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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1955, Dr. Alvin W. Landfield, then at Purdue University, formally presented a hypothesis concerning threat and the factor of self-uncertainty. To date, this new hypothesis has been tested only upon university students, and no investigation has been undertaken to test the hypothesis in relation to other age groups.

Statement of the Problem.

The purpose of this study was to confirm, or deny, the Landfield (8) hypothesis of threat when that hypothesis was tested with adolescents as experimental subjects. The threat hypothesis is based on the following logic: If threat involves self-uncertainty, then one can expect that an individual will perceive himself as being less predictable to himself in social relationships involving threatening acquaintances than in social relationships involving nonthreatening acquaintances.

Need for the Study.

Personality development investigation has been frequently stressed as one of the most important aims of the science of psychology. In spite, however, of
the general recognition of the importance of personality investigation, very little scientific work has been pointed toward the understanding of threat. Moreover, the few theories designed to aid in the attainment of this goal have been outdated or limited in scope.

In the present study, which is a test of the Landfield (8) hypothesis concerning threat, an attempt was made to employ projective techniques on an age group that has not been previously examined in relation to the hypothesis.

Definitions of Terms Used.

Threatening acquaintance. One whom an individual wishes to avoid, or whose behavior he would like to greatly modify.

Nonthreatening acquaintance. One with whom an individual wishes to have contact, and whose behavior he would not care to greatly modify.

Adolescent. One whose chronological age is between fourteen and nineteen years.

Threat. An expression of menace. Emotional conflict resulting from threat may be characterized by worry, feelings of insecurity, apprehension, agitation, and anxiety. The aspect of self-uncertainty, and the subsequent inability to predict or anticipate ones own actions are stressed in this definition.
Self. The organism experiencing relations with the environment.

Hypothesis. An "educated guess". A tentative assumption adopted from observable facts used to explain the relationship among the experimental variables.

Previous Research.

Very little has been written in regard to the actual nature of threat and its implications, because threat is generally considered under the broad classification of conflict or frustration by most writers.

Maslow (11), in an early study of threat wrote that frustration is less useful as a single concept than the two separate concepts of deprivation and threat. He pointed out that deprivation could not be considered an attack upon, or rejection of the self. Moreover, he defined threat in terms of attack on the integrity of the organism and its mastery of the world. He further differentiated between deprivation and threat when he stated that the secondary effects of deprivation were not commonly psychopathological, while threat has psychogenic effects on the individual.

In a later study, Maslow (10), distinguished threat as opposed to conflict in terms of consistency. He characterized conflict as a sheer choice between
wishes or paths to a goal, while threat is characterized by persistency with no alternative possibilities of choice.

Hogan (5), who was interested in psychoanalytic theories, believed that threat is understood to occur when experience is perceived by the individual as inconsistent with learned conceptions and evaluations of the self.

He stated three characteristics of threat: (1) that which is threatened is the individual's perception of his ability to reformulate his tension defense system, (2) threat is felt when incongruence is perceived by the self, i.e., threat is personal since not all individuals perceive threat as occurring from a common source, and (3) the disturbance created by threat requires that the individual take measures to alleviate the threat tensions.

Cohen (2) considered self-esteem as a determinate factor in the perception of a power-figure as threatening when he studied 198 telephone operators and their reactions to a power-figure's (their supervisor's) instructions and moods. The instructions given by the supervisor were varied from clear to unclear, and his behavior varied from consistent to inconsistent during the testing period. By comparing
personality characteristics of the 198 operators with such factors as time on assigned tasks, evidences of anxiety and regression, and apparent motivation, the investigator concluded that subjects who held themselves in high esteem rejected the threat situations and did not suffer from excessive tensions. On the other hand, those subjects who held themselves in low esteem suffered from threat and became dependent upon the power-figure.

Similarly, Bills, Vance, and McLean (1) studied self estimation and the source of threat in an exhaustive investigation. The three investigators designed an index of adjustment and values which consisted of 124 traits taken from Allport's list of 17,953 traits. Four hundred eighty-two college students were asked to rate themselves on a five-point scale for each trait, and at a later testing period, to indicate whether they would like or dislike to be described according to each trait. A dichotomous Chi-square was computed using scores above and below the mean for the first test as compared with ratings on the second test. The writers concluded from the results (Chi-square equal to 24.6) that those subjects who rated themselves low in relation to the way they would actually
like to be described blamed themselves for their own unhappiness since they rated themselves as essentially weak. Acceptance of self scores for this group were construed to indicate that threat came from the individual subject and was directed toward himself. For that group above the mean on the first test, threat directed toward the individual subject was assumed to originate in other persons, and not in the self.

Fiedler, Warrington, and Blaisdell (4) studied socio-metric choice of friends in relation to threat by asking twenty-six fraternity men living together to name their best-liked, and least-liked, fellow group members. The subjects then listed their own personality traits. The results suggested to the author that the subjects perceived fellow group members they liked as similar to themselves, and disliked fellow group members as dissimilar. The investigators therefore concluded that perception of threat is a product of how each individual perceives or estimates himself.

The Landfield (8) hypothesis of threat (as expressed in the present investigation) was derived from, and is consistent with a theoretical framework advanced by Kelly (6). The system and theoretical position
formulated by Kelly is entitled *The Psychology of Personal Constructs*, and the fundamental postulate of this school of thought states that an individual's processes are psychologically channelized by the ways in which he anticipates events. In other words, man views his world through patterns which he creates and then attempts to fit over the realities of the world. The patterns referred to are the personal constructs, with which man predicts and controls his environment.

To determine what personal constructs (descriptive frameworks) are used most often, Landfield (7) asked fifty-four undergraduate university students to describe how their acquaintances were alike and different when the acquaintances' names were presented to the subjects three at a time. The thirty-three descriptive frameworks used in the present investigation were derived from that study, and these thirty-three descriptions of people were the most common ways in which the fifty-four subjects perceived the acquaintances in their environment.

To test whether or not experimental results of the threat hypothesis could be explained by the variable of familiarity, Landfield (8) tested a group of thirty-nine engineering students. Instructions for the
pertinent acquaintances (numbers 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11) on the Role Specification sheet were changed as follows:

6. A person with whom you are very familiar, with whom you have worked or associated who appeared to dislike you. (Threatening acquaintance).

7. A person with whom you are somewhat familiar, with whom you have worked or associated who appeared to like you. (Nonthreatening acquaintance).

8. The person with whom you are very familiar, with whom you usually feel most uncomfortable. (Threatening acquaintance).

9. The person of the same sex as yourself you have just met whom you would like to know better. (Nonthreatening acquaintance).

10. The teacher with whom you are very familiar, whose point of view you have found most objectionable. (Threatening acquaintance).

11. The teacher with whom you are somewhat familiar whose point of view you have found most acceptable. (Nonthreatening acquaintance).

The statistical results of this research (Chi-square equal to 10.24, with one degree of freedom) allowed the null hypothesis of a 50:50 theoretical
frequency to be rejected at better than the 5% level of significance. Therefore, these data did not support the contention that familiarity was the crucial explanatory variable. Even when the "cards were stacked" in favor of a familiarity theory, results still supported the threat hypothesis.
CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE

Subjects and Testing Situation.

A group of 31 students from Omaha Benson High School, Omaha, Nebraska, were used in the study. The group consisted of 16 native born, white males who ranged in age from 14 years, 5 months, to 17 years, 7 months, and 15 native born, white females who ranged in age from 15 years, to 18 years, 6 months. The mean age for the males was 16.21 years, and the mean age for the females was 16.39 years. The mean age for the combined group of males and females was 16.30 years.

The experiment was conducted immediately after the 31 students had volunteered to become subjects for a "scientific study", and the testing was conducted in a quiet, well lighted classroom.

Student comment after the experiment indicated that the subjects were too busy to speculate in the purpose of the test, and apparently they did not attempt to guess at the nature of the hypothesis.

Description of the Test.

Each subject was given three sheets: A Role Specification list titled Sheet #1 (see example, page 12),
a Descriptive Frameworks list titled Sheet #2 (see example, page 13), and a Rating Sheet titled Sheet #3 (see example, page 14). The sheets were given number designations, rather than names, to prevent speculation.

Instructions.

The instructions were read verbatim to the subjects. Parts of the instructions were repeated upon request, but no additional information or instructions were given. Student comment after the experiment was completed indicated that the instructions were clear, but the task was difficult.

Instructions were read as follows: "This experiment is concerned with the prediction or anticipation of yourself. You will be asked to state your feelings about how well you think you can forecast your own behavior in relation to certain people that you know. Since the information to be collected is personal, do not place your name on any of the sheets. The expression of real feelings is extremely important to the outcome of the experiment, so please be as honest as possible when you record your answers.

"Take Sheet #1 and follow the instructions."
1. Either write the word mother in the first blank, or the name of the person who has played the part of your mother.
2. Either write the word father in the second blank, or the name of the person who has played the part of your father.
3. Write the name of your brother nearest your own age, or the person who has played the part of such a brother.
4. Write the name of your sister nearest your own age, or the person who has played the part of such a sister.
5. Your present boy (girl) friend. Do not repeat the name of anyone listed above. If you cannot think of a person's name, or the name is a duplicate of one used before, use some other title for this category.

DO NOT REPEAT ANY NAMES FROM THIS POINT ON.

6. Your closest present friend of the same sex as yourself.
7. A person with whom you have worked or associated who appeared to dislike you.
8. The person with whom you usually feel most uncomfortable.
9. The person of the same sex as yourself whom you have met whom you would most like to know better.
10. The teacher whose point of view you have found most acceptable.
11. The teacher whose point of view you have found most objectionable.
12. The most successful person whom you know personally.
13. The most unsuccessful person whom you know personally.
14. The happiest person whom you know personally.
15. The unhappiest person whom you know personally.
Sheet #2

1. Mature - Immature
2. Easily influenced - Mind of own
3. Serious minded - Happy-go-lucky
4. Broad minded, open minded - Narrow, prejudiced
5. Feeling inferior - Feeling superior
6. Responsible - Irresponsible
7. Social, friendly - Unsocial, unfriendly
8. A leader - A follower
9. Honest - Dishonest
10. Quick tempered - Calm
11. Selfish, self-centered - Unselfish
12. Bright, intelligent - Unintelligent, dull
13. Economical - Spendthrift
14. Loyal - Disloyal
15. Talkative - Quiet
16. Antagonistic, argumentative - Not antagonistic
17. Aggressive - Passive
18. Put things off - Not put things off
19. Set ideas - Ideas fluctuate
20. Outgoing, extrovert - Withdrawn, introvert
21. Dependent - Independent
22. Glory-seeker - Not a glory seeker
23. Bigoted, windbag - Humble
24. Likes to lead others - Wants to be a follower
25. Religious - Not religious
26. Authoritative - Democratic
27. Stable - Unstable
28. Hard to understand - Easy to understand
29. Idealistic - Realistic
30. Patient - Impatient
31. Predictable - Unpredictable
32. Sophisticated - Naive
33. Pessimistic - Optimistic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age: Years</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Sex: Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V - very predictable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P - predictable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S - sometimes predictable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N - not predictable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons Named

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.
14.
15.
Sheet #1 tells you how to fill in blanks 1 through 15 on Sheet #3. Write the word mother in the first blank, or the name of the person who has played the part of your mother. Now fill in the remaining fourteen blanks as directed by Sheet #1. Full names do not have to be used. In fact any designation is sufficient—nicknames, initials, or a title—if you know to whom it refers."

(A pause was allowed at this point, until all subjects had filled in blanks 1 through 15 on Sheet #3.)

"Now take Sheet #2. Thirty-three descriptive frameworks are listed within which a person may be described. The first descriptive framework is MATURE versus IMMATURE. People may be described in regard to the maturity of their behavior. The next descriptive framework is BASILY INFLUENCED versus MIND OF OWN. This is another framework within which people may be described. From this list of thirty-three descriptive frameworks, select seven which you use most often in thinking of other people. Write these descriptions in the seven blanks at the top of Sheet #3. Use the descriptive framework you use most often in thinking of other people in the first blank. List the remaining six descriptive frameworks in descending order
(A pause was again allowed, until all subjects had filled in the seven descriptive framework blanks.)

"Now think about how predictable you are to yourself, but in relationship to the fifteen people you have listed. For example, suppose your first descriptive framework is MATURE versus IMMATURE. Within the framework of mature versus immature behavior, how well can you anticipate what you will say and do? How well can you anticipate what you will say and do in a social relationship with your mother, father, or brother? How certain are you about how maturely, or immaturity, you will act in a relationship involving you and another particular person?

"On Sheet #3 you will find the letters V, P, S, and N. If you feel that you can predict yourself very well, or to a high degree in a social relationship with a certain person, within a certain descriptive framework, place the letter V after his name, under the proper descriptive framework. If you feel that you can predict yourself, but not to such a high degree, use the letter P. If you feel that you can sometimes predict yourself, use the letter S. If you feel that you cannot predict yourself within a certain
descriptive framework, use the letter N. Do your ratings one column at a time. First, rate yourself within the first descriptive framework in relationship to each of the fifteen people before going on to the next descriptive framework."

Experimental Hypothesis.

The Landfield (8) hypothesis states: If threat involves self-uncertainty, then one can expect that an individual will perceive himself as being less predictable to himself in social relationships involving threatening acquaintances than in social relationships involving nonthreatening acquaintances. Accordingly, the experimental hypothesis of this study may be stated as follows: The subjects will employ the ratings S and N more often in relation to threatening acquaintances than in relation to the nonthreatening acquaintances.

Three threatening acquaintances and three non-threatening acquaintances were included among the fifteen types of acquaintances listed on the Role Specification Sheet (Sheet #1). Numbers 7, 8, and 11 are threatening acquaintances, while numbers 6, 9, and 10 are nonthreatening acquaintances. All of the other types of acquaintances listed on the Role Specifica-
tion Sheet are "fillers" used to prevent speculation on the purpose of the test, and do not have any significance in the investigation.

The example given on page 19 of this study may help to clarify the experimental hypothesis. As can be seen, the subject has employed a total of three S and N responses in relation to nonthreatening acquaintances. One S rating appears after acquaintance #6. Two S ratings appear after acquaintance #9. No S or N ratings appear after acquaintance #10.

The subject has employed a total of nine S and N responses in relation to threatening acquaintances. One N and two S ratings appear after acquaintance #7. One S and two N ratings appear after acquaintance #8. One N rating and two S ratings appear after acquaintance #11.

Since a larger number of S and N ratings appear after the threatening acquaintances than after the nonthreatening acquaintances, the subject holds to the experimental hypothesis.

**Statistical Analysis.**

**Technique.** The Chi-square test of significance was employed in the analysis because, (1) the obtained
### Sheet #3

**Descriptive Frameworks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age: Years</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Sex: Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V - very predictable</td>
<td>P - predictable</td>
<td>S - sometimes predictable</td>
<td>N - not predictable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Persons Named**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. NONTREAT</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. THREAT</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. THREAT</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. NONTREAT</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. NONTREAT</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. THREAT</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
data fell into distinct categories, (2) Chi-square is independent of sample size, and (3) Chi-square is particularly applicable to situations where one may test the departure of observed frequencies in a sample from the frequencies expected on the basis of a hypothesis.

The computations of the Chi-square formula are relatively simple: Take the difference between each observed and expected number, square these discrepancies, divide each squared discrepancy by the corresponding expected number, and sum.

Chi-square ($\chi^2$) may be written as equal to $\sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e}$, where "o" indicates the observed frequency, "e" indicates the expected frequency, and "$\sum$" indicates summation.

Chi-square is useful in the analysis of this study since, by chance alone, we would expect the frequency of V and P ratings versus S and N ratings to occur on a 50:50 basis in a large population of ratings. The null hypothesis, accordingly, is stated as follows: There is no difference between the expected and observed frequencies, and the observed sample data have been drawn from a population of ratings according to the expected ratio of 50:50.
For this study, the 5% level of significance was used to reject, or accept, the null hypothesis.

Groups. To test whether or not sex differences contributed to the results of the experimental hypothesis, the subjects were analyzed first as a combined group, then as to sex.

Boys and Girls Combined. Of the 31 subjects, 25 employed the ratings S and N more often in relationship to threatening acquaintances than in relation to nonthreatening acquaintances. Three subjects employed the ratings S and N more often in relationship to nonthreatening acquaintances. Three subjects employed the same number of S and N ratings in relation to threatening and nonthreatening acquaintances. These latter cases were handled statistically by arbitrarily placing \(1\frac{1}{2}\) cases with each of the prediction groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Nonthreat</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-e</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((o-e)^2)</td>
<td>121.0</td>
<td>121.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\frac{(o-e)^2}{e})</td>
<td>7.806</td>
<td>7.806</td>
<td>15.612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-square is equal to 15.612, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected at better than the 5% level of significance (3.841).

Boys. Of the 16 subjects, 14 employed the ratings S and N more often in relation to threatening acquaintances than in relation to nonthreatening acquaintances. Two subjects employed the ratings V and P more often in relation to threatening acquaintances than in relation to nonthreatening acquaintances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Nonthreat</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-e</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o-e)^2</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\frac{(o-e)^2}{e}</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>4.500 = 9.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square is equal to 9.000, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected at better than the 5% level of significance (3.841).

Girls. Of the 15 subjects, 11 employed the ratings S and N more often in relation to threatening acquaintances than in relation to nonthreatening acquaintances. One subject employed the ratings S and N more often in relation to nonthreatening acquaint-
ances than in relation to threatening acquaintances. Three subjects employed the same number of S and N ratings in relation to threatening and nontreathing acquaintances. These latter cases were handled statistically by arbitrarily placing $1/2$ cases with each of the prediction groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Nonthreat</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o-e$</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(o-e)^2$</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(o-e)^2/e$</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>6.666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square is equal to 6.666, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected at better than the 5% level of significance (3.841).

**Adjusted Chi-square Values.** A significant value of Chi-square denotes a sample so discrepant as to bring into doubt the null hypothesis used; in other words, any Chi-square value beyond 3.841 is large and suggests rejection of the hypothesis.

However, to eliminate bias whenever any cell entry is less than five in number, an adjusted Chi-
square value may be obtained by adding .5 to the smallest cell entry, subtracting .5 from the largest cell entry, and proceeding with the Chi-square analysis as usual.

Adjusted Chi-square values for the three groups are: 14.226 for Boys and Girls combined, 7.562 for Boys, and 5.400 for Girls. These results still suggest rejection of the null hypothesis at better than the 5% level of significance, regardless of adjusted values.

Pairing of Acquaintances. To determine whether or not one type of threatening acquaintance contributed to the experimental hypothesis, threatening and nonthreatening acquaintances were paired, and the null hypothesis was tested in relationship to each pair.

The pairing of threatening and nonthreatening acquaintances was completed by chance drawing of threatening acquaintances (numbers 7, 8, and 11) from a hat, and matching each draw by a nonthreatening acquaintance drawn by chance from another hat (numbers 6, 9, and 10). The pairs drawn were: #10 with #11, #8 with #9, and #7 with #9. The Chi-square analysis was again employed, with one degree of freedom, and the 5% level of significance was used to reject, or accept, the
null hypothesis.

**Items #10 and #11.** Of the 31 subjects, 18 listed more S and N ratings in item #11 than in item #10, five subjects did not, and eight subjects employed the same number of S and N ratings in relation to each item. These latter cases were handled statistically by placing four cases with each item group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item #11 (Threat)</th>
<th>Item #10 (Nonthreat)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-e</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\frac{(o-e)^2}{e}</td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\frac{(o-e)^2}{e}</td>
<td>2.726</td>
<td>2.726</td>
<td>5.452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square is equal to 5.452, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected at better than the 5% level of significance (3.841).

**Items #6 and #8.** Of the 31 subjects, 18 listed more S and N ratings in item #8 than in item #6, seven subjects did not, and six subjects employed the same number of S and N ratings in relation to each item. These latter cases were handled by placing three cases with each item group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item #8 (Threat)</th>
<th>Item #9 (Nonthreat)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-e</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (o-e)^2 )</td>
<td>30.25</td>
<td>30.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} )</td>
<td>1.952 + 1.952 = 3.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square is equal to 3.904, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected at better than the 5% level of significance (3.841).

**Items #7 and #9.** Of the 31 subjects, 23 listed more S and N ratings in item #7 than in item #9, three subjects did not, and five subjects employed the same number of S and N ratings in relation to each item. These latter cases were handled by placing 2\( \frac{1}{6} \) cases with each item group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item #7 (Threat)</th>
<th>Item #9 (Nonthreat)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-e</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (o-e)^2 )</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} )</td>
<td>6.452 + 6.452 = 12.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-square is equal to 12.904, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected at better than the 5% level of significance.

Results.

The function of a sample is to furnish evidence about the population sampled. In the present investigation, the assumption is made that in a large population of ratings made by a volunteer sample of adolescents we would expect that by chance alone the ratings S and N would be used as often as the ratings V and P in relation to threatening acquaintances.

Accordingly, any significant value of Chi-square derived from the sample statistics would tend to indicate that either the volunteer sample of adolescents is not representative of a large population of adolescents, or that the ratings used by the sample of adolescents are evidence of a discrepancy from the expected frequency of a 50:50 usage of the ratings S and N versus the ratings V and P. The bulk of evidence present in this investigation favors the latter view and does not specifically signify that a caprice of sampling has occurred.

Adjusted Chi-square results for the combined
group of boys and girls was equal to 14.226, for boys alone Chi-square equalled 7.562, and for girls alone Chi-square equalled 5.400. In each of these cases the null hypothesis was rejected at better than the 5% level of significance (3.841).

These results suggest that the subjects perceived themselves as being less predictable to themselves in social relationships involving threatening acquaintances than in social relationships involving nonthreatening acquaintances.
CHAPTER III

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary.

Sixteen male and fifteen female adolescents (mean age: 16.30 years) were examined in a written, projective technique situation to test the Landfield hypothesis of threat which states: If threat involves self-uncertainty, then one can expect that an individual will perceive himself as being less predictable to himself in social relationships involving threatening acquaintances than in social relationships involving nonthreatening acquaintances.

The subjects predicted their own behavior within seven descriptive frameworks in relation to three threatening and three nonthreatening acquaintances by rating themselves as very predictable, predictable, sometimes predictable, or not predictable, with each acquaintance.

The experimental hypothesis stated: The subjects will employ the ratings sometimes predictable, and not predictable, more often in relation to threatening acquaintances than in relation to nonthreatening acquaintances.

The Chi-square technique of analysis was used
to test an expected ratio of 50:50 between the ratings of very predictable and predictable, versus sometimes predictable and not predictable. The null hypothesis was rejected, or accepted, at the 5% level of significance (3.841).

Adjusted Chi-square results for the combined group of boys and girls was equal to 14.226, for boys alone Chi-square equalled 7.562, and for girls alone Chi-square equalled 5.400. In each of these cases the null hypothesis was rejected at better than 5% level of significance.

Conclusions.

The results of this investigation lend support to the Landfield (8) hypothesis of threat which states: If threat involves self-uncertainty, then one can expect that an individual will perceive himself as being less predictable to himself in social relationships involving threatening acquaintances than in social relationships involving nonthreatening acquaintances.

Suggestions for Further Study.

Future studies could be based upon the Landfield (8) hypothesis of threat with the following variations:

1. Other age groups examined in relation to the hypothesis.
2. Enlarging or reducing the number of ratings to be used by the subjects in their predictions.

3. Revision of the number or method of stating the descriptive frameworks.

4. Changing the acquaintance list.

Other investigations, beyond variations of the testing procedure as already suggested, might include:

1. Studies designed to examine personality factors, or character traits, and their relation to the ratings expressed by each subject.

2. Socio-economic factors and the anticipation of threat.

3. Intelligence and the anticipation of threat.

4. Environmental factors influencing the anticipation of threat.
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