

ATTITUDES TOWARDS EX-MENTAL PATIENTS AS A FUNCTION OF GENDER,

by

David Blodgett Jones,

Thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Psychology

APPROVED:

---

R. E. Mattson, Chairman

---

A. M. Prestrude

---

J. J. Germana

June, 1977

Blacksburg, Virginia

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my Chairman, \_\_\_\_\_, as without his help, direction and patience this work would never have been completed. I would also like to thank my other committee members, \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_, whose theoretical zeal was helpful in the completion of this thesis.

Special notes of thanks go to \_\_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_\_ for serving many long hours as my confederates, and to \_\_\_\_\_ who was of invaluable assistance with the computer.

A final note of special thanks to all of my friends in the program who made my graduate experience worthwhile.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. . . . .	ii
INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
METHOD. . . . .	7
Subjects . . . . .	7
Apparatus. . . . .	7
Procedure. . . . .	7
RESULTS . . . . .	12
DISCUSSION. . . . .	14
CONCLUSION. . . . .	20
REFERENCES. . . . .	21
APPENDIX A. Analysis of Variance for Prerating Variable	
Perceived Attractiveness. . . . .	23
APPENDIX B. Analysis of Variance for Prerating Variable	
Perceived Normalcy. . . . .	24
APPENDIX C. Experimental Instructions. . . . .	25
APPENDIX D. Personal History Questionnaire . . . . .	26
APPENDIX E. Personal Attitude Questionnaire. . . . .	28
APPENDIX F. Adjective Checklist. . . . .	30
APPENDIX G. Information Questionnaire. . . . .	31
APPENDIX H. Analysis of Variance for Adjective	
Checklist Item Predictable-Unpredictable. . . . .	33
APPENDIX I. Analysis of Variance for Adjective	
Checklist Item Reliable-Unreliable. . . . .	34

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

APPENDIX J. Analysis of Variance for Adjective	
Checklist Item Tense-Relaxed. . . . .	35
APPENDIX K. Analysis of Variance for Adjective	
Checklist Item Valuable-Worthless . . . . .	36
APPENDIX L. Analysis of Variance for Adjective	
Checklist Item Adjusted-Poorly Adjusted . . . . .	37
APPENDIX M. Analysis of Variance for Adjective	
Checklist Item Trustworthy-Untrustworthy. . . . .	38
APPENDIX N. Analysis of Variance for Personal	
Attitude Questionnaire Item 1.. . . .	39
APPENDIX O. Analysis of Variance for Personal	
Attitude Questionnaire Item 2.. . . .	40
APPENDIX P. Analysis of Variance for Personal	
Attitude Questionnaire Item 3.. . . .	41
APPENDIX Q. Analysis of Variance for Personal	
Attitude Questionnaire Item 4.. . . .	42
APPENDIX R. Analysis of Variance for Personal	
Attitude Questionnaire Item 5.. . . .	43
APPENDIX S. Analysis of Variance for Personal	
Attitude Questionnaire Item 6.. . . .	44
APPENDIX T. Analysis of Variance for Personal	
History Questionnaire Information Retained . . . . .	45
APPENDIX U. Analysis of Variance for Interview	
Items Retained. . . . .	46

## INTRODUCTION

Intuitively, one would expect the label "ex-mental patient" to be a stigma causing both negative attitudes and behaviors towards the individual identified as such. This position has been argued from a general standpoint without empirical verification (Goffman, 1961; Szasz, 1961), and has been empirically verified by Nunnally's extensive research in this area.

The general finding of early research seemed to reinforce Nunnally's (1961) conclusion that the mentally ill are regarded as relatively worthless, dangerous, dirty, cold and unpredictable. Nunnally reported that when a female confederate labelled as an ex-mental patient delivered a brief lecture on mental illness, she was rated more negatively on an attitude survey than the same confederate when presented without the ex-mental patient label. This same effect was reported throughout Nunnally's exploration of general attitudes towards those individuals labeled as ex-mental patients. Other studies have in part reported similar results. Farina, Felner, and Boudreau (1973) reported that male hospital employees had more negative attitudes, as measured in part by their willingness to recommend a male confederate for hospital employment, towards an ex-mental patient than towards an identical control. On behavioral tasks college students preferred to work alone when their partner had been labeled an ex-mental patient and they tended to blame him more for mistakes than identical controls (Farina & Ring, 1965). Male subjects behaved more harshly toward a male they perceived as having

been psychiatrically hospitalized than a control by administering shocks of longer duration (Farina, Holland & Ring, 1966). Furthermore, when the stigma ex-mental patient is compared to the stigma ex-convict, the ex-mental patient was viewed as more likely to break down under stress, less reliable in an emergency, less likely to be used as a baby-sitter and less able to deter rehospitalization than the convict was to deter reincarceration (Lamy, 1966).

More recent findings (Farina, et. al., 1973; Farina & Hagelauer, 1975) have seriously challenged the position that the public at large hold negative attitudes towards ex-mental patients in general. The thrust of these findings is that while males seem to conform to the traditional finding of negative attitudes toward ex-mental patients, females do not share these attitudes. Instead, females tend to rate those labeled as ex-mental patients in similar ways to those not so labeled.

The first set of studies reporting this difference used female department store clerks as subjects and a female confederate purportedly applying for employment with the store as the stimulus (Farina, et. al., 1973). Regardless of whether the confederate was labeled as an ex-mental patient or a control, no significant differences were found in acceptance or rejection for employment. This effect was successfully replicated using female hospital employees rating a female confederate who again was seeking employment. The final study in this series used male hospital employees as subjects and a male confederate in the same design. Males

consistently rejected the subject when he was labeled as an ex-mental patient, while accepting him when he was not so labeled. In all of these studies the ex-mental patient and control subjects' behavior were also varied by having the confederates act "nervously" in half of the conditions and "calm" in the other half. Nervousness always led to significantly more rejection, while the calm ex-mental patient condition produced rejection only by male subjects. To test for a possible interaction of sex of rater and sex of perceived stimulus, Farina and Hagelauer (1975) replicated one of the above studies by using new female clerks in the same department store rating a male confederate labeled as either an ex-mental patient or a control, and again employing the nervous/calm dimension. The same general results were again found; the nervous condition led to rejection while the calm condition led to acceptance, regardless of label.

A general interpretation of this research is that males conform to traditional findings of displaying negative attitudes towards ex-mental patients while females rate ex-mental patients similar to those not so labeled. However, the results of one study partly contradict this conclusion. LaTorre (1975) reported significant differences in male and female raters' attitudes toward male and female schizophrenic patients. Specifically, female subjects rated the patient as more difficult to accept as a friend and more severely ill than did male subjects. LaTorre also reported a significant difference as a function of sex of stimulus with females being seen

as more likely to benefit from help and more likely to seek help. This study questions Farina's findings that females do not have negative attitudes toward ex-mental patients and also raises the question addressed in part by Farina and Hagelauer (1975) regarding possible interactions between sex of rater and sex of perceived stimulus. A major difference between these studies involves research procedures, with Farina's subjects observing and interacting with an individual, while LaTorre used only a very brief written statement as the stimulus presentation. Further, subjects were drawn from different populations; LaTorre's subjects were college students while Farina's subjects were adult employees of various institutions. These procedural differences make conclusions drawn through comparisons of these studies tenuous.

LaTorre's findings tangentially raise the question of the raters' stereotype of males and females, and the possibility of differences in general perceptions, attitudes and expectations of males and females toward stimulus presentations of males and females. It is possible that if there are these gender differences in attitudes, these differences could interact with the label ex-mental patient. One study (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz & Vogel, 1970) reported significant attitudinal differences toward the labels "mentally healthy adult", "mentally healthy female" and "mentally healthy male." Specifically, there were no significant differences in attitudes toward the label mentally healthy male and the more abstract mentally healthy adult,

but differences were evident between the label mentally healthy female and mentally healthy adult. These differences seemed to follow cultural stereotypes, with a mentally healthy female being more submissive, less adventurous, more easily influenced and more emotional than a mentally healthy male. This effect has also been reported elsewhere (Nowacki & Poe, 1973).

Given the Broverman, et. al. finding, LaTorre's reported differences in male and female stimuli could be interpreted as caused in part by different stereotypes of males and females held by the raters. This finding also brings into question general conclusions drawn from research where subjects rated a stimulus presentation of only one sex, for reported differences could be a function of an interaction between sex of rater and/or sex of the stimulus person.

Summarizing the above results, the position that the label ex-mental patient will cause negative attitudes in all persons has been disproved by empirical research, with the general finding being that males do seem to exhibit these attitudes, while females apparently do not. Some evidence exists that contradicts this position, but it was generated from vastly different experimental procedures. Further, there is evidence that raters in general have differential attitudes toward people based on the sex of person observed, and this stereotyping effect must be considered in any research where the sex of the stimulus is known to the rater. Finally, the interacting effects of the label ex-mental patient,

the sex of the rater, and the sex of the stimulus person have not been fully explored.

Thus, there appears to be two general questions in this area of attitude research which must be examined further. The first involves attitudinal differences due to the sex of the rater. The second concerns the interaction between the effects due to the sex of the rater, the sex of the stimulus person, and the label given the stimulus person (i.e., ex-mental patient versus control). Concerning this second issue the author is aware of no research that has drawn both male and female subjects randomly from the same population and presented them with identical male and female stimuli labeled either as ex-mental patients or not so labeled. Thus, the current research project has been designed to address these two questions which have been raised by previous research.

## METHOD

### Subjects

Subjects were undergraduate students enrolled in psychology courses and received academic credit for their participation in the study. A total of 128 subjects were used, with equal numbers of males and females.

### Apparatus

A Sony Videomonitor with a 19-inch screen was used to present the stimulus information.

### Procedure

The design of the study consisted of a 2 X 2 X 2 factorial, with the independent measures being Sex of Subject (i.e., rater), Sex of Stimulus Person, and Stimulus Condition (i.e., ex-mental patient label or ex-medical patient label). A videotaped interview with a male and an identical videotaped interview with a female were used as the primary stimulus presentations. This particular procedure was chosen as a viable midpoint between a written description of a stimulus person and an in vivo confederate. Furthermore, previous research (Langer & Abelson, 1974) found this general procedure to produce reliable differences in ratings of identical videotaped interviews labeled as either job applicants or psychiatric patients. The time of the interview was eleven minutes. In addition to reasons of procedural economy, a partial rationale for this time period was provided by Huguenard, Sager and Ferguson (1970). They reported that interviewer perceptions of an

interviewee were influenced by an initial label (in their case warm or cold ) but the duration of the interview which varied between ten and thirty minutes produced no significant differences.

The interviews were recorded under identical conditions in a professional video studio, with equivalent lighting, camera distancing and sound levels. Both of the interviewees were given identical scripts to rehearse, and during the interview these scripts were blown up and visible to both the interviewer and the interviewee. The camera recorded only the face and shoulders of the interviewee and the interviewer was not visible. The same interviewer, a male with considerable acting experience was used for both the male and female interview. The female interviewee also had considerable acting experience, and the male interviewee was a graduate student in psychology. The interview contained material very typical of general life events of a typical college student, e.g., problems and successes in school, personal life, relationships with parents and an automobile accident.

Prior to using the videotapes in the experimental procedure, ratings were obtained from subjects drawn from the same population as the actual experimental population on perceived physical attractiveness and perceived normalcy of the interviewees. An analysis of variance of these two measures produced no significant differences for interviewee sex or rater sex on perceived attractiveness  $F(1,36) = 2.56, p > .05$ , or on perceived normalcy  $F(1,36) = 0.13, p > .05$  (see Appendices A, B). Both the male and female interviewees

were rated as "somewhat attractive" and as acting "probably close to the way most people would behave in this type of situation" (i.e., a general interview with no reference to psychiatric hospitalization).

Subjects signed up for an experiment labeled as evaluation of different "interview techniques." They were run in groups of 3 or 4, with the design being counterbalanced for sex of subject, seat of subject during experimental procedures, and condition of interviewee (either male or female and labeled as an ex-mental patient or ex-medical patient). Upon being seated in the laboratory, subjects were asked to read carefully the instruction sheet on the booklet in front of them (see Appendix C) and to read the Personal History Questionnaire (PHQ) on the following page (see Appendix D). The instructions stated that they were taking part in an experiment designed to explore differences in interviewing styles and techniques with different types of people. The instructions further stated that they would watch a short videotaped interview, and then would be asked to answer some questions at the end of the videotape. Subjects next read the PHQ which they were told contained the same information that the interviewer had at the onset of the interview. The PHQ was an official-looking document that included such information as educational history, family history, hobbies, etc. The PHQ included one section entitled Medical History, which contained one of two statements: that the person they were going to observe being interviewed had been psychiatrically hospitalized during

adolescence for emotional illness (ex-mental patient condition), or that the person had been hospitalized during adolescence for a severe case of mononucleosis (ex-medical/control condition). No reference was made in the PHQ as to the sex of the interviewee, nor were any identifying characteristics given that might lead subjects to assume the sex of the interviewee. Therefore, with the exception of the statement about the type of previous hospitalization, the same PHQ was used for all subjects.

When all subjects indicated that they had finished reading the instructions and the PHQ, this material was collected and the videotape was shown.

At the end of the videotape, subjects were instructed to complete three questionnaires. The first questionnaire was an Adjective Checklist (AC) which included the following bi-polar adjectives separated by a seven point scale: "predictable-unpredictable," "reliable-unreliable," "tense-relaxed," "valuable-worthless," "well adjusted-poorly adjusted," and "trustworthy-untrustworthy" (see Appendix F). The second questionnaire was the Personal Attitude Questionnaire (PAQ) which consisted of six questions about how the subject might interact with the interviewee (see Appendix E). The third measure was the Information Questionnaire (IQ) which contained twelve items based on the PHQ and twelve items based on the information given by the interviewee during the interview (see Appendix G). No overlap of information existed between the PHQ and the interview such that a subject could determine an

answer to the PHQ from the material presented in the videotape.

Upon completion of the dependent measures, subjects were debriefed as to the actual purpose of the experiment.

## RESULTS

A 2 X 2 X 2 analysis of variance was conducted on all 15 dependent measures. There were two significant Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition (i.e., ex-mental patient versus ex-medical patient) interactions. The first of these significant interactions was found for the AC item "Adjusted-Poorly Adjusted"  $F(1,120) = 7.44, p < .05$ . Using the Newman-Keuls Test (Keppel, 1973) to examine this interaction it was found that male subjects rated the interviewee labeled ex-mental patient significantly more poorly adjusted than they rated the interviewee labeled ex-medical patient ( $p < .05$ ) (see Appendix L). Further, male subjects rated the ex-mental patient significantly more poorly adjusted than did female subjects ( $p < .05$ ) (see Appendix L). There also was a significant Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition interaction for the PAQ item regarding perceived similarity to the interviewee  $F(1,120) = 5.32, p < .05$ . The Newman-Keuls Test demonstrated that males rated themselves as less similar to the ex-mental patient (regardless of sex) than the females rated themselves ( $p < .05$ ) (see Appendix S).

There was a significant Subject Sex X Stimulus Sex interaction for the PAQ item: "How willing would you be to develop a friendship with this person?"  $F(1,120) = 5.89, p < .05$ . Using the Newman-Keuls Test to examine this interaction it was found that males demonstrated a greater willingness to develop a friendship with a female interviewee (regardless of condition) than with the male interviewee ( $p < .05$ ) (see Appendix N).

Two significant effects were produced by rater sex alone. Males were less willing to overlook inappropriate behavior of the interviewees in either condition  $F(1,120) = 4.26, p < .05$  (see Appendix Q), and retained less information from the PHQ than female subjects  $F(1,120) = 8.71, p < .05$  (see Appendix T). Significant main effects were also found for Stimulus Sex and for Stimulus Condition. All subjects rated the female interviewee, regardless of label, as more unreliable than the male interviewee  $F(1,120) = 5.70, p < .05$  (see Appendix I). Further, all subjects rated themselves as more willing to go out of their way to help the ex-mental patient interviewee than the ex-medical patient interviewee  $F(1,120) = 11.43, p < .05$  (see Appendix R).

An examination of those results approaching significance (i.e.,  $0.10 > p > 0.05$ ) yielded an interesting trend, with female subjects rating the ex-mental patient in a more positive light than the control. Specifically, females rated the ex-mental patient as more predictable ( $p = .08$ ), more reliable ( $p = .07$ ), and more trustworthy ( $p = .08$ ) than they rated the ex-medical patient control. Females also stated that they were more willing to develop a friendship with the ex-mental patient than with the ex-medical patient ( $p = .09$ ).

## DISCUSSION

No definitive trends emerged from this study. Males did rate the ex-mental patient stimulus, regardless of sex, as more poorly adjusted than the control stimulus. Males also rated the ex-mental patient more poorly adjusted than females rated the ex-mental patient. Further, males rated themselves as less similar to the ex-mental patient stimulus than to the control. However, on all other measures no significant Sex of Subject X Stimulus Condition interaction effects were found. Males also appeared to be more intolerant than females as they were less willing to overlook inappropriate behavior of any of the stimulus presentations than were females. Only one main effect for Stimulus Condition was found, with all subjects stating that they would be more willing to go out of their way to help the ex-mental patient than the control. This finding clearly does not support the contention that the label ex-mental patient is a negative stigma.

Two specific problem areas merit discussion, as they not only influence the conclusions of this work, but also of other similar studies.

First, the use of a single stimulus presentation for each sex raises the criticism that all subjects' attitudinal responses were idiosyncratic to that stimulus person. This position also implies that even differential responses to the label ex-mental patient versus the control could be a function of an interaction between the label and that specific person, and therefore impossible to

separate. The implication of this position is that for definitive conclusions to be drawn, subjects should respond to many different male and female stimuli presentations with only the label in common. This would represent a methodological approach very different from that of the present study as variability in stimulus presentations would intentionally be increased rather than decreased. One of the possible idiosyncratic differences of the present study was that the female was rated as more unreliable than the male. This difference could have influenced ratings on other measures, causing actual differences to be diminished.

A second related problem of this study was the equating of the stimulus presentations on the dimensions of attractiveness and perceived normalcy. Given the Broverman, et. al. (1970) findings that differential stereotypes exist for mentally healthy males and females, the equating of the male and female interviewees could have rendered one or the other atypical rather than typical. This criticism also leads one to speculate that perhaps multiple stimuli presentations are more valid than single sex presentations.

A third possible criticism of this study's procedure is that the manipulation for labeling the interviewees was not salient enough to produce the attitudinal differences between male and female raters. However, it was a goal of this study to present the label ex-mental patient as neutrally and factually as possible in order to reduce any demand characteristics of the label ex-mental patient. Given the nature of the design and the fact that the label did produce some

significant differences, the author feels that the manipulation was successful. Also, none of the subjects accurately guessed the purpose of the experiment. The closest assumption to the actual purpose of the study was usually "the person we saw had been in a mental hospital and you wanted to see our responses to him/her because of this." As this was one of the primary manipulations of the study comments like this were construed as the successful manipulation of this variable.

The position that the public at large have negative attitudes toward those with the label ex-mental patient was clearly not supported by the findings of this study. Only one dimension differentiated the general category of ex-mental patients from the control conditions, with all subjects reporting that they would be more willing to go out of their way to help the ex-mental patient. A similar tendency of responding has been reported by Ellsworth (1965). When psychiatric patients' ratings of ward staff were correlated with those staff members' attitudes toward the patients, a factor labeled as "nontraditionalism" emerged. Those staff fitting into this category tended to reject traditionally judgmental concepts about the causes of mental illness as being lack of will power, overt organic causes, as well as attitudes that patients were unpredictable and dangerous. Given that the present subject population consisted of college students, this group could be closer to the nontraditional orientation rather than the traditional reported by Nunnally (1961). This area seems to be fertile for further

research into both attitudes toward ex-mental patients and attitudes toward mental illness.

The data neither strongly supported nor refuted Farina and his colleagues' (Farina, et. al., 1973; Farina & Hagelauer, 1975) conclusion that women are undifferentiating in their attitudes toward those labeled as ex-mental patients while males respond negatively toward someone so labeled. This pattern was replicated on two out of twelve attitudinal measures with male subjects rating the ex-mental patient more poorly adjusted than the control and as more poorly adjusted than female ratings of the ex-mental patient. Males also rated themselves as less similar to either the male or female ex-mental patient than females rated themselves. While these two measures verify Farina's findings, male subjects were also more willing to develop a friendship with the female interviewee regardless of label. Thus, in this case heterosexual effects were powerful enough to negate some of the effects of the label.

The failure to completely replicate Farina's findings is somewhat difficult to explain. Farina's subjects were department store clerks and hospital employees who could be expected to have different attitudes than college students. Age as well as educational and cultural backgrounds produce different attitudes. However, other studies using college students as subjects (Farina, Holland & Ring, 1966; Farina & Ring, 1965) reported this group to respond negatively towards those labeled as ex-mental patients. Furthermore, there appears to be no obvious reason as to why college

versus noncollege differences should transcend the reported differences in male versus female attitudinal differences.

Farina, et. als.' (1973) hypothesis that males may be more influenced by the background information of an individual than by current information, and that females may respond in an opposite direction was not supported by the results of the IQ. The purpose of the IQ was to indirectly test the above hypothesis by examining whether males would retain more information from the PHQ than females and if females would retain more information from the interview than males. A nearly opposite finding occurred, as females retained significantly more information from the PHQ than males, and both groups retained similar amounts from the interview. Therefore, to whatever degree the retention of information is a measure of influence of background information, females were more attentive to this variable. Also, the trend for females to be more positive in their ratings of the ex-mental patient interviewee than their ratings of the control interviewee indicates some degree of influence by prior information.

This study has several implications for further research. First, the results neither confirmed nor rejected the previous findings that males rate those labeled as ex-mental patients more negatively than those not so labeled. The possible transience of this effect could be caused by the use of only a single person stimuli presentation for the Sex of Subject Variable. A design incorporating many stimuli presentations for this variable would

increase variability, but it would also directly test the robustness of the phenomenon of negative male attitudes. Further research in this area might also investigate the effects of individual demographic variables as well as personality differences. During debriefing, the role of individual differences in attitudes towards stimulus presentations seemed to be quite strong. Often vastly different impressions of the interview were reported by subjects who all had the same information about the interviewee. Some subjects responded in the traditional manner with such statements as: "she seemed to be a little different - I'm not surprised she was in a mental hospital." Others replied very neutrally about the stimulus presentations, with comments like: "seemed like a typical college student to me" with no reference to the psychiatric hospitalization. It would be useful to examine the attitudinal differences of the subject population as a function of measurable differences in personality traits.

## CONCLUSION

No significant trends emerged from this study. While males displayed some negative attitudes toward individuals labeled as ex-mental patients, the results did not support the conclusion that this was a consistent effect. The position that the label ex-mental patient is a stigma and will produce negative attitudes toward those so labeled was clearly not supported by this research. The position that females do not display differential attitudes toward someone labeled as an ex-mental patient and someone not so labeled was supported. The current study used only one male and one female for the stimulus presentation of the Subject Sex Variable, raising the possibility of idiosyncratic responding to the particular persons used as interviewees.

## REFERENCES

- Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P. S. & Vogel, S. R. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgements of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.
- Ellsworth, R. B. A behavioral study of staff attitudes toward mental illness. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1965, 20, 194-200.
- Farina, A., Felner, R. D. & Boudreau, L. A. Reactions of workers to male and female mental patient job applicants. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 41, 363-372.
- Farina, A. & Hagelauer, H. D. Sex and mental illness: The generosity of females. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 122.
- Farina, A., Holland, C. H. & Ring, K. The role of stigma and set in interpersonal interaction. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1966, 71, 421-428.
- Farina, A. & Ring, K. The influence of perceived mental illness on interpersonal relations. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1965, 70, 47-51.
- Goffman, E. Asylums. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961.
- Huguenard, T., Sager, E. B. & Ferguson, L. W. Interview time, interview set, and interview outcome. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1970, 31, 831-836.
- Keppell, G. Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Lamy, R. E. Social consequences of mental illness. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 30, 451-455.
- Langer, E. J. & Abelson, R. P. A patient by any other name...: Clinical group difference in labeling bias. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 4-9.
- LaTorre, R. A. Gender and age as factors in the attitudes toward those stigmatized as mentally ill. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 97-98.

Nowacki, C. M. & Poe, C. A. The concept of mental health as related to sex of person perceived. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 40, 160.

Nunnally, J. C. Jr. Popular conceptions of mental health. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.

Szasz, T. S. The myth of mental illness. New York: Dell, 1961.

APPENDIX A

Analysis of Variance for Prerating Variable Perceived Attractiveness

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Videotape	1.23	1	1.23	2.56	N.S.
Rater Sex	1.23	1	1.23	2.56	N.S.
Interaction	.02	1	0.02	.04	N.S.
Error	17.50	36	0.48		
Total	19.98	39			

APPENDIX B

Analysis of Variance for Prerating Variable Perceived Normalcy

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Videotape	0.00	1	0.00		
Rater Sex	0.10	1	0.10	0.13	N.S.
Interaction	0.10	1	0.10	0.13	N.S.
Error	26.20	36	0.48		
Total	26.40	39			

## APPENDIX C

### Experimental Instructions

#### INTERVIEWING EXPERIMENT

The main purpose of this experiment is to explore differences in interviewing styles and techniques with different types of people.

You will watch a short video-taped interview. Please pay careful attention to the interview as you will be asked to answer some questions at the end of the video-tape.

To briefly acquaint you with the subject that is interviewed, the next page contains the same information that the interviewer had at the onset of the interview. Information such as certain names and places have been removed to protect the confidentiality of the interviewee. Please read this sheet carefully, and when you are through place this and the personal history sheet in front of you at the edge of your table so the experimenter can pick them up. Please do not turn to any other pages until instructed to at the end of the tape.

APPENDIX D

Personal History Questionnaire

Interviewing Research Associates, Inc.  
Personal Data Form QR5 (revised 5/75)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_

Hair: Brown Eyes: Brown

Educational History:

<u>School</u>	<u>Dates</u>	<u>Degree</u>
Sonoma Elementary School	1961-1967	-
Sonoma Junior High School	1967-1970	-
LaTour High School	1970-1973	YES

School Activities: Junior Prom Committee; Intramural Sports; Booster Club; Swim Club

Personal History:

Hobbies: Water sports, tennis, guitar playing

Clubs, Organizations: St. George Swim & Tennis Club

Family Background:

Parents Mother - Living XX Deceased    

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Birthdate: 11/33

Occupation: Housewife

Education: H.S. Grad; 2yrs Col.

Father: Living XX Deceased    

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Birthdate: 5/31

Occupation: Accountant

Education: H.S. Grad, B.A.

Siblings:

Sisters: None

Brothers: 1, age 22, Flight technician in USAF, plans USAF career

Medical History: (EX-MENTAL PATIENT CONDITION) Appendix removed at age

8; Subject stated some personal problems During adolescence resulting in a "few month hospitalization in a Psychiatric Hospital for emotional illness."

(EX-MEDICAL/CONTROL CONDITION) Appendix removed at age 8; Subject stated severe case of mononucleosis resulted in extended hospitalization during adolescence.

Current Information: Subject is currently an undergraduate at College. States no definite career plans at this time.

Current curriculum is liberal arts. Lives off campus with 3 friends.

Owns and drives own car.

INFORMATION/RESEARCH RELEASE (Please have subject sign): I AUTHORIZE THE ABOVE INFORMATION TO BE USED IN A PERSONAL INTERVIEW FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES. I ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT I WILL BE INFORMED OF THE NATURE OF THE INTERVIEW AND THE CONTENT OF THE QUESTIONS BEFORE THE INTERVIEW.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX E

Personal Attitude Questionnaire

Here are some questions about how you might personally interact with or feel about the interviewee you observed.

1. How willing would you be to develop a friendship with this person?

Not very willing	Moder- ately willing	Very willing
------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------

\_\_\_\_\_

2. How willing would you be to sponsor the interviewee for membership in a club to which you belong?

Not very willing	Moder- ately willing	Very willing
------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------

\_\_\_\_\_

3. In light of what you know about this person, how likely is this person to make lasting friendships?

Not very likely	Moder- ately likely	Very likely
-----------------------	---------------------------	----------------

\_\_\_\_\_

4. How willing would you be to overlook occasional inappropriate behavior on this person's part?

Not very willing	Moder- ately willing	Very willing
------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------

\_\_\_\_\_

5. How willing would you be to go out of your way to help this person if this person got into personal difficulties?

Not very willing	Moder- ately willing	Very willing
------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------

\_\_\_\_\_

6. How similar is the interviewee to you?

Not  
very  
similar

Some-  
what  
similar

Very  
Similar

-----

APPENDIX F

Adjective Checklist

Please rate the interviewee you observed along the following dimensions:

	Very much like this	Quite a bit like this	A little like this	A little like this	Quite a bit like this	Very much like this	
Predictable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Unpredictable
Reliable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Unreliable
Tense	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Relaxed
Valuable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Worthless
Well Adjusted	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Poorly Adjusted
Trustworthy	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	Untrustworthy

## APPENDIX G

### Information Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions in the spaces provided to the right of the question. Please answer precisely.

1. What is the occupation of the interviewee's brother?
2. & 3. Name two high school activities in which the interviewee participated.
4. What does the interviewee miss about high school?
5. How many roommates does the interviewee have?
6. What was the last job the interviewee held?
7. What grade did the interviewee make in second semester Math?
8. & 9. Name the two careers the interviewee is considering after graduation.
10. What is the occupation of the interviewee's father?
11. What was the Math teacher's name?
12. What is the name of the interviewee's father?
13. What grades has the interviewee typically made in college?
14. What was the interviewee's first job?
15. What year did the interviewee graduate from high school?
16. Of all the interviewee's jobs, which one did the interviewee like best?
17. What operation did the interviewee have at age eight?
18. What is the name of the interviewee's Mother?
19. Did the interviewee have a car in high school?
20. How old is the interviewee's brother?
21. What did the interviewee's father buy the interviewee?

22. What is the current curriculum of the interviewee?
23. What music course did the interviewee recently take on campus?
24. How long did the interviewee's Mother attend college?

APPENDIX H

Analysis of Variance for Adjective Checklist Item  
 Predictable-Unpredictable

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Subject Sex	1.32	1	0.87	0.87	N.S.
Stimulus Sex	0.38	1	0.25	0.25	N.S.
Stimulus Condition	5.70	1	3.75	3.75	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Sex	0.12	1	0.08	0.08	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition	5.28	1	3.33	3.33	N.S.
Stimulus Sex X Stimulus Condition	1.53	1	0.97	0.97	N.S.
Interaction	0.50	1	0.32	0.32	N.S.
Error	190.25	120	1.56		
Total	209.88	127			

APPENDIX I

Analysis of Variance for Adjective Checklist Item

Reliable-Unreliable

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Subject Sex	0.03	1	0.03	0.02	N.S.
Stimulus Sex	9.03	1	9.03	5.70	0.02
Stimulus Condition	3.13	1	3.13	1.97	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Sex	0.13	1	0.13	0.08	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition	5.28	1	5.28	3.33	N.S.
Stimulus Sex X Stimulus Condition	1.53	1	1.53	0.32	N.S.
Interaction	0.50	1	0.50	0.97	N.S.
Error	190.25	120	1.52		
Total	209.88	127			

Mean for Male Stimulus = 2.95

Mean for Female Stimulus = 3.48

APPENDIX J

Analysis of Variance for Adjective Checklist Item

Tense-Relaxed

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Subject Sex	3.78	1	3.78	1.45	N.S.
Stimulus Sex	0.28	1	0.28	0.11	N.S.
Stimulus Condition	2.00	1	2.00	0.76	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Sex	4.50	1	4.50	1.72	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition	0.28	1	0.28	0.11	N.S.
Stimulus Sex X Stimulus Condition	7.03	1	7.03	2.69	N.S.
Interaction	0.16	1	0.16	0.05	N.S.
Error	314.00	120	2.62		
Total	332.00	127			

APPENDIX K

Analysis of Variance for Adjective Checklist Item

Valuable-Worthless

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Subject Sex	0.95	1	0.95	0.60	N.S.
Stimulus Sex	0.20	1	0.20	0.12	N.S.
Stimulus Condition	2.82	1	2.82	1.79	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Sex	2.26	1	2.26	1.43	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition	1.32	1	1.32	0.84	N.S.
Stimulus Sex X Stimulus Condition	0.38	1	0.38	0.24	N.S.
Interaction	0.20	1	0.20	0.12	N.S.
Error	189.44	120	1.58		
Total	197.55	127			

APPENDIX L

Analysis of Variance for Adjective Checklist Item

Adjusted-Poorly Adjusted

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Subject Sex	2.53	1	2.53	1.14	N.S.
Stimulus Sex	0.78	1	0.78	0.35	N.S.
Stimulus Condition	3.78	1	3.78	1.70	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Sex	0.03	1	0.03	0.01	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition	16.53	1	16.53	7.44	0.007
Stimulus Sex X Stimulus Condition	1.53	1	1.53	0.69	N.S.
Interaction	0.78	1	0.78	0.35	N.S.
Error	266.75	120	2.22		
Total	292.72	127			

Results of Newman-Keuls Test

STIMULUS CONDITION

		Ex-Mental	Ex-Medical
S U B J E C T I T E S E X	Male	$\bar{X} = 3.97$	$\bar{X} = 2.91$
	Female	$\bar{X} = 2.97$	$\bar{X} = 3.34$

APPENDIX M

Analysis of Variance for Adjective Checklist Variable  
Trustworthy-Untrustworthy

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Subject Sex	2.00	1	2.00	1.17	N.S.
Stimulus Sex	0.13	1	0.13	0.07	N.S.
Stimulus Condition	0.50	1	0.50	0.29	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Sex	0.28	1	0.28	0.16	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition	5.28	1	5.28	3.08	N.S.
Stimulus Sex X Stimulus Condition	0.03	1	0.03	0.02	N.S.
Interaction	3.13	1	3.13	1.82	N.S.
Error	205.88	120	1.72		
Total	217.22	127			

APPENDIX N

Analysis of Variance for Personal Attitude Questionnaire Item

"How willing would you be to develop a friendship with this person?"

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Subject Sex	0.28	1	0.28	0.13	N.S.
Stimulus Sex	2.00	1	2.00	0.94	N.S.
Stimulus Condition	2.00	1	2.00	0.94	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Sex	12.50	1	12.50	5.89	0.02
Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition	6.12	1	6.12	2.89	N.S.
Stimulus Sex X Stimulus Condition	0.78	1	0.78	0.37	N.S.
Interaction	0.03	1	0.03	0.01	N.S.
Error	254.75	120	2.12		
Total	278.47	127			

Results of Newman-Keuls Test

STIMULUS SEX

		Male	Female
S U B J E C T S E X	Male	$\bar{X} = 4.12$	$\bar{X} = 5.00$
	Female	$\bar{X} = 4.84$	$\bar{X} = 4.47$

APPENDIX O

Analysis of Variance for Personal Attitude Questionnaire Item

"How willing would you be to sponser the interviewee for membership in a club to which you belong?"

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Subject Sex	0.00	1	0.00		
Stimulus Sex	0.28	1	0.28	0.11	N.S.
Stimulus Condition	3.12	1	3.12	1.20	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Sex	3.12	1	3.12	1.20	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition	0.28	1	0.28	0.11	N.S.
Stimulus Sex X Stimulus Condition	0.00	1	0.00		
Interaction	0.28	1	0.28	0.11	N.S.
Error	312.62	120	2.61		
Total	319.72	127			

APPENDIX P

Analysis of Variance for Personal Attitude Questionnaire Item

"In light of what you know about this person, how likely is this person to make lasting friendships?"

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Subject Sex	0.01	1	0.01	0.004	N.S.
Stimulus Sex	5.70	1	5.70	2.57	N.S.
Stimulus Condition	4.13	1	4.13	1.87	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Sex	1.32	1	1.32	0.60	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition	0.63	1	0.63	0.29	N.S.
Stimulus Sex X Stimulus Condition	0.07	1	0.07	0.03	N.S.
Interaction	0.63	1	0.63	0.29	N.S.
Error	265.81	120	2.22		
Total	278.40	127			

APPENDIX Q

Analysis of Variance for Personal Attitude Questionnaire Item

"How willing would you be to overlook occasional inappropriate behavior on this person's part?"

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Subject Sex	7.51	1	7.51	4.26	0.04
Stimulus Sex	0.95	1	0.95	0.54	N.S.
Stimulus Condition	0.20	1	0.20	0.11	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Sex	0.63	1	0.63	0.36	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition	0.63	1	0.63	0.36	N.S.
Stimulus Sex X Stimulus Condition	4.13	1	4.13	2.35	N.S.
Interaction	2.26	1	2.26	1.28	N.S.
Error	211.31	120	1.76		
Total	227.62	127			

Mean for Male Subjects = 4.31

Mean for Female Subjects = 4.80

APPENDIX R

Analysis of Variance for Personal Attitude Questionnaire Item

"How willing would you be to go out of your way to help this person if this person got into personal difficulties?"

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Subject Sex	3.12	1	3.12	2.16	N.S.
Stimulus Sex	4.50	1	4.50	3.11	N.S.
Stimulus Condition	16.53	1	16.53	11.43	0.001
Subject Sex X Stimulus Sex	0.12	1	0.12	0.09	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition	2.53	1	2.53	1.75	N.S.
Stimulus Sex X Stimulus Condition	0.28	1	0.28	0.19	N.S.
Interaction	0.28	1	0.28	0.19	N.S.
Error	173.50	120	1.45		
Total	200.87	127			

Mean for Ex-Mental Condition = 5.27

Mean for Ex-Medical Condition = 4.57

APPENDIX S

Analysis of Variance for Personal Attitude Questionnaire Item

"How similar is the interviewee to you?"

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Subject Sex	2.82	1	2.82	1.14	N.S.
Stimulus Sex	0.38	1	0.38	0.16	N.S.
Stimulus Condition	0.19	1	0.19	0.08	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Sex	0.95	1	0.95	0.38	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition	13.13	1	13.13	5.32	0.02
Stimulus Sex X Stimulus Condition	8.51	1	8.51	3.45	N.S.
Interaction	4.13	1	4.13	1.68	N.S.
Error	296.06	120	2.47		
Total	326.18	127			

Results of Newman-Keuls Test

STIMULUS CONDITION

		Ex-Mental	Ex-Medical
S U B J E C T S E X	Male	$\bar{X} = 2.72$	$\bar{X} = 3.28$
	Female	$\bar{X} = 3.66$	$\bar{X} = 2.94$

APPENDIX T

Analysis of Variance for Personal History Questionnaire Information

Retained

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Subject Sex	47.53	1	47.53	8.71	0.004
Stimulus Sex	11.28	1	11.28	2.07	N.S.
Stimulus Condition	12.50	1	12.50	2.29	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Sex	2.00	1	2.00	0.37	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition	0.28	1	0.28	0.05	N.S.
Stimulus Sex X Stimulus Condition	0.78	1	0.78	0.14	N.S.
Interaction	4.50	1	4.50	0.82	N.S.
Error	655.00	120	5.46		
Total	733.88	127			

Mean for Male Subjects = 7.11

Mean for Female Subjects = 8.33

APPENDIX U

Analysis of Variance for Interview Items Retained

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F	P
Subject Sex	1.32	1	1.32	0.50	N.S.
Stimulus Sex	5.70	1	5.70	2.18	N.S.
Stimulus Condition	0.008	1	0.008	0.003	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Sex	3.45	1	3.45	1.32	N.S.
Subject Sex X Stimulus Condition	0.95	1	0.95	0.36	N.S.
Stimulus Sex X Stimulus Condition	6.57	1	6.57	2.51	N.S.
Interaction	2.82	1	2.82	1.08	N.S.
Error	314.06	120	2.62		
Total	334.87	127			

**The vita has been removed from  
the scanned document**

# ATTITUDES TOWARDS EX-MENTAL PATIENTS AS A FUNCTION OF GENDER

by

David Blodgett Jones

(ABSTRACT)

The major purpose of the present study was to examine the attitudinal differences between males and females toward males and females labeled as either an ex-mental patient or an ex-medical patient. Undergraduate students first read a personal history questionnaire which was identical in all experimental conditions except for the type of patient described under the heading of "Medical History," i.e., ex-mental or ex-medical patient. Subjects then watched an eleven-minute videotaped interview of a college student who was presented as the person described in the personal history questionnaire. These videotaped interviews were identical except for the sex of the interviewee. After viewing the videotapes, subjects completed a questionnaire composed of six bi-polar adjectives regarding the interviewee's adjustment, a questionnaire containing six questions about how the subject might interact with the interviewee, and an information questionnaire containing twelve questions based on the personal history questionnaire and twelve items from the videotaped interview. The position that the label ex-mental patient is a stigma and will produce negative attitudes toward those so labeled was clearly not supported by this research. While males displayed some negative attitudes toward individuals labeled as ex-mental patients, this was not a consistent effect. The notion that females do not display differential attitudes toward

someone labeled as an ex-mental patient and someone not so labeled was supported. Several methodological issues possibly affecting the results were discussed.