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CHAPTER I

PRESENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

Introduction

The main purpose of this study is to present an organized summary of some of the outstanding contemporary psychoanalytic theories of personality which have evolved during the past fifty or sixty years and to identify the similarities and convergences of these theoretical positions.

According to one survey (4) personality theorists have been concerned more with the organization of personality traits into a hierarchy of functions than in studying the individual aspects of behavior. Some personality theorists have emphasized that a more complete understanding of individual behavior would best be achieved when the whole functioning person was studied. Personality theorists have likewise been concerned with the incentive or the motive which prompted behavior as a very pertinent problem for comprehending personality.

Although the word, personality, is used in various senses, most of these popular meanings fall under one of two headings. The first usage equates the term to social skill or adroitness. An individual's personality is assessed by the effectiveness with which he is able to elicit positive reactions from a variety of persons under circumstances. In referring to a student as presenting a personality problem, one is indicating that his social skills are not adequate to maintain satisfactory relations with his fellow
students and his teachers. The second usage considers the personality of the individual to inhere in the most outstanding or salient impression which he creates in others. A person may thus be said to have an "aggressive personality" or a "submissive personality" or a "fearful personality." In each case the observer selects an attribute or quality which is highly typical of the subject and which is presumably an important part of the overall impression which he creates in others and his personality is identified by this term. It is clear that there is an element of evaluation in both usages. Personalities as commonly described are good and bad (4, p. 7).

There is a multiformity of uses and meanings which the psychologist has given to the term, personality. In an exhaustive survey of the literature, Allport (1937) extracted almost fifty different definitions which he classified into a number of broad categories (1).

It is important to distinguish between what Allport calls biosocial and biophysical definitions. The biosocial definition shows a close correspondence with the popular use of the term as it equates personality to the "social stimulus value" of the individual. It is the reaction of other individuals to the subject which defines his personality. One may even assert that the individual possesses no personality but that provided by the response of others. Allport objects vigorously to the implication that personality resides only in the "responding-other" and suggests that a biophysical definition which roots the personality firmly in characteristics or qualities of the subject is much to be preferred. According to the latter definition, personality has an organic side as well as a perceived side and may be linked to specific qualities of the individual which are susceptible to objective description and measurement (4, p. 8).

Personality has also been appraised by listing the individual characteristics that one considers of importance in describing the individual and stating that personality is
composed of these. Other definitions place major emphasis upon the structure of personality.

The foregoing definitions indicate that personality is the structure that is given to the distinctive aspects of behavior of the individual or else they indicate that the structure results from the personality which is the driving force within the individual. Personality is that which unifies and gives harmony to all the different aspects of behavior. Some theorists have suggested that the real task of personality is to reflect the adjustment of the individual. In other definitions, personality refers to the uniqueness of behavior. In this instance, it is a term used to indicate those things about the individual that are unusual and which describe him as a person. Finally, some theorists have considered personality to indicate the intrinsic nature of the individual. These definitions indicate that personality refers to those aspects of the individual which designate him, not only in that they point him out from other persons, but because it is "what he actually is." Allport proposes that "personality is, 'what a man really is,' illustrates this type of definition" (1). To Allport, therefore, personality consists of what is most distinctive and representative of the person.

The definition chosen in this study suggests that personality is defined by the noteworthy experiences and observations which are important components of the theory of
personality used by the observer. Personality is a term which is "used to describe the individual being studied according to the variables or dimensions which occupy a central position within the particular theory utilized" (4, p. 9). Each of the personality theories will most assuredly indicate these important elements.

Older than the history of psychology is the question of whether man should be viewed as possessing purposive or teleological qualities. Some theories of behavior create a model of the individual in which goal-striving, purpose, and seeking are viewed as essential and central aspects of the individual's behavior. Other theories assume that the striving and seeking aspects of behavior are unimportant and believe that behavior can be accounted for adequately without such an emphasis. The latter theorists consider the subjective elements of striving and seeking as an epiphenomenon, accompanying behavior but not playing a determinant role in its instigation. Generally theories which minimize the importance of purpose or teleology are labeled "mechanistic" although this term has come to have a disparaging quality which is undesirable when, after all, we are simply considering matters of theoretical option (4, p. 21).

Another consideration confronting personality theorists is the importance of conscious and unconscious determinants of behavior. The unconscious is used here to indicate behavior of which the individual is unaware and unable to bring to awareness except under special conditions. Theories of personality range from those which ignore any consideration of such determinants, to the theories which consider them the most important determinants of behavior. Some theorists are willing to accept the importance of unconscious determinants in the behavior of disturbed individuals but indicate that
for the normal individual conscious motives are the important
determinants of behavior (4).

A fundamental distinction between theories of personality has to do with the extent to which the
learning process, or the modification of behavior, is a matter for detailed and explicit attention.
Some personality theorists see in the understanding of the learning process the key to all behavioral
phenomena, whereas, for other theorists, learning is an important but secondary problem. Although some
theorists prefer to focus upon the acquisition or outcomes of learning rather than on the process it-
self. This issue thus becomes a matter of disagree-
ment between those who propose to deal primarily
with the process of change and those who show them-
selves most interested in the stable structures or acquisitions of personality at a given time (4, p.
22).

One controversial question which is prevalent among per-
sonality theorists is the importance of hereditary factors in
influencing and determining behavior. Most theorists will
concede that hereditary factors will naturally influence be-
behavior, but there are some who minimize their importance. In
America, the importance of hereditary factors has been given
a minor role with major emphasis being placed on "some brand
of environmentalism but there is still considerable variation
as to how much and how explicitly the various theorists are
willing to deal with genetic factors" (4, p. 23).

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this investigation is to note the similari-
ties and convergences among theories of personality of some
of the contemporary psychoanalysts. Thus through the presenta-
tion of the theories, it is felt that one may gain the central
importance of the theories as a means of generating or stimulating understanding. These theories will aid in the organization of facts which will help in understanding behavior. It is recommended that these theories be evaluated in terms of their capacity to generate new thinking and in their capacity to assist the psychologist in finding some meaningful relationships as he is studying behavior. The value of each theory is to be equated to its utility.

Procedure

The plan of this investigation faced three problems of development. The first problem was concerned with an investigation and presentation of pertinent theories of personality which would illustrate the metamorphases and various descriptions of personality as viewed by contemporary theorists; the second, the investigation of each theory in a distinct and explicit manner so as to point out its unique contribution to the understanding of behavior; and third, the investigation with resultant syntheses of meaningful relationships that each theory generates to the psychologist that will be helpful to him for practical application in understanding behavior.

Contemporary literature is replete with various points of view concerning personality theories. The first problem confronting the writer was a method of ascertaining the personality theories which would illustrate the teleology and
the various manner in which personality may be viewed. A feasible approach in the selection of the personality theories to be investigated was obtained by perusal of recent and pertinent psychological texts and literature, and to present these theories in historical sequence.

Being cognizant of the fact that certain personality theories are complex, this study was concerned with the presentation of the information gleaned from each theory of personality in an effective and rational manner. Each theory was to be presented so as to emphasize the unique contribution which it offers in explaining and understanding behavior. However, intricate terminology was avoided in explaining each theory so as to refrain from confusion or perplexity of the material.

The last item for investigation was the advancing in a direct manner from principles established or assumed and propositions provided in each personality theory, to meaningful relationships that would have practical application in understanding behavior. Each theorist's contribution was evaluated and condensed using its unique characteristics so as to produce a logical and understandable framework for the understanding of personality.

In summary, this investigation was made to locate and present pertinent theories of personality that would show the various progression of ideas in the description and
enlightenment of personality and to present them in a clear and concise manner so that these "facts" can be utilized by those who are attempting to find practical application of this information in understanding behavior.

A presentation of the individual theories of personality of Sigmund Freud, Carl Jung, Alfred Adler, Karen Horney, Harry Stack Sullivan, Gordon Allport, and Kurt Goldstein will be given in Chapter II.
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CHAPTER II

PSYCHOANALYTIC THEORIES

For many, many years men have tried to understand themselves and their behavior. From the early civilizations of Greece and Rome some of the great thinkers of the centuries have been concerned with questions concerning human personality. It was during the nineteenth century, however, that systematic approaches were made to attempt to understand psychological aberrations. Sigmund Freud, who was one of the early geniuses, conceived of the ideas that man was driven by certain central forces that activated behavior, and that these impellants were emotional in character and derived from basic, biological given "instincts" (15).

There was opposition to the tenets of this kind of psychology. Some theorists found it difficult to accept the idea of behavior as being primarily motivated by biological urges. Still others questioned the idea that personality was dominated and controlled by influences which were preponderantly formulated during the early years of life. There were some who viewed the personality as having been partially controlled and molded by cultural influences. As a result of these contrasting viewpoints, personality theorists began to delve into various aspects and influences upon the individual
with the hope of attaining answers that would unravel some of the myriad of personal and behavioral factors (10).

Freud's Psychoanalytic Theory

Sigmund Freud, in his study of the traditional psychology of consciousness, chose a different direction from contemporaries of his who were working in psychiatry. His attention was directed toward a study of the unconscious mental life—for it was his belief that these "unseen forces" commanded a dictatorial control over the conscious thoughts and acts of man. Thus, it seemed to him that a psychology which limited itself to the study of consciousness was not adequate for understanding the reasons for man's behavior (2, 7, 14).

During Freud's over fifty years of study and investigation, he advanced many fruitful hypotheses and collected pertinent information on psychoanalysis, interpretations of dreams, psychopathology of everyday life, and others. This study will be limited to an analysis of significant information concerning Freud's theory of personality.

The Structure of Personality

In Freudian psychoanalytic theory, the functions of the total personality are divided into three parts—the id, the ego, and the superego, each system having its unique function, but all three acting together concurrently—rarely exclusively—producing human behavior (12).
The id, Freud explained, is the original system of personality and it is present from the beginning of life itself; it includes the instincts. The task of the id is to seek pleasure and to furnish energy for the other two systems, the ego and superego. Because of the apparent inadequacy of the id in dealing with objective reality, the ego emerges (4).

The ego has dominion over all the cognitive and intellectual functions in order that appropriate action may be taken to fulfill the needs of the organism. It is the mediator between the instinctual requirements of the organism and the conditions of the surrounding environment.

The superego is the internalized moral arbiter of conduct developed by the child's response to the rewards and punishments meted out by the parents. Its main functions are (1) to inhibit the impulses of the id, (2) to persuade the ego to substitute moralistic goals for realistic ones, and (3) to strive for perfection. The superego is concerned with idealistic goals and is opposed to the realistic function of the ego and the instinctual gratification of the id.

In summary, the three psychological processes described above, under ordinary circumstances, work together as a team under the administrative leadership of the ego and balance each other in order that the personality may function normally.
The Dynamics of Personality

Freud regarded the human organism as a complex energy system which derives its energy from the food it consumes and expends it for such various purposes as circulation, respiration, muscular exercise, perceiving, thinking, and remembering. Energy used for the psychological activities, he called psychic energy and maintained that this energy could be transformed into physiological energy and vice-versa using the id as the bridge between the two.

An instinct is defined as an inborn psychological representation (wish) of an inner somatic source of excitation (need) which motivates and directs human behavior (1). Freud's concept of the instinct implies that it is for tension-reduction, thus returning the individual to the former relatively quiescent state before excitation. He further states that the source and aim of instincts are relatively constant throughout life, but the object or means by which the person attempts to satisfy the need can and does vary considerably due to the fact that psychic energy can be expended in various ways. This displacement of energy from one object to another is the most important feature of personality dynamics, and Freud's theory of motivation was based on the assumption that the instincts are the sole energy sources for man's behavior (1).

The dynamics of personality consists of the way in which psychic energy is distributed and used by the id, ego, and
superego. Since the amount of energy is limited, there is competition among the three systems for the available energy.

The dynamics of personality is to a large extent governed by the necessity for gratifying one's needs by means of transactions with objects in the external world which also contains regions of danger and insecurity. The environment can threaten as well as comfort, this fact being responsible for the feelings of fear in the individual.

The function of anxiety is to warn the person of impending danger; it is a signal to the ego that unless appropriate measures are taken the danger may increase until the ego is overthrown, and he may flee from the threatening region, inhibit the dangerous impulse, or obey the voice of conscience. Anxiety which cannot be dealt with by effective measures is said to be traumatic, causing the person to fall back upon unrealistic methods of coping with the situation. These are so-called defense mechanisms of the ego.

**The Development of Personality**

Freud was probably the first psychological theorist to emphasize the developmental aspects of personality, and in particular to stress the decisive role of the early years of infancy and childhood in laying down the basic character structure of the person. Indeed, he felt that personality was fairly well formed by the end of the fifth year, and that subsequent growth consisted for the most part of elaborating this basic structure.
Personality was viewed as motivated by various conflicts and threats which contended for supremacy. Much energy was expended during the contest of these various forces whose aim was to reduce tension and bring about equilibrium. This process of coping with and handling conflicts resulted in the development of personality (11, 14).

Identification and displacement are two methods by which the individual learns to resolve his frustrations, conflicts, and anxieties. The concept of identification may be defined as the method by which a person takes over the features of another person which are particularly attractive to him in fulfilling his needs and makes them a corporate part of his personality. The final personality structure represents an accumulation of numerous identifications made at various periods of the person's life, although the mother and father are probably the most important identification figures. Displacement concerns the continually shifting and searching for an object or means for gratifying a need, thus reducing the anxiety.

Under the pressure of excessive anxiety, the ego is sometimes forced to take extreme measures to relieve the pressure through defense mechanisms. The principal defense mechanisms are repression, projection, reaction formation, fixation, and regression, all of which have two characteristics in common: (1) they deny, falsify, or distort reality,
and (2) they operate unconsciously so that the person is not aware of what is taking place.

Repression is said to occur when an object-choice that arouses undue alarm is forced out of consciousness by an anticathexis, and cannot be abolished until the person can assure himself that the danger no longer exists; however, he cannot get such reassurance until the repression is lifted so that he can test reality—thus, a vicious circle is established.

Projection occurs when the individual reduces anxiety by substituting a lesser danger for a greater one. In view of the fact that neurotic or moral anxiety is more threatening, the individual is likely to achieve greater relief for his anxious condition if the source of the anxiety can be attributed to the external world rather than to the individual's own primitive impulses.

Reaction formation is a defensive measure which involves the replacement in consciousness of an anxiety-producing impulse or feeling by its opposite, i.e., love for hate. This defense mechanism is characterized by extreme forms of behavior.

Personality passes through a series of rather well-defined stages in its development until it reaches maturity—each stage being fraught with certain frustrations and anxieties. The person who finds the next step in growth too full of anxiety
will be halted temporarily or permanently, thus becoming fixated in his present pattern of behavior.

Closely related to the fixation type of defense is that of regression in which a person encountering a traumatic experience retreats to an earlier stage of development which is usually determined by his earlier fixations. It may be said that fixation and regression are ordinarily relative conditions; a person rarely fixates or regresses completely.

There are three stages of psycho-sexual development: the oral, anal, and phallic stages, which are defined in terms of their interest and attachment with particular body zones. The latency period follows these pre-genital stages, and there is a quiescence of infantile sexual interest and an apparent emergence of new interests. During this period social feelings develop. The adolescent stage then emerges, wherein there is a reactivation of sexual interest and heterosexual adjustments are formed. If the individual satisfactorily advances through each of these developmental periods, wherein the ego becomes tolerant and the early sexual impulses become sublimated, then he emerges into the final stage of maturity, the genital stage.

One of the main functions of the genital stage is that of procreation of the race and the other is that of psychological development which will provide for stability and consistency of personality. The individual becomes more altruistic and
socialized, he plans for a career, and the establishment and rearing of a family. The early oral, anal, and phallic impulses become channelled and synthesized into the genital impulses.

While Freud differentiated four stages of personality growth, he emphasized that a smooth transition occurred as the individual emerges out of one stage into another. The final organization of personality represents contributions and influences from all four stages.

**Research Methods**

Freud used a number of special data-collecting techniques. They were used, of course, in the therapeutic situation because this is where Freud gathered his data.

After a brief trial of the method of hypnosis which was then very much in vogue, especially in France, Freud learned about a new method which had been used successfully by his friend and colleague, Dr. Joseph Breuer, in the treatment of a case of hysteria. This method which Breuer called catharsis or the "talking cure" consisted of the patient relating the details of the first appearance of each of his symptoms, following which the symptoms disappeared. Out of this method, Freud gradually evolved his own unique free-association method which Ernest Jones has called "one of the two great deeds of Freud's scientific life," the other being Freud's self-analysis (7, p. 58).

In essence, the free-association method requires the patient to say everything that comes into consciousness, no matter how ridiculous or inappropriate it may sound. The role of the therapist is, to a great extent, a passive one.
He sits and listens, prods occasionally by asking questions when the verbal flow of the patient dries up, but he does not interrupt the patient when he is talking.

Freud observed that the patient eventually begins to talk about memories of early childhood experiences which provided the theorist with his first real insight into the formation of the personality structure and its subsequent development.

The analysis of dreams, if a natural consequence of the instruction to the patient that he talk about everything that comes to his mind, provided Freud with a rich insight into human behavior. He formulated the famous theory which states that the dream is an expression of the most primitive workings and contents of the human mind, and by having his patients free-associate their dreams, he was able to penetrate into the most inaccessible regions of the human mind and to discover the bedrock of personality. Freud was reluctant to accept the validity of any hypothesis until he had tested it out on himself for he practiced self-analysis throughout his life.

Jung's Analytical Theory

Carl Gustav Jung became interested in Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams* soon after it was published, and he afterward became an ardent follower and adhered to Freud's ideas. However, nearly a decade later this friendship ceased, and Jung
began to develop his own theory of psychoanalysis which is known as "Analytical Psychology."

Carl Jung is acclaimed as one of the greatest living thinkers. For over a half century he has devoted himself with great energy and purpose to the investigation and understanding of human personality. Now in his ninetieth year of life, Jung is still engaged in research and writing. He is known not only to psychologists and psychiatrists but also to other erudite individuals of various vocations. Next to Freud, Jung is probably recognized as one of the most outstanding modern psychologists.

Although Jung's theory of personality is usually identified as a psychoanalytic theory because of the emphasis that it places upon unconscious processes, it differs in some notable respects from Freud's theory of personality. Perhaps the most prominent and distinctive feature of Jung's view of man is that it combines teleology with causality. Man's behavior is conditioned not only by his individual and racial history (causality) but also by his aims and aspirations (teleology). Both the past as actuality and the future as potentiality guide one's present behavior. Jung's view of personality is prospective in the sense that it looks ahead to the person's future line of development and retrospective in the sense that it takes account of the past. To paraphrase Jung, "the person lives by aims as well as by causes." This insistence upon the role of destiny or purpose in human development sets Jung clearly apart from Freud. For Freud, there is only the endless repetition of instinctual themes until death intervenes. For Jung, there is constant and often creative development, the search for wholeness and completion, and the yearning for rebirth (7, p. 78).

Jung's theory of personality gives recognition to racial and phylogenetic foundations of personality. Jung emphasizes
that man has been fashioned into his present form by the pre-
ceding experiences of foregoing generations. While Freud
stressed the infantile origins of personality, Jung empha-
sized the racial origins of personality. This emphasis upon
the importance of man's racial past and the influence that it
has upon man today suggests that Jung, more than any other
psychologist, has delved into a study of man's history in
order to learn what he could of racial origins and the develop-
ment of personality. He has studied mythology, religion and
ancient rituals, as well as the mental processes of man, in
his attempt to understand human personality. His knowledge
and skill have earned for him a place of recognition and ad-
miration among contemporary psychologists.

The Structure of Personality

In discussing the structure of personality, Jung empha-
sizes that the total personality is composed of many individual
interwoven systems.

The principal ones are the ego, the personal
unconscious, and its complexes, the collective un-
conscious and its archetypes . . . in addition to
these interdependent systems there are the attitudes
of introversion and extraversion. . . . Finally,
there is the self which is the fully developed and
fully unified personality (?, p. 79).

The ego is described as the conscious mind. The ego is
responsible for one's feeling of "self" and shapes and molds
the personality.
The personal unconscious is composed of experiences of which one was formerly aware, but because of their apparent unimportance have not been retained. However, these experiences, similar to Freud's preconscious material, can be recalled, and there is a reciprocal action between the personal unconscious and the ego.

A complex is a constituent part of the personal unconscious and is composed of our ideas, observations, sensations, mental images, and impressions. It is propelled by a central organization or "nucleus."

The nucleus and its component entities, while not operating at the conscious level, may nevertheless be brought to consciousness.

The discovery of the collective unconscious is one of the unique contributions of Jung's personality theory. This feature of personality is described as being inherited, non-personal, and entirely universal. It is purported as being the most powerful and dominant part of one's personality, for it serves as the foundation upon which one's ego develops, and steers and determines the selection and acquisition of one's individual attitudes and experiences. Though the collective unconscious exerts extensive influence upon man's experiences, "individualism" comes to the fore for otherwise personality would be stripped of its uniqueness.

The archetypes may be viewed as forces which appear to have continuity and order, independent of man, and which are
beyond his influence. According to these forces, the contents sinking into the unconscious are molded and shaped in such a way that they are inaccessible to conscious cognition and are incomprehensible to the individual. It is this "inner functioning" of the unconscious that forms a refuge and help in the everyday happenings of life, but it appears that the individual does not understand how to "get in touch" with it. Thus, archetypes, as Jung perceived them, can alter one's conscious adjustment.

At the center core of personality, Jung emphasized, is the one archetype which coordinates and provides the personality with consistency, organization, and stability. This archetype, which operates between the conscious and unconscious, provides the personality with its aims, and is conceived as not being fully developed until about mid-life. This concept, called the "self," is one of Jung's original and important psychological inventions.

Jung has postulated that there are two fundamental attitudes, namely introversion and extraversion. The first attitude is normally characterized by a hesitant, reflective, retiring nature that focuses or directs the individual toward the "inner, subjective world." The second is normally characterized by an outgoing, candid nature that adapts easily to a given situation and focuses or directs the individual toward the "external, objective world." While both attitudes are inherent and exert influence on each individual, one, however,
is more directive and is "conscious" and the other is less directive and "unconscious." Jung pointed out that if the ego is preponderantly extraverted to the environment, the personal unconscious will be introverted (9).

Virtually all personality theorists, and Jung is no exception, believe that a psychological theory of personality must be founded on the principle of conflict. These conflicts create tension which utilizes energy, and the development of personality ensues. Conflict is conceived as being a fundamental and inevitable fact of life.

Jung believes, however, that personality should not be a turmoil, but rather a synthesis and balancing of opposing forces which integrate personality. The center of this integrated personality is the "self" which unites all of the opposing trends of the various systems and works toward the ideal goal of perfect unity and harmony.

For Jung, the personality is an exceedingly complex structure. Not only are there numerous components—the number of possible archetypes and complexes, for example, is legion—but the interaction between these components are intricate and involved. No other personality theorist has evolved such a rich and complex description of the structure of personality (7, p. 90).

The Development of Personality

The most outstanding feature of Jung's theory of personality, aside from his conception of the collective unconscious with its archetypes, is the significance that he places upon
man as he attempts to progress from a less complete stage of
development to a more complete one.

The ultimate goal toward which man is progressing is
self-actualization. Self-actualization means that the in-
dividual needs to realize his potential growth and to develop
to the highest stature of which he is capable. All of his
needs have to be met so that there may ensue a harmonious
working together of all the components of his personality.

According to this viewpoint, man's personality is com-
prehended in terms of his past, his present, and his future,
and it is in these areas that the psychologist must delve in
order to better understand behavior. While man cannot undo
what he has already done, it is, however, the psyche which
creates its own future, and this gives man an optimistic
feeling of hope and a zest for living.

Heredity is accredited an important role in Jungian psy-
chology. He recognizes that man inherits the biological in-
stincts which provide for self-preservation and reproduction.
Jung's views on instincts are no different from those held by
modern biology.

Jung does not specify in detail, as Freud does, the stages
through which the personality passes from infancy to adulthood.
In the very early years, libido is concerned with the need for
survival. Before the age of five, sexual values begin to ap-
ppear and reach their height during adolescence. In youth and
early adult years, the individual directs his energy and
vigor toward the pursuit of a vocation, marriage and rearing of a family, and establishing himself in the community.

When an individual reaches the middle years of life, youthful interests become more cultural and spiritual and less biological. The middle-aged person becomes more introverted and less impulsive. He is changed into a spiritually oriented individual.

Development may follow either a forward movement, progression, or a backward movement, regression. During a progression energy is utilized in adjusting to the environment and in meeting the needs of the unconscious. Regression may ensue when a frustrating circumstance is met or the individual may displace his psychic energy from the instincts to cultural, spiritual, and more differentiated forms of adjustment. This process is called sublimation. If sublimation is not possible, then repression occurs. Thus, sublimation is progression and repression is regression. Jung has emphasized that during regression the personal and collective unconscious which have been repressed or ignored come to the fore and enable the ego to overcome the frustration. One of the signposts which may point the way out of the predicament is the dream which can offer a useful compensation for this perplexing condition. Thus, Jung feels that dreams should be analyzed as they reveal unconscious material and assist in working through a frustrating condition.
To Jung, the development of personality is an unfolding and progressive process from a simple uncomplicated form of development to a complex differentiated form of existence. Man's biological instincts provide for his self-preservation and the propagation of the race. Various techniques of adjustment are utilized through progression, repression, sublimation, and dreams. From youth until the end of life, man is attempting to build a satisfactory and happy relationship between himself and his existing environment.

**Research Methods**

Jung is a prodigious and enthusiastic investigator. One of his noteworthy contributions in the study of emotional reaction is his use of the word-association test.

In the word-association test, which is one of the very earliest of the projective tests, the standard method of administration consists in presenting a list of stimulus words to a subject, who is asked to respond with the first word that comes to mind. Concurrently, Jung used a pneumograph to measure the change in respiration rate and a psychogalvanometer to indicate the skin resistance reaction. The reaction time in responding to each word was noted as were the changes in respiration and in skin resistance. These three measures were used to indicate an emotional reaction to the specific words in the test (14).
Jung found these methods to be a valuable aid in the study of complexes in patients. A significant delay in responding to the stimulus word and a change in respiratory and skin resistance reactions indicated that a complex had been located and set off by the stimulus word.

The case study, as has already been observed in discussing Freud, is the principal method which psychoanalysts use for uncovering unconscious material and for locating personality functions. Jung, like Freud, is a master of the case study technique, and he utilized free associations and dreams for gathering his basic data in the study of personality. Jung has made two unique contributions to the case study method. These are (1) dream series method, and (2) the method of active imagination.

Freud analyzed dreams one at a time by the free association method, and from the dream material and the free associations obtained an interpretation of the dream. Jung, however, utilizes a series of dreams obtained from a person.

In the method of active imagination, the subject is asked to focus his attention on a complicated and misunderstood dream image, or on a visual image and note what happens to the image. The fantasies produced by active imagination, Jung suggests, furnish better material for study than do nocturnal dreams because they are presented by a waking consciousness rather than a somnolent one.
Jung employed many of the usual psychological vehicles for obtaining information from his patients. His active use of the word association gave impetus to others for locating complexes, and inspired other theorists to initiate additional research in this area. His case study method utilized two unique techniques for locating and presenting unconscious material—namely the dream series method and the method of active imagination. The latter, Jung postulated, may be preferred as material is presented while the patient is awake.

Social Psychological Theories: Adler, Horney, and Sullivan

During the latter part of the nineteenth century, sociology and anthropology began to develop independently and have had a phenomenal growth. Gradually, these social and cultural influences began to invade psychological and psychoanalytical sciences. Some of the disciples of Freud began to revamp psychoanalytic theory and to incorporate the new ideas of the social sciences.

Among those who provided psychoanalytic theory with the twentieth century look of social psychology are Alfred Adler, Karen Horney, and Harry Stack Sullivan. Of these three Alfred Adler may be regarded as the ancestral figure of the "new social psychological look" because as early as 1911 he broke with Freud over the issue of sexuality, and proceeded to develop a theory in which social interest and a striving for superiority became two of its most substantial conceptual pillars. Later, Horney became interested in the relevance of social psychological variables for personality theory. Finally, Harry
Stack Sullivan in his theory of interpersonal relations consolidated the position of a personality theory grounded in social processes. Although each of the theories has its own distinctive assumptions and concepts, there are numerous parallels among them (7, p. 115).

Harry Stack Sullivan, a former follower of Freud, is one who has brought his ideas to a higher and more independent level by developing a system which was strikingly different from the Freudian one. He was extremely influenced by anthropology and social psychology. The thinking of Horney remained within the area of psychoanalysis and elaboration of Freudian concepts. Adler, although not an ardent follower of Freud, was influenced by Freudian concepts throughout his life. Sullivan, a highly original thinker, attracted a large group of followers and developed what is sometimes called a "new school of psychiatry."

Alfred Adler

Alfred Adler, after receiving his medical degree and practicing in general medicine, became a psychiatrist. Adler soon began to develop ideas which were divergent from those of Freud and other contemporaries, and when these differences became marked he was asked to present his views to the society. This he did in 1911, and as a consequence of the criticism of his position by other members of the society, Adler resigned as president and shortly thereafter severed his connection with Freudian psychoanalysis.
He enlisted a group of followers and developed his "Individual Psychology," which attained world recognition. During the First World War, Adler served as a physician in the Austrian Army and following the war he became interested in child guidance and established the first child guidance clinics in conjunction with the Viennese school system. He also assisted in establishing an experimental school in Vienna where his educational theories were put into practice.

In 1935 Adler came to the United States where he was engaged in psychiatry and served as Professor of Medical Psychology at the Long Island College of Medicine. Adler was an extensive and productive writer and published approximately a hundred books and articles during his lifetime.

The Structure of Personality

In contradistinction to Freud's assumption that man is motivated by inborn instincts and Jung's principles that man is governed by inborn archetypes, Adler insists that man is motivated "primarily by social urges." Adler specifically explains his views in the following manner:

Man is, according to Adler, inherently a social being. He relates himself to other people, engages in cooperative social activities, places social welfare above selfish interest, and acquires a style of life which is predominantly social in orientation. This emphasis upon the social determinants of behavior which had been overlooked or minimized by Freud and Jung is probably Adler's greatest contribution to psychological theory. It turned the attention of psychologists to the importance of social variables and helped to develop the field of social psychology.
at a time when social psychology needed encouragement and support, especially from the ranks of psychoanalysis (7, p. 117).

Adler's second major contribution to personality theory is his concept of the "creative self." In contrast to Freud's ego, Adler's self is a "highly personalized, subjective system" which explains and utilizes the experiences of the organism and assists in satisfying his style of life; should these elements be absent, the "self" attempts to "create" them. Adler's recognition of "the self" as a motivation for behavior is of tremendous importance in understanding personality.

A third tenet of Adler's psychology which departs from psychoanalysis is its insistence upon the uniqueness of personality. Adler indicated that each individual possesses his unique motives, traits, goals, interests, and distinctive style of life.

Adler's theory, in contrast to Freud's theories, emphasizes that man is primarily a social and not a sexual creature, and he is therefore motivated by social interests. He recognizes that an individual, while influenced by both physical and psychological factors, nevertheless strives to develop a unique style of life in which the sexual drive plays a minor role. Adler points out that the way that man satisfies his sexual needs is determined by his style of life and not vice versa (15).
Finally, Adler made consciousness the core of personality. He emphasizes that man is a conscious being; he is most usually cognizant of the reasons for his behavior. He is aware of his inferiorities and endeavors to plan for and attain his goals. This is a complete reversal from Freud's theory which emphasized that man's actions and reactions were motivated and governed by his unconscious.

The Development of Personality

Adler, like other personality theorists, was trained as a psychiatrist and worked in the areas of abnormal psychology. However, he became interested in the normal personality during the 1920's and developed his theory of personality which consists of a few basic concepts that underlie his whole theoretical structure. For that reason, Adler's points of view can be listed under a few general tenets. These include (1) striving for superiority, (2) style of life, (3) inferiority feelings and compensation, (4) social interest, and (5) the creative self.

Adler insisted that all men aim for a harmonious and unified personality. This is accomplished through man's "striving for superiority." By superiority, Adler does not mean a dictatorial role but rather a principle which is similar to Jung's ideal of the "self" or Goldstein's doctrine of "self-actualization." It is a striving for unity, harmony, and perfection.
Man's striving for superiority and fulfillment, Adler says, is "innate," universal, and expresses man's uniqueness. This motivational force is the dynamic principle which propels the individual through his developmental stages and throughout life, and may manifest itself in many different ways.

The manner in which the individual may strive for superiority may be through his inferiority feelings which Adler explains in the following way:

Feelings of inferiority arise . . . from a sense of incompleteness or imperfection in any sphere of life. . . . Adler contended that inferiority feelings are not a sign of abnormality; they are the cause of all improvement in man's lot. The feeling of inferiority or a sense of incompleteness is the great driving force of mankind. In other words, man is pushed by the need to overcome his inferiority and pulled by the desire to be superior (7, p. 121).

Adler believed in social justice, democracy, and the attainment of the goal of a "perfect society." Adler felt that man is a social creature by nature and not by habit. However, like any other natural aptitude, this innate predisposition has to be developed and enhanced by guidance and training. Because he emphasized the importance of education, Adler established child guidance clinics, helped to improve schools, and taught the proper methods of rearing children.

One of the most distinctive features of Adler's personality theory is his "style of life." Adler felt that the individual's style of life was determined, in the main, by
specific inferiorities, either fancied or real, that the
person has. However, this simple explanation seemed to Adler
to be inadequate. In his search for a more dynamic prin-
ciple, he discovered the "creative self."

While the "creative self" cannot be observed, neverthe-
less, its effects can be seen, for it is the force that in-
tervenes between the stimuli acting upon the person and the
overt responses that he makes to these stimuli. The creative
self is the principle which gives life its goal and meaning
and is not unlike the older concept of "soul."

Research Methods

Adler's data were gathered largely from therapeutic ses-
sions and are composed of information gleaned from oral re-
ports given by his patients and his observations of their
reactions.

Adler felt that the earliest memory a person could re-
port was an important key to understanding his basic style
of life. He was particularly interested in the kinds of
early experiences which might tend to develop a faulty style
of life. He discovered three important factors: (1) chil-
dren with inferiorities, (2) spoiled children, and (3) neg-
lected children. Children with physical or mental impairments
are likely to feel insecure and inadequate in coping with life
and often consider themselves to be failures. However, if
parents are encouraging and understanding they may assist
these children in compensating for and/or conquering their problems. These children may thereby form objective and realistic concepts of the world and develop wholesome personalities.

Karen Horney

Karen Horney conceives of her ideas as being within the framework of Freudian psychology, and not as a formulation of an entirely new approach to the understanding of personality. She hoped to rid psychoanalysis of its fallacies which have their root, she believes, in Freud's "mechanistic, biological orientation," in order that psychoanalysis may realize its full potentialities as a science of man.

Horney objects strongly to Freud's concept of penis envy as the motivating factor in the psychology of women. Freud, it will be recalled, observed that the attitudes and feelings of women developed from their feeling of genital inferiority and their jealousy of the male. Horney believes that feminine psychology is based on lack of confidence and an overemphasis of the love relationship and has very little to do with her sex organs. Regarding the Oedipus complex, Horney feels that it is not a sexual-aggressive conflict between the child and his parents, but an anxiety growing out of basic disturbances--for example--rejection, overprotection, and punishment in the child's relationships with his mother and father. Aggression she viewed as a tool by which man
tries to protect his security. Narcissism is not really self-love but self-inflation and overvaluation owing to feelings of insecurity. These reactions were caused by feelings of anxiety.

Horney's primary concept is that of "basic anxiety." In general, she emphasized, anything that disturbs the security of the child in relation to his parents produces basic anxiety.

The insecure, anxious child develops certain methods for handling his feelings of isolation and helplessness. He may become hostile and seek to avenge himself against those who have rejected or mistreated him. Or he may become submissive in order to regain the love that he feels he has lost. He may develop an unrealistic picture of himself in order to overcome his feelings of inferiority. He may try to bribe others into loving him, or he may use threats to make people like him, or endeavor to gain people's sympathy.

If he cannot get love he may seek to dominate others. In that way, he compensates for his sense of helplessness, finds an outlet for hostility, and is able to exploit people. On the other hand, he may become competitive to the extent that winning becomes far more important than the achievement. He may turn his aggression inward and belittle himself.

According to Horney, any of these techniques may become permanently embedded in the personality and may serve in
motivating action as if they were part and parcel of the operational personality structure.

Horney has indicated that other techniques may be acquired by the individual as methods of coping with problems which have resulted because of difficulty in interpersonal relationships. These techniques have been instigated to meet the needs of the individual. Horney has listed ten needs which she feels the individual has acquired in attempting to find answers to difficulties which he has encountered in human relationships (8, 14). These needs she has labelled "neurotic needs" because they are insatiable, irrational, and inappropriate.

Horney later incorporated these ten needs under three headings, which are explained in the following manner:

She advances the proposition that in a competitive culture like our own, the developing child, helpless because of his size and inadequate experience, is menaced by older, wiser, and stronger people with whom he cannot successfully compete. Thus threatened, he must work out some strategy by which to cope with the basic anxiety aroused by these figures. According to Horney, there are three possible alternatives. First, he can move toward people, protecting himself by overtures of affection and dependence. Second, he can move against people, protecting himself by aggression and attack. Third, he can move away from people, protecting himself by isolation and withdrawal (14, p. 38).

While the normal person can resolve these conflicts, the neurotic person, because of his greater basic anxiety, must find irrational and artificial solutions. He consciously recognizes only one of the trends and denies or represses
the other two. Or he creates an "idealized image of himself" in which the opposing trends presumably disappear, although actually they do not. In a later book (1950) Horney (7) has a great deal more to say about the consequences that develop from an "unrealistic conception of the self" and from attempts to live up to this false picture. The search for glory, feelings of self-contempt, dependency upon others, and self-abasement are some of the unwholesome and destructive results that grow out of an "idealized self." A third solution employed by the neurotic person for his inner conflicts is to project them. This solution creates conflicts between the person and others.

All of these conflicts are prevented if the child is raised in a home where there is security, trust, love, respect, understanding, and warmth. That is, Horney, unlike Freud and Jung, does not feel that conflict is innate and therefore inevitable. Conflict arises out of social conditions. The person who is likely to become neurotic is one who has experienced the culturally determined difficulties in an accentuated form, mostly through the medium of childhood experiences (7, p. 290).

Harry Stack Sullivan

Harry Stack Sullivan, after receiving his medical degree, was with the armed forces during the First World War. At the conclusion of the war, he went to Saint Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington, D. C., where he came under the influence of William Alanson White, a leader in American Neuro-psychiatry. Later he was associated with the Medical School of the University of Maryland where he conducted
investigations of schizophrenia and became an influential teacher. Sullivan advocated a closer working relationship between anthropology, sociology, and psychoanalysis. Sullivan began to formulate his theory of interpersonal relations in 1929 and had consolidated his thinking by the mid-1930's (7, 15).

The Structure of Personality

Sullivan insists that personality is an entity which cannot be observed or studied apart from interpersonal situations. The unit of study is the interpersonal situation and not the person. The organization of personality consists of interpersonal events and manifests itself when the person is behaving in relation to one or more other individuals. These people do not need to be present; in fact, they can even be imaginary figures. Perceiving, remembering, thinking—and all of the other psychological processes are interpersonal in character. Even dreams are interpersonal, since they usually demonstrate the dreamer's relationships with other people.

Although Sullivan grants personality an hypothetical status, he states that it is a core of various processes which occur in a series of interpersonal fields. Moreover, he gives status to some of these processes by identifying and naming them and noting their components. The principal ones are dynamisms, personifications, and cognitive processes.
The dynamisms which are human in character characterize one's interpersonal relations. Any habitual reaction towards one or more persons, whether it be in the form of a feeling, an attitude, or an action, constitutes a dynamism. All people have the same basic dynamisms, but each is expressed in accordance with the situation and the life experience of the individual.

Most dynamisms serve the purpose of satisfying the basic needs of the organism. However, there is an important dynamism which develops as a result of anxiety. This is called the dynamism of the "self" or the "self-system." Anxiety is transmitted originally from the mother to the infant and later in life by threats to one's security. In order to avoid or minimize actual anxiety, the person uses various protective measures and supervisory controls over his behavior. These security measures form the self-system which initiates certain types of behavior and forbids other forms.

The self-system guards the person from anxiety and protects him from criticism. As the self-system matures it prevents the person from making objective judgments of his behavior and contradictions between what the person really is and what his self-system says he is. Although the self-system reduces anxiety, it tends to interfere with one's ability to live constructively with others.

A personification is an image that an individual has of himself or of another person and is composed of feelings,
attitudes, and conceptions that grow out of experiences in meeting needs and coping with anxiety. Any interpersonal relationship which produces satisfaction builds up a favorable picture and conversely, unhappy experiences produce anxiety. These pictures that are formed are most often of the people to whom they refer, but once formed they usually persist and influence one's attitudes toward other people. Thus a person who personifies his father as a mean and dictatorial man may project this same personification onto other males. Consequently, something that serves as an anxiety-reducing function in early life may interfere with one's interpersonal relations later in life. These anxiety-fraught pictures distort one's conceptions of significant people and also prevent an objective self-evaluation. These personifications are called "stereotypes" and are handed down from generation to generation. Examples of common stereotypes in today's culture are the absent-minded professor, the eccentric artist, and the hard-headed businessman.

Sullivan's unique contribution regarding the place of cognition in the affairs of personality is his threefold classification of experience. Experience, he says, occurs in three modes; these are prototaxic, parataxic, and syntaxic. Prototaxic experiences may be regarded as the discrete series of momentary states of the sensitive organism. The prototaxic mode of experience is found in its purest form during the early months of life and is the necessary precondition for the appearance of the other two modes (7, p. 140).

The parataxic type of thinking consists of seeing causal relationships between events that occur concurrently but which
are not logically related. Sullivan believes that much of one's thinking lies at this level; that one sees causal relationships between experiences that have nothing to do with one another. All superstitions are examples of parataxic thinking.

The third and highest mode of thinking is the syntactic which consists of symbols which have been agreed upon by a group of people as having a standard meaning. Words and numbers are examples of such symbols. The syntactic mode produces logical order among experiences and enables people to communicate with one another.

In addition to this formulation of the modes of experience, Sullivan emphasizes the importance of foresight in cognitive functioning. Man lives with his past, the present, and the future, and all are relevant in explaining his thought and action. Foresight depends upon one's memory of the past and interpretation of the present.

Although dynamisms, personifications, and cognitive processes do not complete the list of the components of personality, they are the chief distinguishing features of Sullivan's system.

The Dynamics of Personality

Sullivan, like other personality theorists, conceives of personality as an energy system whose chief task consists of activities that will reduce tension. Sullivan says there is
no need to add the term "mental" to either energy or tension since he uses them in exactly the same sense as they are used in physics.

Sullivan begins with the familiar conception of the organism as a tension system which theoretically can vary between the limits of absolute relaxation or euphoria as Sullivan prefers to call it, and absolute tension as exemplified by extreme terror. There are two main sources of tension: (1) tensions that arise from the needs of the organism, and (2) tensions that result from anxiety. Tensions can be regarded as needs for particular energy transformations which will dissipate the tension, often with an accompanying change of mental state, a change of awareness, to which we can apply the general term, satisfaction. The typical consequence of prolonged failure to satisfy the needs is a feeling of apathy which produces a general lowering of the tensions (7, p. 141).

Anxiety is the experience of tension that results from real or imaginary threats to one's security. In large amounts, it reduces the efficiency of the individual in satisfying his needs, interferes with interpersonal relations, and produces confusion in thinking. Anxiety varies in intensity. Severe anxiety may produce utter confusion and even amnesia, while less severe forms of anxiety can be informative. Sullivan believes that anxiety is the first greatly educative influence in living. Anxiety is transmitted to the infant by the "mothering one," and as a consequence of this anxiety other objects in the near surroundings become heaped with anxiety by the operation of the parataxic mode of associating experiences. The infant learns to veer away from activities and objects that increase anxiety. If this
cannot be accomplished, he tends to fall asleep. This dynamism of "sommolent detachment," as Sullivan calls it (?), is the dynamism aroused by unsatisfied needs. Sullivan feels that psychology should concern itself with the study of the causes and development of anxiety in interpersonal relationships, rather than focusing on anxiety manifestations.

Sullivan disavows instincts as important sources of human motivation and rebuts the libido theory of Freud. He emphasizes that human beings react in a specific manner as a result of their interpersonal relationships with other individuals.

The Development of Personality

Sullivan viewed the development of personality as the culmination which accrues from the experiences that are encountered in interpersonal situations as the person passes through definite stages of development from infancy to adulthood. He refuted Freud's theory of sexual influence and subordinated biological factors as social determiners of psychological development in favor of a social-psychological view of personality growth which viewed social relationships as the unique contributors of human relationships. Sullivan, like other social psychological theorists, was a severe critic of society.

Sullivan recognized six stages in the development of personality prior to the final stage of maturity. These six
stages are: (1) infancy, (2) childhood, (3) the juvenile era, (4) pre-adolescence, (5) early adolescence, and (6) late adolescence (14).

The period of infancy extends from birth to the development of speech. It is the period in which the oral zone is the primary zone of interaction between the baby and his environment. The feature of the environment which stands out during infancy is the object which supplies food to the hungry baby. The baby develops certain ideas of the nipple depending upon the kinds of experiences he has with it.

From infancy to childhood the child acquires language and organizes his experiences in the syntactic mode. Childhood extends from the emergence of speech to the appearance of the need for playmates. The self-system begins to develop the conception of the sexual role prescribed by society. The growth of symbolic ability enables the child to dramatize which serves the purpose of warding off anxiety—Sullivan calls these "preoccupations."

One dramatic event of childhood is the "malevolent transformation," the feeling that one lives among enemies. This feeling, if it becomes strong enough, may prevent the child from responding positively to the affectionate advances of other people. The malevolent transformation is caused by frustrating experiences with individuals which may be so painful that the child returns to an earlier stage of development where he feels more secure.
Sublimation, Sullivan defines as the substitution for a behavior pattern which encounters anxiety with the self-system, of a socially more acceptable pattern which is harmonious with the self-system. The excess of tension which is not discharged by sublimation is expelled symbolically. This discharge may be accomplished through dreams. While this mechanism of adjustment appears in the childhood stage of development it is nevertheless further cultivated, refined, and enhanced in the juvenile stage of development.

The juvenile stage extends throughout most of the grammar school years. It is the period for becoming social—the acquisition of respect to authority figures outside the family, for becoming competitive and co-operative, and for learning to respond to group feelings. The juvenile learns to dismiss external circumstances that do not interest him, to govern his behavior by internal controls, to form stereotypes in his attitudes, to develop new and more effective modes of sublimation, and to distinguish more clearly between fantasy and reality.

The relatively brief period of pre-adolescence is marked by the need for an intimate relationship with a chum of the same sex in whom one can confide and with whom one can collaborate in meeting the tasks and solving the problems of life. This is an extremely important period because it marks the beginning of human relationships with other people.
The main problem of the period of early adolescence is the development of a pattern of heterosexual activity. The youth experiences physiological, psychological, and social changes. Sullivan points out that many of the conflicts of adolescence arise out of the opposing needs for sexual gratification, security, and intimacy. Early adolescence persists until the person has found some stable pattern of performances which satisfies his genital drives.

In late adolescence the individual begins to develop a widening circle of human relationships and through his acceptance and sharing of cultural responsibilities, he begins to form ideals which he draws from the society. Through his self-system, he begins to formulate better methods of handling his tensions and anxieties.

When the individual has passed through all of these stages and reached the final stage of adulthood, he has been transformed largely by means of his interpersonal relations, and has been so drastically altered that he is no longer an animal but a human being.

Although Sullivan acknowledge the importance of heredity in providing certain capacities for receiving and elaborating experiences, he also accepts the principle that training cannot be effective before maturation. Heredity and maturation provide the biological framework for the development of personality, but the culture operating through a system of
interpersonal relations enables the person to reduce his tensions and satisfy his needs.

While Sullivan believes that personality is set at an early age, he feels that it is amenable to change as new interpersonal situations arise because the human organism is extremely plastic and flexible. Although the motivations of learning and development predominate and propel forward, regressions can and do occur when pain, anxiety, and failure become intolerable.

**Research Methods**

Harry Stack Sullivan acquired his knowledge of personality by working with patients suffering from various types of personality disorders. Sullivan discovered that the method of free association did not work with schizophrenics as it aroused too much anxiety. Thus, he became interested in studying the forces that facilitate rapport and communication between two people, and discovered that the psychiatrist was an active and vital participant in an interpersonal situation. From his study and observation he developed his idea of the therapist as a "participant observer." He, therefore, lays great emphasis on the method of participant observation, and implies that skill in the person-to-person psychiatric interview is of fundamental importance.

Sullivan's principal research contribution consists of a number of articles on the etiology, dynamics, and treatment
of schizophrenia. These writings demonstrate his great
talents for understanding the mind of the psychotic. Empathy
was one of his outstanding personality traits, and he used
it advantageously in treating his patients.

Sullivan stimulated other psychiatrists and social
scientists to carry on research related to interpersonal
theory. Sullivan's interpersonal theory has probably of-
fered more impetus to research than any of the three the-
orists herewith presented. One reason for this is that
Sullivan used a more objective language in describing his
theory and kept his ideas closely allied with the result that he
seemed to be describing the behavior of real people.

Allport's Psychology of the Individual

During the past twenty years, most of the erudite psy-
chological theorists were endeavoring to locate and under-
stand the role of unconscious motives. During this period,
Gordon Allport began to pursue studies of the individual
with emphasis on conscious motivation. Thus, his ideas and
findings represent perhaps better than any other contemporary
theorist the consensus of traditional psychological thought
and personality theory.

Allport was graduated at Harvard University and com-
pleted the requirements for the Ph.D. in psychology in 1922.
During the next two years he studied in Berlin, Hamburg, and
Cambridge, England. His extensive experience in foreign
academic settings must have played some part in developing his interest in international affairs, and also led to his serving as one of the chief interpreters of German psychology in America. He taught psychology at Dartmouth and then accepted an appointment at Harvard. He was one of the central figures of the movement that led to the formation of the Department of Social Relations at Harvard University in the attempt to partially integrate psychology, sociology, and anthropology. He has received many professional honors, and is a provocative writer.

His writing reveals an untiring attempt to describe the complexity and uniqueness of individual behavior. In spite of the complexity of the individual, the main trends in his nature display a consistent unity. Furthermore, for the normal individual conscious determinants of behavior are of tremendous importance. The consistency of behavior and the importance of conscious motives lead Allport to an emphasis upon those phenomena often represented under the terms "self" and "ego." Consistent with this emphasis upon rational factors is Allport's insistence that the individual is more a creature of the present than the past. His concept of "functional autonomy" represents an attempt to free the theorist from unnecessary concern with the history of the organism. In broad terms, his is a view of man in which conscious elements of motivation are emphasized, and behavior is seen as internally consistent and determined by contemporary factors.
For Allport there is a disparity between normal and abnormal, child and adult, animal and man. Theories such as psychoanalysis may be highly effective as representations of abnormal behavior. However, theories that demonstrate and explain behavior of the infant are not adequate to represent adult behavior. He is interested in the application of psychological methods and findings in an "action setting" where experimentation is made to bring about the eradication of some undesirable social condition.

There is a basic consistency to all of Allport's writing. He states that his work is derived from and guided by observable experiences and data. He does not purport to establish theories or methods per se. To him personality is a complex phenomenon.

The Structure and Dynamics of Personality

Allport's theory does not consider the structure of personality and the dynamics of personality separately, as this distinction seems largely inapplicable. Personality structure is mainly represented in terms of traits, and at the same time, behavior is motivated or driven by traits. Thus, structure and dynamics are, for the most part, one and the same.

Gordon Allport ascribes a rich variety of concepts in his description of human behavior. In the most detailed statement of his theory, Allport (1937) (7), suggests that
each of the following concepts possesses some utility: conditioned reflex, habit, attitude, trait, self, and personality.

Although all of the above concepts are acceded as having a certain importance, the major emphasis of the theory is upon traits, with attitudes and intentions given an almost equal status. Indeed, Allport's theory is often referred to as a "trait psychology." Within this theory, traits occupy the position as being the major motivational dynamism. What the instinct is to Freud, the trait is to Allport.

Allport's theory emphasizes that no two individuals ever have exactly the same traits. Although there may be similarities in the trait structures of different individuals, there are always unique features to the way in which any particular trait operates for any one person that distinguishes it from all similar traits in other persons. Thus, in the most important sense all traits are individual traits—unique to the single individual.

Allport's theory is that what the individual is "trying to do" is the most important key to "how" he will behave. Whereas other theorists turn to the past for unravelling the strands of present behavior, Allport turns to the future. In this respect, he is in agreement with certain views of Alfred Adler and Carl Jung, although there is no reason to believe that there was a direct influence from these sources.
The Development of Personality

Thus far it has been seen that personality is composed of dispositions that set behavior in action. Attention will now be focused on the way these structures emerge throughout the various developmental stages.

Allport considers the newborn infant almost altogether a creature of heredity, primitive drive, and reflex existence. Significantly, Allport does not consider the newborn as possessing a personality. The process of development takes place along multiple lines between infancy and adulthood—the infant is a creature of biology which becomes transformed into an individual who operates in terms of a growing ego, and a widening trait structure with an orientation toward future goals and aspirations. There are two motivational structures of the individual: the one, a biological (tension-reduction) model, which is adequate at birth but which becomes gradually less adequate until with growing awareness of the self, a reorientation becomes necessary.

There exists, in the mature individual, a person whose determinants of behavior are a set of organized and congruent traits. These traits have arisen in a variety of ways in the newborn infant. The exact route of development for these tendencies is not known because they are no longer deriving their motive power from primitive sources, whatever they may have been. The normal individual knows, as a rule, what he is doing and why he does it. A full understanding of the
adult can be secured by knowing his future goals and aspirations. His most important motives are not influences of the past but rather demands from the future. In most cases, one knows more about what a person will do if he knows that person's conscious plans than if he knows his repressed memories.

Allport grants that the picture we have just outlined is somewhat idealized. Not all adults achieve full maturity. There are grown individuals whose motivations still smack of the nursery. Not all adults seem to guide their behavior in terms of clear, rational principles. However, the extent to which they avoid unconscious motivation and the degree to which their traits are independent of childish origins represents a measure of their normality and maturity. Maturity implies that the individual possesses a unifying philosophy of life (7, p. 277).

Research Methods

Allport has emphasized that the investigator may choose to study behavior in terms of general principles, universal variables, and a large number of subjects; or he may choose to study the "individual case."

The study of the individual case is a logical approach for Allport, first of all because he emphasizes the uniqueness of behavior, and the investigator is impelled to select a method of study that will focus upon and extract "individuality." Second, and closely related, is the emphasis upon the importance of individual traits as the primary determinants of behavior. If these traits are the core on which personality is centered, and if they are characteristic of only a single person, then clearly the most effective approach
to the study of behavior will be a method of studying the individual.

It seems fair to say, in summary, that Allport, consistent with his theoretical position, has urged psychologists to devote more of their time and energy to the study of the individual case than has been their custom. Further, it appears that this emphasis has met with considerable favor and acceptance on the part of most contemporary psychologists.

Organismic Theory

Ever since Descartes, who three centuries ago suggested that the individual was two separate yet interacting entities—body and mind, and Wundt, who later attempted to describe the mind by reducing it to the elementary functions of sensations, feelings, and images, there have been various attempts to put the mind and the body back together and to treat the organism as a unified whole. One attempt which has attracted a large following within recent years is known as the organismic viewpoint.

The leading exponent of organismic theory today is Kurt Goldstein, the eminent neuropsychiatrist. Largely as a result of his observations and investigations of brain-injured soldiers during World War I, and his earlier studies of speech disturbances, Goldstein came to the conclusion that any particular symptom displayed by a patient could not be understood solely as the product of a particular organic lesion or disease but had to be considered as a manifestation of the total organism. The organism always behaves as a unified whole and not as a series of differentiated parts. Mind and body are not separate entities, nor does the mind consist of
independent faculties or elements and the body of independent organs and processes. The organism is a single unity. What happens in a part affects the whole. The psychologist studies the organism from one perspective, the physiologist from another. However, both disciplines need to operate within the framework of organismic theory because any event, be it psychological or physiological, always occurs within the context of the total organism unless it has become artificially isolated from this context. The laws of the whole govern the functioning of the differentiated parts of the whole. Consequently, it is necessary to discover the laws by which the whole organism functions in order to understand the functioning of any member component. This is the tenet of organismic theory (7, p. 298).

Kurt Goldstein

Kurt Goldstein received his training in neurology and psychiatry in Germany. During the First World War, he became director of the Military Hospital for Brain-Injured Soldiers and was instrumental in establishing an institute for research on the after-effects of brain injuries. It was in this institute that Goldstein made the fundamental studies which purport his organismic viewpoint. He came to the United States in 1935. During the war years he published a book on the effects of brain injuries in war. In 1945 he was engaged in the private practice of neuropsychiatry and psychotherapy. He is currently associated with Columbia University and the New School for Social Research (6, 7).

The Structure of the Organism

Goldstein emphasizes that the organism consists of differentiated members which usually co-operate and function
together; these members do not become detached and isolated from one another except under abnormal circumstances such as strong anxiety. The primary organization of organismic functioning is that of figure and ground. A figure is any process that emerges and stands out against a background. In terms of perception, it is that which occupies the center of awareness. The reason for the emergence of the figure from the background of the total organism is because of the needs and requirements of the organism. Thus, when a hungry organism is confronted by the task of getting food, any process which will aid in performing the task becomes elevated as a figure.

Though Goldstein emphasizes the flexible and plastic nature of human behavior, he suggests that preferred activities may remain fairly constant throughout life without losing their intimate relationship to the whole organism. Traits and habits do not usually lose touch with the totality in which they are embedded. In fact, Goldstein attributes many constancies to the organism, such as sensory thresholds, motor performances, intellectual characteristics, emotional factors, and the like, which are innate and operate as selective agents for behavior. However, the constants are also shaped and molded by experience and training and are influenced by the culture in which the person has been raised.

Although Goldstein does not have much to say regarding the structure of the organism aside from differentiating between figure and ground, he does point out that there are three different kinds of
behavior. These are the "performances" which are voluntary, consciously experienced activities, "attitudes" which are feelings, moods, and other inner experiences and processes which are bodily functions that can be experienced only indirectly (7, p. 303).

Another distinction that Goldstein makes great use of is the dissimilarity between concrete and abstract behavior. Concrete behavior is described as reacting to a stimulus in a fairly automatic manner while abstract behavior consists of action upon the stimulus by the organism. The difference between concrete and abstract behavior is the discrimination between an immediate reaction and reacting to it after thinking about the stimulus.

The Dynamics of the Organism

The main dynamic concepts presented by Goldstein are (1) the equalization process or the centering of the organism, (2) self-actualization, and (3) "coming to terms" with the environment.

The goal of a healthy, normal person is to equalize the tension, so as to permit the organism to execute its work of coping with the environment and of actualizing itself in further activities according to its nature. Complete balance is an idealistic state and is probably rarely achieved.

The principle of equalization explains the consistency, coherence, and orderliness of behavior in spite of disturbing stimuli (6). Goldstein stresses that in an adequate environment, the organism will always remain more or less in balance.
As a result of maturation and experience, the person develops preferred ways of behaving which keep the conflicts to a minimum and which maintain the balance of the organism. An individual's life becomes more centered and less subject to the tumult of his environment as he matures.

Self-actualization is Goldstein's master motive; in fact, it is the only motive that the organism possesses. Although self-actualization is a universal phenomenon, it is, however, individualistic. This is so because people have different capacities that mold and direct their individual development and growth as well as different environments to which they must adjust and from which they must secure the necessary supplies for growth. An individual's potentialities can be determined by finding out what the person prefers and what he does best. His preferences correspond to his potentialities. This means that if one is to know what a person is trying to "actualize" he must know what that person likes to do and what he has a talent for doing.

In general, Goldstein stresses conscious motivation over unconscious motivation. The unconscious is the storeroom for conscious material that is no longer useful for self-realization in a particular situation and from which it is reactivated when it again becomes suitable and appropriate for self-realization.

Goldstein, as an organismic theorist, emphasizes the inner determinants of behavior and the principle that the organism selects the environment which is most appropriate for
self-actualization. However, he is well aware of the importance that the environment is filled with disturbances with which the individual must cope and is the fountainhead which shapes man's destiny.

Goldstein describes a normal, healthy organism as one who through self-actualization integrates his actions, and adjusts to and/or solves difficulties victoriously which arise in the environment. Thus, coping with the environment consists primarily of mastering it. If this is not feasible then the individual is forced to accept the difficulties and adjust himself as best he can. If the organism's goals and the realities of the environment are too divergent, then the organism either breaks down or relinquishes some of its aims and tries to actualize itself on a different level of existence.

The Development of the Organism

The concept of self-actualization suggests that there are stages of development through which the person progresses, and that he develops patterns of behavior which become more orderly and more appropriate to the environment as he matures. Goldstein hints that there are tasks which are indicative of certain age levels, but he does not state what these tasks are or whether they are the same for all individuals. The importance of heredity is recognized, though its contribution is not explicitly stated.
Goldstein indicates that if a child is exposed to situations with which he can cope, he will develop normally through maturation and training. As new problems arise he will form new patterns to deal with them. Reactions that are no longer useful for the goal of self-actualization will drop out. However, if the conditions of the environment are too demanding for the child's capacities, he will develop reactions that are not consistent with the principle of self-actualization.

**Research Methods**

As an investigator trained in neuropsychiatry, Kurt Goldstein has engaged himself in studying symptoms and behavior patterns of the total organism. For Goldstein, a symptom is a specific function of the organism. Symptoms do not come to the fore themselves. Definite methods have to be applied in order to reveal the symptoms.

In his study of the origin of symptoms in brain injury, Goldstein considers these four symptom complexes: (1) direct symptoms, (2) indirect or depending symptoms, (3) symptoms due to catastrophic conditions and protective mechanisms against catastrophe, and (4) symptoms due to fatigue and perseveration. Direct symptoms are those which have been lost or impaired because of dysfunction of a particular area in the cortex. Goldstein calls this dedifferentiation or a disintegration of the function involved. For example, if
there is injury or a lesion occurring in the left third frontal convolution, then a language difficulty will ensue (6).

A second class of symptoms is produced by the effect of changes in the damaged area or other parts of the nervous system. The defective part disturbs the function of any other part of the nervous system with which it has a relationship. Goldstein points out that the complete destruction of a functional unit, such as vision, may disturb the functioning of the total organism less than a partial destruction does. The reason for this is that the blind person is forced to depend upon his other senses, whereas the partially blind person is constantly trying to cope with the environment through an imperfect sensory system with the result that his total performance usually suffers.

In observing patients who have brain damage one will note a marked variation in their performance. At one moment the patient will be able to perform the task at hand, and a few minutes later he may be completely unable to so execute it. This condition seems to indicate a disturbance in ability to focus attention on the task, or a disinterest in performance, or a complete weariness may manifest itself. This condition may be viewed as a disturbance in the so-called general functions. As the patient seems to be very disturbed in his whole pattern of behavior, this situation has been termed a disturbance in "catastrophic situations."
Finally, there are symptoms resulting from fatigue and perseveration. Fatigue is most likely to appear when the task is one that appears to the patient to be beyond his ability. In other words, fatigue serves as a kind of protective mechanism which helps the patient escape from a stressful situation. Perseveration, or the tendency to repeat a performance that the patient is able to do, is another means by which the person can avoid catastrophe.

Goldstein observes that the organism is very plastic and quickly adapts itself to any localized damage as long as the person feels that he can cope with the environment and is not placed under undue pressures.

The organismic viewpoints require an extensive study and careful analysis of the meaning of symptoms and deep observation of all aspects of the individual's behavior. Tests are employed in order to reveal the direct result of the brain injury and to note the secondary reactions to the injury. Also, the patient must be observed in everyday life situations. When an intensive study has been made through the use of tests and observation of behavior and activities in coping with everyday life situations have been carefully analyzed, then a program of therapy can be planned. If the injury cannot be eradicated, then the patient must be helped in finding ways of adjusting to the defect. In order to glean all of this information, it is necessary that an
intensive investigation be made over a long period of time. This is one reason why Goldstein conducted studies of brain-injured patients.

Goldstein's most important psychological studies have been made on abstract and concrete behavior. He and his associates have developed a number of tests for diagnosing the amount of impairment of the "abstract attitude." These tests are widely used in clinical practice, especially for determining the amount of brain damage. Goldstein strongly urges the examiner to note the patient's behavior during the test as well as the number of passing and failure of items on the test. A defect in the abstract attitude produces changes in the personality as a whole and affects all forms of behavior. The abstract attitude represents an entirely "new mental set" in which the conscious will is one of its most pertinent features. Lacking this attitude, the person is different from the normal person. Goldstein's studies of abstract and concrete behavior illustrate that if damage occurs in one part of the organism it affects the functioning of the whole organism. Goldstein made contributions through his research activities by the richness of his empirical data and his insights into the reasons for man's behavior. His techniques illustrate the type of research which is employed by a representative organismic theorist.

In conclusion, pertinent ideas of each of the contemporary personality theorists, which have been investigated
in this study, have been presented so as to illustrate and describe the unique contributions of each theory.

A summary and evaluation of the individual theories of personality of Sigmund Freud, Carl Jung, Alfred Adler, Karen Horney, Harry Stack Sullivan, Gordon Allport, and Kurt Goldstein will be given in Chapter III.
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CHAPTER III

SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

The findings of this study indicate that there are certain similarities, convergences, and divergences as one explores the personality theories of the contemporary theorists, Freud, Jung, Adler, Horney, Sullivan, Allport, and Goldstein. A synthesis of the various points of view will be summarized and evaluated to show the emergence of the stages of development through which the concepts of personality have progressed from Freud to the present time.

Freud is considered the "father" of psychoanalytic theory. He worked diligently throughout his lifetime formulating theories, making investigations, testing and validating his hypotheses. Findings which seemed to him to be substantiated were retained, but those which he could not validate were discarded. Not only were his theories used in treating his patients, but also he used self-analysis in order to evaluate his postulations. He was eclectic in his approach, meticulous in his evaluations, and persistent in his collection of minute and relevant data.

The data upon which Freud bases his theories consisted mainly of information gleaned from the free associations and
expressive behavior of patients who were undergoing psychological treatment and whom he saw daily and often for a two or three year period. During this period, sufficient opportunity was given him to check and recheck his hunches, time and time again, before he made his final interpretations. While he did not employ objective testing and controlled techniques of investigation in his appraisal of personality as we think of it today, yet it would seem inappropriate to assume that these were his only sources of data. For equally as important in developing his theories were Freud's critical attitude and his skill in deriving meaning from inferences. Another characteristic of Freud was his ability to visualize the individual as being influenced both by his inner or fantasy world and faced by the conflicts of the world of reality. Yet, though man was moved by his inner forces and tossed about by certain outer forces, he envisioned man as being capable of rational thought and action but unaware of the "whys" of many of his actions. He pictures man as being "confused and clearheaded, frustrated and satisfied, hopeful and despairing, selfish and altruistic; in essence man is a complex human being" (6, p. 72). For many theorists this is a valid portrait of man, for Freud is recognized both as an original thinker and a keen observer.

Carl Jung, who was an enthusiastic disciple of Freud, became inflamed with Freud's Interpretation of Dreams. For
almost a decade Jung and Freud collaborated and combined their research findings. His interest in the racial influences of man's behavior is one method of departure that was incongruous and caused a breach in their association.

While Freud stressed the infantile origins of personality, Jung postulated that the racial origins were the dominant influence of man's behavior.

Jung's theory of personality has had very little influence upon the development of "scientific psychology." His contributions include his use of the word association test as a valuable method of studying the complexes, and the concepts of introversion and extraversion as attitudes for understanding behavior. While the word association test was not original with Jung, it was through his interest and research with the test that other theorists have been motivated to do further research and study in this area. This enthusiasm was generated to other psychologists because it offered a method which has been accepted as scientific.

It was indeed Jung who gave impetus to the importance of the concepts of introversion and extraversion in understanding attitudes of behavior. Through the interest which he inspired, further investigations have demonstrated that while people do not fall into one of the two classes of introverts and extraverts, rather some components of both attitudes are present in varying proportions in all people.
While Jung's "analytical psychological theory" has not received the severe criticism accorded Freudian psychoanalysis by psychologists, neither has it been given an important place in psychology. One major reason is that Jung's psychology is based upon clinical findings rather than upon experimental investigation. It has not appealed to the experimental investigator any more than has Freudian psychoanalysis. In fact, Jung has had far less appeal than Freud because of his apparent interest in mysticism, and this flavor has been repugnant to many psychologists. Yet one cannot overlook the originality and sincerity of Jung's thinking, and every student of psychology has closely surveyed his ideas.

The three theories of Adler, Horney, and Sullivan have been linked together because they all emphasize the influence of social variables in shaping personality. All of them, in one way or another, are a revolt against the instinctual, mechanistic emphasis of Freudian psychoanalysis--yet each of the theorists acknowledges his indebtedness to Freud and Jung. However, each has deviated from those concepts which viewed personality as representative of biological determinants in favor of personality as having social dimensions. Moreover, their theories have helped to elevate psychology to an important role in the social science field.

In spite of the commonality which they occupy, each theory stresses somewhat different social variables. Karen
Horney recognizes the influence of the social setting in which an individual lives, however, she dwells more upon the factors within the family constellation which shape and mold personality.

Horney emphasized that conflict was not inevitable—she felt that if it should seep through, the child would find satisfactory solutions provided that he had been reared in a home which had fostered love, understanding, security, forebearance, and a respected role in the family constellation. She further reiterated that conflict is not an innate characteristic of the individual, but that strife arises from social conditions and a demanding culture. A person who is apt to be neurotic, she pointed out, is one who has come in conflict with social and cultural deterrents and these experiences have in the main occurred during his childhood years of development. Thus, her points of view were unlike those of Freud and Jung, who emphasized that turmoil and conflict were embedded in man and therefore he could not escape these innate impellants.

Horney's views upon the family constellation and its influence in this respect resemble Sullivan's interpersonal theory. For Sullivan, the human relationships of infancy, childhood, and adolescence were of great concern, and he is very oratorical and convincing when he is picturing the link between the "mothering one" and the baby.
While Sullivan is the creator of a new viewpoint which is known as the "interpersonal theory of psychiatry," he feels that personality cannot be demarcated from interpersonal situations, and interpersonal behavior is all that one can observe as personality. Consequently, Sullivan believes that it is aimless to speak of the individual as an object of study because the person does not and cannot exist apart from his relationships with people. From birth and throughout life man is a member of society, and his thinking and acting are under the surveillance of society.

Although Sullivan does not deny the importance of heredity and maturation in shaping the organism, he feels that what is uniquely human is the product of social interactions. Moreover, the interpersonal experiences of a person may and do change his functioning so that the organism loses its identity as a biological product and becomes a social organism.

While Horney and Sullivan are concerned with the family constellation and the interpersonal relationships of the individual as a member of society, Adler, too, widely searches throughout society for factors that are related to personality, and he finds them everywhere.

Adler fashioned what has been known as a "humanistic theory of personality," and he cloaked man with a mantle of altruism, humanitarianism, co-operation, creativity, uniqueness (6) and restored him to a sense of dignity and worth
that had largely been lost by the psychoanalytical point of view. While Freud viewed man as presenting a dreary, gloomy picture, torn and wrought by his innate instincts over which he sought control and being buffeted upon the sea of his unconscious which he little understood, Adler offered a description of man which was more satisfying, more full of hope, and more complimentary. Adler viewed man as possessing a personality which was in keeping with the modern conceptualization, for man can be the master and not the victim of his fate.

Although all of these theories oppose Freud's instinct doctrine and the permanence of human nature, none adopts the position that an individual's personality is created solely by the conditions of the society into which he is born. Each theory agrees that there is such a thing as human nature which the baby brings with him, largely in the form of fairly general tendencies or capacities rather than as specific needs and traits. Under ideal conditions these theories agree, the individual and society are reciprocal—the person seeks to advance the purposes of the society, and society assists man in attaining his goals. In short, the position adopted by these three theorists is neither entirely social nor exclusively psychological; it is rather social-psychological in character.

Furthermore, each theory not only asserts that human nature is pliable but also that society is flexible. If a
particular society nurtures the demands of human nature, it can be changed by man. In other words, man creates the kind of society he thinks will enhance him. Obviously, mistakes are made in the organization of society, and once these errors have been made their formation and influence may be difficult to change. Yet each theorist was optimistic regarding the possibility of altering society. Adler supported social democracy, pressed for better schools, started child guidance centers, urged reforms in the treatment of criminals, and lectured widely on social problems and their cures. Horney, through her writings and talks, pointed the way to a better society. Sullivan was actively engaged in seeking social improvement at the time of his death. All three of them in their professional capacities as psychotherapists had valuable and extensive experiences with the catastrophic influences of an imperfect social order; consequently, they spoke from personal knowledge and experience as critics and reformers.

Another assumption which each theory makes is that anxiety is socially produced. Man is not by nature "the anxious animal"; he is made anxious by the conditions under which he lives. Remove these conditions, say the theorists, and anxiety will subside. Nor is man by nature destructive as Freud believed. He may become destructive when his basic needs are frustrated, but even under conditions of frustration, he
may choose to submit or withdraw, depending on his evaluation of the more appropriate and expedient solution.

All of the theories with the exception of Sullivan's also emphasized the concepts of the unique individual and the creative self. In spite of attempts by society to pigeon-hole people, each person manages tenaciously to maintain some degree of creative individuality. Indeed, it is by virtue of man's innate creative powers that he is able to ameliorate changes in society. He knows what he wants and he strives consciously to reach his goals. The idea of unconscious motivation is not imported much significance by these social-psychological theorists.

In general, the theories developed by Adler, Horney, and Sullivan enlarged the scope of Freudian psychology by providing room for the social determinants of personality. The needs, trends, styles, orientations, personifications, dynamisms, and so forth, in these theories are incorporated in Freudian theory under the heading of ego-defenses. So nothing new has been added to Freud, and a great deal has been deleted. By enlarging upon the social character of man's personality, they have elevated man from his biological embodiments.

Although these social-psychological theories have not stimulated a great deal of research in comparison with some other theories, they have inspired an intellectual setting in which social-psychological research could flower and grow.
Social psychology is not an offspring of psychology, but rather has its own autonomy in the science of psychology. Adler, Karen Horney, and Sullivan are not exclusively responsible for the rise of social psychology, but their influence has been considerable. Each of them has pictured man as a social being. This is their great contribution to the contemporary point of view.

In contrast to many theorists, Allport has never developed a school of followers, but his theory has, nevertheless, had considerable influence.

One bit of evidence for the theory's utility is supplied by a questionnaire circulated by the Division of Clinical and Abnormal Psychology of the American Psychological Association. This questionnaire was sent to practicing clinical psychologists and asked them to indicate what personality theorist was of most direct value to them in their day-to-day clinical work. The overwhelming majority of the respondents mentioned Freud as being most influential, but the second most frequently mentioned theorist was Allport (6, p. 289).

One of the most interesting current developments in connection with this theory is the manner in which it has become of interest to psychoanalytic theorists. In spite of the fact that Allport has been a caustic critic of orthodox psychoanalysis, he has been accorded as one of the most fashionable of psychological theorists among psychoanalysts.

One of the striking phenomena of the past sixty years in psychology has been the rebirth of self and ego concepts. Perhaps no other psychologist has had so influential a role in restoring the ego concept as Allport, for he has
persistently shown the necessity of such a concept when attempting to describe normal, complex, human behavior. A further feature of Allport's position has been his emphasis upon the importance of conscious determinants of behavior, and his demonstrations of methods of assessing human motivation. In keeping with current psychological thinking is Allport's insistence for the detailed study of the individual case.

A final feature of Allport's theory is contained in his emphasis upon the future and the present, to the relative exclusion of the past as of tremendous importance in evaluating the situational determinants of behavior.

Finally, the contemporary psychologists maintain that Allport's theory gives attention to the interdependence of all aspects of behavior, but fails to recognize that behavior is dynamically influenced by the environmental situation within which it operates. Allport gives too much credit to inner constellation of the organism but not enough credit to the influence of impelling and tugging external forces.

Organismic theory as a reaction against mind-body dualism has been immensely successful. The main tenets of organismic theory are that the whole is something other than the sum of its parts, that what happens to a part happens to the whole, and that there are no separate compartments within the organism.
In this sense, organismic theory is viewed as a frame of reference rather than as a systematic behavior theory. The organismic viewpoint asserts that the total person is the natural unit of study. Since the normal, healthy human being always functions as an organized whole, the proponents of this theory urge that psychology attempt to determine the mechanics by which the total person functions.

An organismic theory of personality is defined by the attitude of the theorist and focuses upon the whole organism as a unified system rather than upon separate traits or drives or habits. Goldstein, Allport, Freud, Jung, and virtually all other contemporary personality theorists adopt an organismic orientation yet there are radical differences among these theories. What Goldstein finds in the organism is not what Allport or Freud finds there, although all three may be classified as organismic in their general orientation.

There is little to find fault with in the organismic approach because it is so universally accepted. Perhaps the most controversial charge that has been made against Goldstein's version of the organismic theory is that he treats the organism and the environment as two separate and distinct entities. However, the organism should be regarded as a component of a larger system which includes the whole universe.

Another issue which is taken with Goldstein's theory is that he fails to distinguish sufficiently between what is inherent in the organism and what has been implanted there
by the culture. Likewise, his concept of self-actualization has been regarded as being too general in character to be useful for making specific predictions. Some psychologists object to Goldstein's disregard of statistical analysis and disagree with his subjective evaluations.

Finally, there have been voiced objections to Goldstein's attempt at understanding the normal personality by studying brain-injured patients.

In spite of these specific criticisms, the current attitude among psychologists toward Goldstein's postulations has been a very favorable one, and his role as a theorist is highly recognized. It may be stated that the organismic theory has conscientiously insisted that the organism is not an antithesis of mind and body, each with its own components or impellants, but that it is a single entity consisting of many intricate functions. Contemporary psychologists are indebted to the organismic point of view for this emphasis which is placed upon the holistic functioning of the individual.

While it appears that there have been some reweaving of ideas and additional new and original emphasis of how personality is formed and of what personality is composed, during the past few decades, there still however, may be found many identifiable threads in the garment which clothes the individual. For the theories of Freud have not been nullified nor have his concepts been disregarded.
In recent literature, psychoanalytic and psychological theorists have continued to present Freud's points of view and to amplify his concepts.

His concept of the ego as the director and executor of the personality is adhered to by the social and organismic disciples. One deviant point of view, however, is that the ego has been relevated to the position as capable of latching on to its own energy system and of subjugating itself from the instinctual objectives.

The role of heredity and development has been somewhat partially mediated by the emphasis upon the influence and impact of social and cultural features as they shape and mold the personality.

Another point of view is concerned with a more experimental and objective method of evaluating personality. Objective testing has been coupled with observation of variables which are now being verified in experimental laboratories where they may be controlled.

An additional finding which has evolved has been that psychology and psychoanalysis again be viewed as part and parcel of the same science. Freud was an exponent of the compatibility of these two points of view for he felt that they purported the same opinions and brought about a greater unity of thought. While both the psychologist and psychiatrist are concerned with problems of behavior, motivation, learning, inheritance, and social and cultural influences, and their
interplay upon the individual and his adjustment, it would therefore seem that there is so much overlapping and interplay between psychology and psychiatry, that it would be difficult to distinguish between the point where one begins and the other ends.

In conclusion, these theories of personality, while showing some deviation and some segmental emphases, summarize their points of view by the recognition that man is a unique and complex individual who inhabits a world which is beset with conflicts and problems to which he must adjust and react in order to reach his aspirations which at times seem unattainable and smogged from view by confusion and misunderstanding. Nevertheless, man is an optimistic and altruistic creature and is capable of fulfilling his physiological, psychological, and sociological needs.

Personality, perhaps in some ways today, is better understood. However, man may still be viewed as a complex organism which at times the psychologist is unable to completely evaluate.

The point of view of each theorist may be accepted or denied by workers in the psychological field with each theory evaluated as to its utility to the psychologist.
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