Hold your party in your apartment \_\_\_\_\_
6. Let the other girl ride in the car \_\_\_\_\_  
Ride in the car \_\_\_\_\_
7. Take her \_\_\_\_\_  
Don't take her \_\_\_\_\_
8. Take the message \_\_\_\_\_  
Don't take the message \_\_\_\_\_
9. Let the other party go first \_\_\_\_\_  
Suggest that your party go first \_\_\_\_\_
10. Let the other girl submit her photo \_\_\_\_\_  
Submit yours \_\_\_\_\_
11. Let her use it first \_\_\_\_\_  
Use it first \_\_\_\_\_
12. Go to her room \_\_\_\_\_  
Ask her to come to your room \_\_\_\_\_
13. Use the color your partner has chosen \_\_\_\_\_  
Use the color you have chosen \_\_\_\_\_
14. Let her watch her program \_\_\_\_\_  
Listen to your program \_\_\_\_\_
15. Use her tickets \_\_\_\_\_  
Ask that she go to your play \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX D

POST-EXPERIMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

## INSTRUCTIONS

Although you may have thought of better solutions to the situations, please answer the question below on the basis of how you felt about the choices you made. When you have finished this, go to the next test in your packet or raise your hand if additional help is needed after reading the instructions for the next test.

You are requested to refrain from discussing this experiment with anyone, for discussion at this point might influence others who will participate at a later date. Thank you very much for participating in this research.

## QUESTION

In the hypothetical situations that you have just completed, do you feel that your answers would be a fairly accurate indication of what you would do should you encounter similar real situations and you had no other alternatives than those given to you in the situation?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

APPENDIX E  
VERBAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATERS

In the booklet before you are 43 situations. You are asked to read them and pretend that you have already decided in favor of the other person in each situation. Then, consider what degree of sacrifice you had to make in order to decide in favor of the other person. In other words, you are being asked to rate numerically the cost incurred by you when you decided in favor of the other person. Cost means this: how much does the helper have to give up or sacrifice in order to give help or decide in favor of another person.

The rating scale you will use is written on the blackboard. For a low cost rating use 1, 2, or 3; for a moderate cost rating use 4, 5, or 6; and for a high cost rating use 7, 8, or 9. Rate each situation using the rating sheet in the booklet with the verbal designation of low, moderate, or high and with the number from a scale of 1 through 9 which you feel best describes the amount of cost incurred in deciding in favor of the other person. Be certain that the number you use corresponds with the verbal rating you use. Please write clearly, making no marks on the booklets and being certain that the situation number corresponds with the number on the rating sheet.

The experimenter realizes how boring this task is, but would like to encourage you to take this task as seriously as possible, for you are helping in the development of an instrument which will be used for a research project in the

field of social psychology. You will be asked to do this rating task twice with a time interval between ratings, and after the second rating, you will be given a full explanation of exactly what you have done, how your participation will be used in future research, and what the experimenter plans to study in a future research study.

If these verbal instructions are not clear to you at this point, please signal the experimenter, and you will receive more explanation, for it is realized that verbal instructions are difficult to follow, and failure to understand is not a reflection on your abilities.

APPENDIX F  
RATING SHEET

RATING SHEET

Situation	Word Rating	No. Rating	Situation	Word Rating	No. Rating
1.			28.		
2.			29.		
3.			30.		
4.			31.		
5.			32.		
6.			33.		
7.			34.		
8.			35.		
9.			36.		
10.			37.		
11.			38.		
12.			39.		
13.			40.		
14.			41.		
15.			42.		
16.			43.		
17.			44.		
18.			45.		
19.			46.		
20.			47.		
21.			48.		
22.			49.		
23.			50.		
24.			51.		
25.			52.		
26.			53.		
27.			54.		

APPENDIX G

ANNOUNCEMENT FOR SOLICITING VOLUNTEERS

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING ANNOUNCEMENT:

A student in the Psychology Department who is doing research for her Masters thesis is in need of 100 nursing and 100 physical education majors to participate in her study. The study pertains to the field of social psychology and is primarily concerned with how different groups of people react to different situations. All that would be required of you is the taking of 3 fairly short pencil and paper tests which should not require more than one hour of your time. In return, the student will give you before the end of the semester a printed sheet on the results of the tests and on the results of the research. Your answers to the tests will be held strictly confidential, and you would not be judged or evaluated individually. You might find participation in this research a valuable addition to your understanding of research procedures. Of course, you will be making a contribution as well, for without participants, there would be no research involving humans.