

INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

72-24,150

ROSKAM, Anne H., 1938-
PATTERNS OF AUTONOMY IN HIGH ACHIEVING
ADOLESCENT GIRLS WHO DIFFER IN NEED-
FOR APPROVAL.

The City University of New York, Ph.D., 1972
Psychology, clinical

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

**PATTERNS OF AUTONOMY
IN HIGH ACHIEVING ADOLESCENT GIRLS
WHO DIFFER IN NEED FOR APPROVAL**

by

ANNE H. ROSKAM

A dissertation submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Psychology in partial
fulfillment of the requirement for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City
University of New York.

1972

This manuscript has been read and accepted
for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in
satisfaction of the dissertation requirement
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

5/3/72
date

Laurence J. Gould
Chairman of Examining Committee

5/12/72
date

Matthe Weiss
Executive Officer

Professor Laurence Gould

Professor Max Hertzman

Professor Irving Paul
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have
indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my committee, Professors Laurence Gould, Max Hertzman, and Irving Paul for their help in the preparation of this dissertation. I especially want to express my appreciation to Professor Hertzman who, over the years, has inspired me most in my development as a clinician.

I would also like to thank the judges for the interview material: Diane Burhenne, Gerrit Crouse, Joan Farber, Andrea Ostrum, Nannette Shaham, and George Weinberg; Helene Bluvol who judged the TAT material; Louise Atcheson who assisted me in the selection and testing of subjects; my friend, Bill Franklin, for his candid and constructive criticism; and the young women who participated in this research.

Finally, I am deeply grateful to my late husband, Clair, whose courage, integrity, and humanness have been invaluable in my life and work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LITERATURE	6
Theory	6
Definition of the Autonomy Syndrome	
Processes Making Up the Autonomy Syndrome	
The Development of Autonomy and	
the Process of Socialization	
Research Findings	24
Studies on Autonomy	
Studies on the Need for Approval	
and Autonomy	
Studies on Need for Approval	
and Academic Achievement	
Studies on Academic Achievement	
and Autonomy	
Summary of Research Findings	41
III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY AND HYPOTHESES	43
Principle Objectives	43
Secondary Objectives	50
Hypotheses	55
IV. METHODOLOGY	57
Subjects	57
Specific Research Procedures	61

Chapter

Page

Session No. 1: The Psychological Testing Session	
Session No. 2: The Interview and Experimental Condition	
Session No. 3: The Post-Experimental Condition	
Instruments	68
The Autonomy Interview	
The Fantasy Measures (TAT)	
The Research Evaluation Questionnaire	
Scoring and Reliability of the Interview Measures	74
Scoring and Reliability of the Fantasy Measures (TAT)	77
Scoring of the Research Evaluation Questionnaire	80
V. RESULTS	81
Association Among the Six Interview Variables	81
Association Among the Three TAT Variables	87
Association Among Mean Interview Scores and the Three TAT Variables	90
Differences Between the Groups on the Interview Measures	93
Differences Between the Groups on the Fantasy Measures	96
TAT Autonomy Ratings	
TAT Openness Ratings	
The Hostility Ratings	
Reaction to the Achievement-Praise Condition	99

Chapter

Page

The Effect of Praise Over Time Inconsistency of Individual Item Ratings Summary of Findings for the Achievement Praise Condition	
Clinical Observations of Subjects in Testing Session No. 1.	112
Qualitative Findings on the Differences Between HNA and LNA Achievers.	113
VI. DISCUSSION	124
Summary of Findings.	134
The Interview as a Measure of Autonomy.	136
The Need for Approval and Autonomy	137
Praise for Intellectual Performance and the Need for Approval.	139
Implications of the Findings	141
The Importance of Studying Within Group Differences	
The Effects of Need for Approval and Educational Processes on Autonomy and Creativity	
The Effects of Parent-Child Interaction on the Development of Autonomy and Implications for Child Rearing	
High and Low Need for Approval and Differences in Superego Development	
Blind Compliance vs. Dissociation, Isolation and Negativism	
Implications for Psychotherapy	
Limitations of the Study	153
Availability of Results for Generalization Experimental Condition	

Chapter		Page
	Size of Sample Autonomy Measures Based on Subjects' Self-Reports	
	Suggestions for Future Research.	157
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	162
APPENDIX A	PERSONAL DATA SHEET AND MARLOWE- CROWNE SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE	168
APPENDIX B	SUMMARY OF PILOT RESEARCH.	171
APPENDIX C	MODIFIED ALPHA EXAMINATION FORM 9 (TEST B)	174
APPENDIX D	THE AUTONOMY INTERVIEW	176
APPENDIX E	THE TAT SCALES	184
APPENDIX F	THE RESEARCH EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE. .	192
APPENDIX G	INSTRUCTIONS TO JUDGES RE: RATINGS OF SUBJECTS.	195
APPENDIX H	QUALITATIVE SAMPLES OF THE DIFFERENCES OBTAINED BETWEEN HNA AND LNA ACHIEVERS.	202

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVEN TAT CARDS.	70
2. PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR INTERVIEWER AND INDEPENDENT JUDGES' RATINGS OF THE SIX INTERVIEW VARIABLES	76
3. PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS FOR WRITER AND JUDGE'S RATINGS OF THE THREE HOSTILITY SCALES.	79
4. PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE SIX INTERVIEW VARIABLES FOR THE HNA GROUP	82
5. PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE SIX INTERVIEW VARIABLES FOR THE LNA GROUP	84
6. PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE SIX INTERVIEW VARIABLES FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE.	85
7. PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE THREE TAT VARIABLES FOR THE HNA GROUP	87
8. PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE THREE TAT VARIABLES FOR THE LNA GROUP.	88
9. PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE THREE TAT VARIABLES FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE.	89

Table

Page

10. PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF MEAN INTERVIEW SCORE AND THE THREE VARIABLES FOR THE HNA GROUP.	90
11. PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF MEAN INTERVIEW SCORE AND THE THREE TAT VARIABLES FOR THE LNA GROUP	91
12. PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF MEAN INTERVIEW SCORE AND THE THREE TAT VARIABLES FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE	92
13. MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATION AND RESULTS OF T TEST COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE TWO NEED FOR APPROVAL GROUPS ON THE SIX INTERVIEW VARIABLES.	94
14. A COMPARISON OF MEAN INTERVIEW SCORES (OVER ALL SIX VARIABLES) FOR HNA AND LNA GROUPS.	95
15. A COMPARISON OF MEAN TAT AUTONOMY RATINGS FOR HNA AND LNA GROUPS	96
16. A COMPARISON OF MEAN TAT OPENNESS RATINGS FOR THE HNA AND LNA GROUPS	97
17. MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF RATINGS ON THE THREE HOSTILITY SUBSCALE AND MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF TOTAL TAT DEFENDED HOSTILITY SCORES FOR LNA AND HNA GROUPS	98
18. A COMPARISON OF SUBSCALE A SCORES FOR THE FOUR TREATMENT GROUPS, ADMINISTRATION NO. 1 AND TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	100
19. A COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR SUBSCALE B, ADMINISTRATION NO. 1 FOR THE FOUR TREATMENT GROUPS AND TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE.	101
20. A COMPARISON OF MEAN CHANGES IN SUBSCALE A SCORES FROM ADMINISTRATION 1 TO 2 FOR THE FOUR TREATMENT GROUPS AND TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE.	103

Table

Page

21. MEAN SCORES FOR SUBSCALE A, ADMINISTRATION NO. 1, MEAN CHANGE SCORES AND ADJUSTED MEAN SCORES FOR THE FOUR TREATMENT GROUPS AND ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE.	105
22. A COMPARISON OF MEAN CHANGES IN SUBSCALE B SCORES FROM ADMINISTRATION 1 TO 2 FOR THE FOUR TREATMENT GROUPS AND TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE.	107
23. A COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL SUBJECT VARIATION IN ITEM RATINGS FROM ADMINISTRATION 1 TO ADMINISTRATION 2 PER TREATMENT GROUP FOR SUBSCALE A AND TWO WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE.	109
24. A COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL SUBJECT VARIATION IN ITEM RATINGS FROM ADMINISTRATION 1 TO ADMINISTRATION 2 PER TREATMENT GROUP FOR SUBSCALE B AND TWO WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE.	110

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"...our normal, 'adjusted' state is too often the abdication of ecstasy, the betrayal of our true potentialities... many of us are only too successful in acquiring a false self to adapt to false realities."

R. D. Laing
(The Divided Self)

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between the desire for approval and patterns of autonomy in a group of adolescent girls who are equally high in academic achievement. The study will explore differences in autonomy patterns of high achievers who differ markedly in their need for approval.

Despite the considerable research on personality differences between high and low academic achievers, as well as on the many problems related to underachievement, there have been few studies of personality and motivational differences among high achievers. Typically, in research on academic achievement, "under" or low achievers are presented as "mal-adjusted", "immature", "hostile", or "emotionally disturbed." High achievers are shown to be comparatively "adjusted",

"mature", or otherwise psychologically healthy. Accordingly, as individuals are evaluated for colleges, graduate schools and employment in various fields, academic achievement confers a halo effect implying psychological maturity, mental health and competence.

It is quite possible that such implications, in some cases, may be seriously misleading. An article in the Saturday Review quotes a former dean of admissions at Harvard:

The student who ranks first in his class may be genuinely brilliant or he may be a compulsive worker or the instrument of domineering parents' ambition or a conformist or a self-centered careerist who has shrewdly calculated teachers' prejudices and expectations and discovered how to regurgitate efficiently what they want; or he may have focused narrowly on grade getting as compensation for his inadequacies in other areas, because he lacks other interests or talents or lacks passion and warmth or normal healthy instincts or is afraid of life.

1

In our middle class society, academic achievement has for many people become a highly desirable, if not necessary, goal for success. Many children are, therefore, subject to rather intense pressures to achieve in school beginning at the kindergarten level. Such pressure often involves a socialization process (especially well known to middle class culture) wherein the child is offered rewards for achievement (in the form of approval and love) and is threatened or coerced if he fails, or is in danger of doing so.

1

Vernon R. Alden, "What Kind of Excellence?", The Saturday Review, July 18, 1964, pp. 52-53.

The educator and writer, John Holt (1964), has described the modern method most aptly:

You make children afraid of what will happen if they don't do what you want. You can do this in an old fashioned way or in a modern way, subtly, smoothly, and quietly, by withholding the acceptance and approval which you and others have trained children to depend upon. (Italics mine.)

Clearly, not all academic achievers are motivated in the same manner, however. In some cases, achievement grows out of a sense of curiosity, confidence and early mastery.

These differences in motivation are probably determined on the one hand, by the high achievers' experience with significant figures, particularly parents, in the course of their early development. And, on the other, in how they respond individually to their particular experiences--whether with growth or defensive reactions. If, in this active and reactive process, love and approval become crucial to maintaining a sense of self, the result may be a losing battle for true independence, however impressive personal achievements may be. If, however, love and approval do not become strong motives toward academic success, achievement may not cost the individual his sense of individuality and separateness.

It is the hope of this investigator that the present study will serve as one step in answering the question of the influence of the need for approval on the personality of the high achiever. The aspect of personality chosen to study is autonomy.

Autonomy is viewed in this study as a process for gaining and maintaining psychological independence and, also, certain consequences which theorists believe stem directly from psychological independence. The concept of autonomy here studied constitutes a syndrome of selected behaviors and attitudes summarized below:

1. Maintenance of attitudes and value system: the degree to which the individual is struggling to establish and maintain her own attitudes, values and judgments in the face of pressures exerted by parents, peers and other external sources.
2. Openness to inner conflict: the individual's openness to the experience of internal conflict.
3. Tolerance of friction: the individual's ability to tolerate and to engage in interpersonal friction with a minimum of anxiety and guilt.
4. Self-image and non-defensiveness: the degree of non-defensiveness the individual exhibits regarding maintenance of her self-image.
5. Interpersonal experience: the degree to which the individual experiences gratification in diversified interpersonal relationships.
6. Physical independence: the individual's nearness to her immediate family in terms of domicile arrangements, amount of time spent away from the family, physical care (meal preparation, room cleaning, clothes, etc.).
7. Directness of hostility expression: the degree to which the individual is direct in the expressions of hostility in her fantasy productions.

The present study uses both clinical interview data and TAT fantasy productions as bases for measuring these various dimensions.

In this investigation the need for approval is viewed as

the degree to which an individual's self esteem is based upon the approval of others, either outside sources or internalized "others". It applies both to the need for "outside" support in the choice of goals and as rewards in defining their accomplishment. In the present study this need is assessed through the Marlowe-Crowne Scale for Social Desirability and through reactions to praise incorporated in an experimental design.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE

Theory

Definition of the Autonomy Syndrome

For the purposes of this study, autonomy is defined as a configuration of behaviors (i.e., thoughts, feelings, actions) involving several processes. Some of these processes are viewed as necessary prerequisites to the development of a core of autonomy. Some of them are seen as consequences to the development of this central aspect.

The core of autonomy can be described as the ability to define for one's self and to maintain individualized attitudes, values and judgments in the face of pressure exerted from others (either external sources or internalized "others"). Two processes seem to be necessary prerequisites which would enable an individual to develop and maintain this core of autonomy. The first is a capacity for being open to the experience of inner conflict; the second is an ability to tolerate some degree of interpersonal friction without experiencing extreme anxiety or guilt. The processes which represent the consequences of autonomy are: (1) a capacity for

relating to others in an open and undefensive manner; (2) the ability to have deep and gratifying relationships with diversified others; (3) the ability to become physically independent from one's immediate family; and (4) a freedom in expressing hostility directly.

The Processes Making up the Autonomy Syndrome

Theorists interested in the problem of autonomy have postulated various processes which seem to be involved, necessarily, with its achievement. The following variables reflect these necessary processes. They make up the fairly broad and complex concept of autonomy defined above.

1. Maintenance of attitudes and value system: The degree to which the subject is struggling to establish and maintain her own attitudes, values and judgments in the face of pressures exerted by parents, peers, and other external sources.

For many theorists (Erikson , Horney, Laing), such a struggle is the core for the achievement of autonomy. Erikson (1963), for example, believes the child's ability to stand his own ground in the face of external pressure to be the crucial factor in his struggle for independence and self-mastery. Moustakas (1967) and other existential writers have stressed the importance of "resistance to external pressures" in maintaining autonomy and authenticity of the self. In Moustakas' view, such resistance "is a healthy response... it is the person's effort to sustain his integrity (p. 5-6)".

Witkin's concept of "separate identity" has to do with this aspect of autonomy. This concept is described as manifesting itself in the ability to establish and maintain attitudes and judgments without continuous reference to external standards, and also in a limited need for guidance and support from others. (Witkin et.al. 1962).

2. Openness to inner conflict: the degree to which the individual is open to the experience of internal conflict.

Many theorists have stressed the importance, in fact necessity, of inner conflict in human growth (Horney, 1950; Maslow, 1965; Erikson, 1950). The person who does not allow himself the experience of inner conflicts tends to remain stagnant in life rather than move forward. If autonomy requires that the individual be open to new and different experiences, it follows that it must also necessitate some conscious experience of intrapsychic conflict.

Any move toward independence and separateness is bound to be fraught with some degree of conflict. The adolescent who does not consciously experience some conflicting feelings regarding independence, sex or career goals is likely to be one who has abrogated strivings for autonomy. Rather than thinking of persons who admit emotional conflicts as revealing symptoms of "maladjustment" (as do some users of "objective", personality questionnaires), such persons are viewed here as exhibiting signs of possible health, particularly adolescents.

3. Tolerance of friction: the subject's ability to tolerate and to engage in interpersonal friction with a minimum of guilt and anxiety.

In a paper on self-alienation, Alexander Reid Martin (1961) points to several patterns in American culture which he views as contributing to estrangement from an individual's most vital self. He calls one of these, the "frictionless pattern," which he feels is inculcated early in the lives of many American children. Martin observes that, while it is natural for young children to rough-house with one another, this sort of play provokes anxiety in many parents, motivating them to interfere with it. As a result of this interference, a young person is not allowed to "test his metal". Later he is discouraged from entering into the conflict of vigorous argument with others (in Martin's view interpersonal friction is healthy).

It would follow from above that to be autonomous probably requires some ability to engage in disagreement with others without experiencing debilitating guilt and anxiety. Laing feels that such friction is intolerable for the person without autonomy. Because disagreement for such persons is threatening to their sense of ontological existence, it is avoided at all costs (Laing, 1958).

Psychoanalytic ego psychologists (e.g., Rapaport) view autonomy intrapsychically as a process in which the ego becomes increasingly independent of internal drives and environmental pressures (Rapaport, 1957). Keniston (1965) has suggested that a partial effect of the development of

ego psychology (in our society) has been an increasing emphasis on cognition rather than feeling. Keniston believes that one reason many young people in American society are "alienated" is because the "ego" has become the dominant force in their lives. This means that such qualities as mastery, competence, and achievement are often overstressed in the child's development --that cognitive skills are emphasized and the child's emotional life neglected. Thus, "ego autonomy" may represent a kind of "cognitive detachment" rather than a full and genuine autonomy.

In discussing the matter of autonomy and control, Bettelheim (1967) has stated that "Autonomy is neither dependent on nor helped by an absolute control of our feelings". He stresses the importance of satisfaction and discharge of affect and says that "Autonomy does not require that we are in total, but (in) sufficient control of our emotions (p. 49)".

4. Self image and Non-defensiveness: the degree of non-defensiveness the subject exhibits regarding the maintenance of her self image.

This aspect of autonomy relates specifically to the maintenance of a defensive stance in interpersonal interaction or in a situation where the subject evaluates herself, and is at the same time aware that she is in some way being evaluated by another person (i.e., an interview situation). Theoretically, the person with autonomy would seem to have less need to be defensive than the individual who lacks autonomy. (For example, Murphy (1962) found that preschool children who exhibited autonomy in other ways, were not afraid to ask for help when they felt they needed it, whereas children lacking in autonomy sometimes refused offers of help maintaining a defensive "distance" from persons able to supply it.) The autonomous person is more likely to present a "balanced" picture of herself to others and to feel freer in discussing problem areas in her life, as well as admitting to strengths and weaknesses. The individual lacking in autonomy would seem to be more invested in protecting a self image. Thus it is likely that such an individual would be less spontaneous in interpersonal interaction and less likely to discuss problem areas with much freedom.

5. Interpersonal experience: the degree to which the subject experiences gratification in diversified relationships.

In the view of several personality theorists (Erikson, Laing, Sullivan, and Maslow), autonomy is a necessary prerequisite to engaging in meaningful, enjoyable relations with others. Erikson has stated that only when an individual has attained "firm self-delineation" can he achieve "true engagement with other (1959, p. 124)". In other words, the capacity for intimacy is possible only when one has developed some autonomy. This has been clearly stated by Gruen (1968), who says that it is...

...only after discovering that one can be separate and yet not apart, lonely but not isolated, and then that no one can take away that which through loneliness and separateness you have discovered to be your own, that one first becomes free to love without fear. (p. 652)

In this same vein, Laing describes one of the essential differences between a person with autonomy and a person without it:

...in the individual whose own being is secure in this primary experiential sense, relatedness with others is potentially gratifying, whereas the ontologically insecure person is preoccupied with preserving rather than gratifying himself. (p. 42, 1958) (Italics mine)

According to Laing, interpersonal relationships threaten the person who lacks autonomy with "loss of identity". For such people, the only alternative to clinging, dependent attachments to others is "utter detachment and isolation". For the non-autonomous person "the polarity is between complete isolation

and complete merging of identity rather than between separateness and relatedness". (p. 52)

Other theorists who have considered the nature of interpersonal experiences of the autonomous personality point to a capacity for diversification in relationships. Thus, the child who is allowed to gratify his strivings for autonomy, will likely develop an openness to new people and experiences outside his immediate family. Diversification and expansion of relationships beyond the immediate family are viewed as necessarily involved with attainment of autonomy (Sullivan, 1953b, Erikson, 1959, Singer, E. 1965).

6. Physical independence from family: the subject's nearness to her immediate family in terms of domicile arrangements, amount of time spent away from the family, physical care (meal preparation, room cleaning, laundry, clothes, etc)

The degree of physical independence from one's immediate family can be regarded as one aspect of autonomy, although not a crucial one by itself. The amount of physical time spent away from the family, the degree of responsibility for her physical care--these may or may not be related to an adolescent's psychological independence. However, since physical independence may be particularly important in contributing to autonomy in adolescents, this variable was included as a measure in the cluster making up the autonomy concept.

7. Directness of hostility expression: the individual's ability to express hostility directly rather than indirectly.

Many theorists (Maslow, 1965; Laing, 1958; Singer, E., 1965) have linked autonomy necessarily with an ability to be "in touch" with one's feelings. Being connected with one's self included being aware of angry, hostile feelings as well as loving, affectionate ones. Since autonomous individuals can be expected to be open to negative as well as positive feelings, it is also likely that they will allow more direct expression to such feelings than will individuals who are lacking or deficient in autonomy.

The Development of Autonomy and the Process of Socialization

Maslow (1965), as do some ego psychologists (e.g. White, 1960), conceives of autonomy strivings as natural in the young child, and as emerging out of his simply being alive. The child is viewed as being naturally curious, exploratory and daring, desiring to master the new and the strange. What is crucial for the child is that his exploration, risk-taking, and choice-making be respected. Maslow says, "Ultimately the person, even the child, must choose for himself (p. 47)." The child may begin to depend upon the approval of others when he is not often enough allowed to make his own choices. The frequency of others choosing for the child, according to Maslow, confuses "his ability to perceive...his own impulses, judgements and feelings and to differentiate these from the interiorized standards of others (p. 47)." The opposite of the experience of trusting oneself is relying on the opinion of other people and learning to trust them rather than the self. Maslow states that the child who has abrogated his own choices in order to win love and approval from others either represses or gives up his autonomous pursuits. He adds that "along with this will develop a disapproval of the delight experience or shame and embarrassment and secretiveness about it (p. 49)." In a similar vein, Moustakas (1967) feels that the more an individual learns to depend on the

standards, expectations and approval of others, the more "his growth as a creative self (will be) impaired (p. 35)."

In Bettelheim's view (1967) as well as Erikson's and Maslow's, it is the quality of the child's early relationship with his parents, particularly the mother, which sets the foundation for the development of autonomy. Erikson (1958) has emphasized that in American middle class culture it is most often the mother "...whose all-pervasive presence and brutal decisiveness of judgement--although her means may be the sweetest--precipitate the child into a fatal struggle for his own identity." Erikson conceives the child's dilemma in the struggle for autonomy as based on his desire, on the one hand, to be loved by his parents for what he is (rather than for what he does and accomplishes) and on the other hand, in his growing awareness that he is really loved and rewarded for what he does rather than for what he is. Erikson believes that this problem develops when the parent (or parents) has "selected this child...as the particular child who must justify the parent. Thus, the parents ask only: what have you accomplished? and what have you done for me? (1958, p. 65). (Italics mine.)

With such parents, the child, because of his natural needs for love, safety and protection, is forced into an intolerable position where he feels he must either abrogate his own desires for growth or lose the providers of his basic needs (Maslow, 1965). Maslow feels that most children faced with such a conflict, usually choose to stifle or repress autonomy.

In the view of these theorists, it is in the parents' continuing love and value of the child as himself, as a genuine and unique person, that true identity and autonomy have the opportunity to take root and develop. Failure to develop autonomy, is in large part rooted in the parents' demands, subtle or openly forceful, that their child conform to their desires for accomplishment and achievement and in the child's learning that it is this behavior which rewards him with the "security" of the love and protection of his parents. Erikson and Bettelheim both feel that it is psychologically more important (for autonomy) for emphasis to be placed on the child's becoming a social individual, rather than his becoming a social individual (as is commonly emphasized in our society) (Bettelheim, 1967).

In Kovar's view (1968), a child will affirm himself in the terms in which he was confirmed by his parents. Thus, if his parents have not confirmed him as "genuine", the child will be unable to affirm himself as "genuine" and will not seek such confirmation from others.

While Laing (1958), Bettelheim (1967) and Erikson (1950) all view the critical period for the development of autonomy as that of infancy and early childhood, they, as well as other theorists, stress an additional period where the struggle for autonomy becomes crucial--that of adolescence. Erikson has conceived of this period as the stage of "Identity formation versus role diffusion" (1950). During this stage the adolescent commonly goes through a crisis in self-knowledge

and psychological growth in an attempt to realize a sense of individual identity. In studying young people of 17 to 20, one should not expect to discover many, if any, cases in which true autonomy has been achieved. What one can expect to find is that most young people of this age group will be inter- and intra-personally involved at various levels with some sort of struggle in the process of furthering their sense of independence and of establishing themselves as persons in their own right, with needs, values and attitudes of their own. The very absence of such struggle should arouse one's suspicions. For example, Bettelheim believes, along with Erikson, that "...what happens during the adolescent identity crisis depends in part on how much autonomy was gained in early childhood...(if) no crisis takes place in adolescence ...the child has not gained much autonomy in infancy. (pp.33-34)". (Italics mine.)

Parental and social pressure on the child to conform through loss of love probably involves several dimensions: the degree to which the parent's affection and love will be withheld, the number of situations to which this threat is applied, the likelihood that the threat will be carried out, and, the way in which it is carried out. However, this pressure to conform can probably be represented as a continuum from high to low.

At the same time, not all children are equally resistant to these varying pressures for a variety of reasons which need not concern us here. Some will continue to struggle

against social demands at almost all costs while others will acquiesce early in the game.

It is out of this conflict that autonomy and independence grow and develop or become stunted and stifled. However, these two extremes are not the sole solutions to such conflict. Various theorists have addressed themselves to different outcomes of this struggle. These can be summarized in the following typology.

Type A - high resistance & high pressure to conform	=	schizophrenia or resistance in the form of negativism and isolation.
Type B - low resistance & high pressure to conform	=	blind compliance
Type C - high resistance & low pressure to conform	=	autonomy & independence

Type A - The Schizophrenic or Negativistic, Isolated Individual

Laing considers the core problem in schizophrenia, schizoid and other dissociated states as residing in problems of achieving autonomy. However, in Laing's view (1958) the schizoid or schizophrenic individual has not totally given up the struggle. While he appears to be highly dependent on the presence or approval of others for a sense of identity, and consequently conforms to the demands of others, he does so on a superficial level. Such an individual, according to Laing, has developed a "false self system" which he presents to the world. The individual "feels" that he is the "puppet" of his parents' wishes, experiences himself as a sort of

"pawn", and has some awareness that he is conforming to the demands of others in the service of a "pseudo-self" designed to protect his "real self". On a deeper level, his "real self" has not given up the fight for independence and integrity. Compliance, in this case, represents a way of defending the individual's "real self" against the dangers of being overwhelmed and "engulfed". These dangers, according to Laing, are experienced frequently by the schizophrenic individual.

Kisch (1967) discovered a different pattern of response to pressures to conform. Among a large group of under-achievers he found a group of individuals who were "highly motivated, but socially isolated, angry and alienated (ideologically and culturally)." This subgroup appears to be reacting 'negatively' to pressures to conform. They are not sufficiently "strong" to withstand pressure and tend to resort to "negativism" and isolation as an attempt to salvage some remnant of overt autonomy. Keniston (1965) has described "alienated" youth in a similar manner.

Type B - The Blindly Compliant Individual

Gruen (1968) attempts to differentiate the individuals described by Laing from others whom he views as having conformed blindly to the demands of parents and other significant persons and who have internalized these demands in the form of rigid compulsions. Such individuals, according to Gruen, do not demonstrate the "split in the self" as do persons

similar to those described by Laing. On the surface such individuals

...look good. They seem not to be rejecting of their parents, their identifications seem complete, they do not appear to suffer from the quality of experiencing we have referred to as "not being in one's body and one's acts". Their identifications, however, though giving them an apparent feeling of independence, do not lead to the development of an authentic self, but only to a defence of the status quo.

(p. 652)

In Gruen's view, the individuals described above have completely given up the struggle for autonomy. Such individuals blindly seek social approval and conform without the concomitant feeling that they are being manipulated by others. Their compliance is carried out without the experience of internal conflict, but rather with the conviction that such behavior is a perfectly natural thing.

Crowne and Marlowe's (1964) discussion of the need for approval motive in terms of social learning theory is relevant to a discussion of what one might expect to be characteristic of compliant personalities. Their analysis of the approval motive in the context of social learning theory makes the point that "both generalized expectancies (freedom of movement) and need value are involved in a dependence of the favorable evaluations of others and in avoidance of self-criticism." The authors conclude that individuals high in need for approval have learned that "conformity, submission, and the normative anchoring of their behavior entail the fewest risks of social

rejection and threats of self-esteem". In individuals who have developed a high need for approval, one can expect to find "low freedom of movement for independence, assertiveness and the frank acknowledgement of feelings" (i.e., autonomy).

Type C - The Autonomous Individual

According to several theorists (Erikson, 1958; Bettelheim, 1967; Maslow, 1965) the person who develops a full and genuine autonomy is likely to be one who has overtly resisted pressures to conform in a struggle to differentiate himself from others and to establish and maintain a sense of separate identity with individualized goals and values.

Theoretically, the autonomous individual is likely to have experienced less intense pressure to conform in his early relationships (than types A and B) and more often than not has probably experienced himself as having been confirmed as unique and genuine by his parents.

It can be expected that as a consequence of such confirmation the young child will tend to develop an increasing openness to inner and outer experience, along with a tolerance for conflict, diversification and difference. The child who is encouraged by his parents (and other significant figures) to develop separateness and openness is likely to be reinforced and strengthened in his ability to openly resist pressures for conformity.

The end result in the development of the autonomous individual would be the possession of a capacity for genuine intimacy with others, along with a flexibility and

openness about himself.

Clearly, this simple typology does not exhaust the many possible reactions to varying degrees of pressure to conform. Also, many variations are likely to be found within the suggested responses to pressure. However, it is expected that the two groups of subjects studied here -- specifically, high need for approval achievers and low need for approval achievers -- will most likely be characterized as "blindly compliant" vs. "autonomous individuals," respectively.

Research Findings

Studies on Autonomy

1. Maintenance of Attitudes and Value System

Kovar, in her study of adolescent girls (1968), found that the "autonomous" girls were deeply invested in maintaining their own values and ideas despite pressure from peers or parents. She found other girls to be either overtly oriented to the values of adults (e.g., parents and other authority figures) or conformists to peer values. (This investigator believes that it is probable that a large number of girls will conform to peer group values as a stepping stone away from dependence upon the values of significant adults. Any evaluation of adolescents should certainly be sophisticated enough to include an awareness of a middle or transitional period in persons striving for autonomy.)

An ability to maintain individualized values and attitudes and to make one's own decisions in the face of pressure from parents to do otherwise was a characteristic of highly autonomous girls in Moses' study (1968).

In an extensive, longitudinal study of "normal" children, Lois Murphy and her associates (1962) noted that the ability to stand one's own ground in the face of adult pressure was critical as an indication of developing autonomy. Murphy states that "one aspect of autonomy is the capacity to set limits to demands and pressures from the environment (p. 213)".

It should be mentioned that this aspect, considered alone, could suggest something other than autonomy. Standing one's own ground in the face of pressure exerted from the environment could also be representative of a rebellious negativism (although such rebelliousness itself may contain the seeds of genuine autonomy strivings). For example, Kovar describes one type of adolescent girl in her sample as an "archaic bohemian". This girl searches for autonomy "as an end in itself ". Most relations with others, which have never been very gratifying to this type of girl, are avoided by her. She is described as being "culturally, ideologically, and parentally alienated", and as exhibiting defiance in a "detached isolated way". She is not successful in attaining "genuine" autonomy, according to Kovar, because her separatism is "a permanent retreat rather than temporary retrenchment". (Kovar believes that genuine autonomy presupposes a return -- after a withdrawal from others in search of one's self -- to satisfactory relation.) Thus, the alienated girl described above is viewed as in the process of living a "pseudo-autonomy".

2. Openness to Inner Conflict

With regard to the experience of conflict, one must not disregard the quality of the coping mechanisms the individual has developed to deal with it. Coping devices will be more adequate in some individuals than in others (Kroeber, 1963). For example, in Kovar's study (1968) "delinquent" girls (judged as low in autonomy) often consciously experienced a good deal of conflict. However, their conflicts tended to be overwhelming because many of them had not developed adequate ways of dealing with them. The "autonomous" girl, on the other hand, showed an ability to sustain inner conflict--a tolerance for emotional pain and complexity which was comprised, in part, of an acceptance of personal limits, and in part, of a capacity for being alone.

In Moses' study (1968), girls rated as low in autonomy tended to deny conflicts; girls judged as "middle" autonomy experienced a good deal of inner conflict but lacked adequate coping devices to deal with it; girls judged as high in autonomy showed the most tolerance for inner conflict and were best able to handle it. Moses concluded from her study that "In adolescents who are judged to be relatively autonomous, autonomy is likely to be integrated at a tenuous level and accompanied by conflict". (Italics mine.)

3. Tolerance of Friction

With regard to interpersonal friction, Kovar (1968) suggests that the "autonomous" girls in her study emerge as those who are capable of tolerating such friction. Many of these girls, unlike the "adult-oriented" girls, reported rather frequent arguments with parents, particularly with their mothers. The arguments seemed to center around the girl's desire to make her own decisions and in differences of opinion regarding social, moral and political issues. In Kovar's sample, interpersonal friction for the "adult-oriented" girl, in particular, was very infrequent. Family life, for these girls was reported as being very congenial and harmonious.

The inability to tolerate interpersonal conflict in people who are overly dependent is clearly exemplified by Wynne et. al. (1965) in their descriptions of "pseudomutuality" in families of schizophrenics. In such families, harmony in relationships is maintained at all costs. Conflict among family members is intolerable as it seems to threaten the identity of each family member within the system. Thus, in families where "pseudomutuality" is present to a strong degree, autonomy strivings in individual members are not acceptable. In the families studied by Wynne et.al, adolescents unable to break out of the family system often became schizophrenic.

In several studies of the need for social approval it has been found that subjects highly dependent upon the approval of others tend to avoid expressing hostility in interpersonal

situations (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964; Klein, et.al. 1969; Crandall, et.al. 1965).

4. Self-Image and Non-Defensiveness

In support of defensiveness as an indication of lack of autonomy Moses found a positive and significant relationship between autonomy and lack of repression on the Rorschach (1968). The greater the autonomy, the less repressive the style of the person. In addition, girls judged as "low" in autonomy in Moses' sample, tended to deny their problems with dependence and to present themselves in an idealized fashion as being "very independent" (as measured by the subjects' self-ratings of independence). In another study with college women, Burhenne and Mirels found that score on the MC scale were significantly inversely related to the authenticity of the subjects' self-disclosure in written essays (1970).

In a study on the need for approval, Tutko (1963) found that subjects high in approval dependence produced projective test protocols which were rated as significantly more defensive, less revealing and less productive than the protocols of subjects who were low in need for approval. A study by Lefcourt produced similar findings (1969).

5. Interpersonal Experience

In her study of autonomy and "cognitive expansiveness" Moses (1968) found that girls high in autonomy had a wider variety of friends, and placed more value on interpersonal relationships than girls low in autonomy. Girls low in autonomy showed a tendency not to establish relationships with people who had different values and ideas from theirs or their families.

Similarly, among her "autonomous" girls, Kovar (1968) found more diversification and depth of relationships than she did in girls she viewed as less autonomous. Specifically, Kovar states that the autonomous girl does not "restrict herself to any one class, religion or racial group". In addition, the autonomous girls in her study tended to admire "the ordinary person, man or woman who gives of himself without receiving the power, adulation, or financial return accorded the men at the top."

6. Physical Independence

Moses, for example, found that girls highest in autonomy were relatively more independent physically from their immediate families than were girls low in autonomy. Similarly, Douvan and Adelson (1966) discovered that the question, "With whom do you spend your spare time (p. 151)?" most clearly demonstrated differences in autonomy in adolescent girls.

7. Directness of Hostility Expression

In a study of adolescent girls, Jackson (1964) found that girls who were unable to express strivings for independence were also unable to openly express hostility.

In research with the TAT, Breger (1963) demonstrated that more conforming subjects tended to produce significantly more stories in which hostility was indirectly or defensively expressed than did less conforming subjects.

Several studies on the need for approval have found significant difference between high and low need for approval subjects in the ability to directly express hostility. High need for approval subjects have been shown to exhibit more inhibition with regard to expressions of hostility than have low need for approval subjects.

Studies on the Need for Approval and Autonomy

Research on the need for social approval strongly suggests that this motive is associated with behavior related to autonomy, or the lack of it. The originators of the social desirability scale (designed to measure indirectly an approval seeking motive) have summarized research using the measure:

...what these findings have demonstrated
(at the simplest level) is a relation
between a self-evaluative style and
"other directed" (Reisman, 1950), self
protective and conflict avoidant behavior.

(Crowne & Marlowe, 1964, p. 191)

Much of the work cited and described by Marlowe and Crowne have been behavioral studies attempting to relate the need for social approval to such behaviors as defensiveness, susceptibility to persuasion, verbal conditionability, social conformity, and avoidance of conflict and hostility. In general, the studies have shown that individuals who are highly dependent on the approval of others (i.e., persons who display a tendency to present themselves in a socially desirable manner on the M-C scale) behave in a more conforming, cautious and persuasible manner than do persons who do not exhibit this tendency.

Individuals who score high on the M-C scale have also been known to score high on self-esteem questionnaires and rating scales. High self-esteem in these instances seems to provide some support for the view that the approval-dependent individual is invested in maintaining and defending an "idealized version

of the self (Horney, 1950)." Other researchers have taken note of the problems with self-esteem rating scales:

One of the universal criticisms of the most frequently used measures of self acceptance is that they are about equally correlated with socially desirable responses as they are with each other.

(Crowne, et.al. 1961)

In other words, "the greater the tendency to give socially desirable responses, the less the reported discrepancy between the self and ideal self (Ziller, et.al. 1969).

Crowne and Marlowe emphasize the fact that subjects who are high in approval-dependence may appear more "normal" because they embody many of the values of American middle class culture.

Approval motivated individuals say the right things about themselves, appear to hold "proper" attitudes, reflect common language usage in their associations, set goals of acceptably intermediate risk, do not show hostility, and seem in general to reflect the congeries of virtues defining the "adjusted" individual.

(1964, p. 204)

These people do not look "maladjusted" by the usual criteria -- personal dissatisfaction and self-rejection, acknowledgement of uncommon symptoms, and inappropriate social behavior (Scott, 1958 -- cited by Marlowe & Crowne. 1964)." However, the findings utilizing the M-C scale suggest that "those who are in many respects least deviant by these usual criteria may be, in fact, rather maladjusted individuals." The authors point to the need for questioning the criteria commonly used to define maladjustment.

Crowne and Marlowe defend the notion that approval-dependent individuals are "not frankly aware" of their defensive style of self-evaluation, as measured by their tendency to describe themselves in a socially desirable manner. The authors do not believe that the research supports an alternative suggestion that a person who scores high on the M-C scale is giving a conscious misrepresentation of himself (e.g., deliberately lying). People who appear to be high in approval dependence, as measured by the M-C scale, appear to be more like the "blind conformists" described by Gruen (1968) than like the dissociated, schizoid personalities discussed by Laing (1958) and Gruen (1968).

Research on the need for approval in children, utilizing a modified version of the M-C scale (Crandall, et.al. 1965), tends to yield results similar to those found with adults. High need for approval children have also been found to be more cautious, conforming and tend to avoid expressing hostility (Crandall, 1966; Crandall et.al, 1965; Klein, et. al. 1969). Sex differences have been found for both children and adults on the social desirability scales. In each instance, females have tended to score higher than males. This has been partly attributed to difference in the male and female roles as conceived in our culture: girls are usually taught to be more deferential, to be "nice" and to inhibit aggression, than are boys. In general IQ has been found to be unrelated to scores on the M-C scale for adults and children.

Getzels' and Jackson's (1962) work on intelligence and creativity has some relevance to the topic of autonomy and need for approval. These investigators found striking differences in personality and family backgrounds of two groups of children: children judged as "highly creative" and children assessed as "high IQ". The high IQ children were found to be rigid in their behavior and attitudes and in their emotional life. They tended to come from homes where achievement and cognitive skills were highly emphasized (to the neglect of emotional, affective factors) and where parents exerted rigid controls over personal cleanliness and the child's choice of friends. The creative children, on the other hand, were more assertive, showed more flexibility and freedom in their emotional life, attitudes and behavior. They tended to come from homes where parents were more permissive, tended to stress individuality and self-expression and cared little about academic achievement. (The teachers of these children preferred the high IQ child to the creative one. Apparently, the high IQ child showed better "adjustment", which is to say he was more cooperative and conforming to the dictates of the teacher and rules of the school.)

Related to the results of Getzels and Jackson regarding family background difference in their two groups, Kovar's findings (1968) indicated that in families of autonomous girls, there tended to be less stress on academic achievement than in the families of the "adult-oriented" or "peer-oriented" girls. (Many girls in all three of these groups, however, made good grades.)

Studies on the Need for Approval and Academic Achievement

In regard to research with children relating the need for approval to achievement, results have been equivocal and somewhat confusing. Crandall (1966) found that children in grades 4, 5, 8 and 12 who scored high on the social desirability scale, tended to do less well on an academic achievement test than children scoring low on the scale, regardless of IQ level. However, she found that "among high IQ children in grades 8 and 12, those who had high CSD scores attained better achievement test performance." Crowne, et.al. (1968) found that high need for approval children were more impulsive and showed poorer learning on discrimination tasks than did low need for approval children. Crandall et. al. (1965) have noted some sex differences in the achievement findings. For example, in some cases girls (of grade school age) high in need for approval have been found to do better on achievement tasks than girls low in need for approval; whereas the reverse has been found for boys. In any case, there seems to be no clear relationship between scores on the M-C scales and achievement performance.

Studies on Academic Achievement and Autonomy

High academic achievement has often been loosely associated with "competence", "adjustment" and other criteria connoting mental health. Articles on the psychological problems connected with underachievement abound in psychological and educational journals. However, no definitive research has been done which specifically sets out to study how and to what degree autonomy, as conceived in various aspects, is exhibited in individuals of high or low academic achievement. In general, research on the personalities of high achievers has been neglected. In point of fact, few studies have been done investigating differences within groups of high or low achievers. Interestingly, a few recent studies have shown that there tends to be as many (or more) significant differences within groups of high and low achievers as between them (Kisch, 1967).

Kisch (1967) has dramatically demonstrated the importance of within-group differences in underachievers. It was the premise of his investigation that "treating underachievers as a homogeneous group masks important within-group differences." He sought to demonstrate that "underachievement represents a number of processes that share a common behavioral expression". Kisch found that as a whole, underachievers did not differ in areas of intellectual interests or "emotional adjustment" from overachievers. However, as a group, "they tended to respond in ways characteristics of creative, impulsive, non-achievement oriented individuals". An intensive pattern and

cluster analysis, revealed groups of characteristics among the underachievers suggesting typologies for this group. For example, one group of underachievers was typically characterized as "attempting to compensate for feelings of social inadequacy by adopting an extroverted, exhibitionistic stance." Another group was described as "highly motivated, but socially isolated, angry and alienated (ideologically and culturally)". This latter group's underachievement was viewed as a result of their conflict with any pressure for conformity.

In a factor analytic study of non-intellective variables in achievement and underachievement which was designed to measure differences between these two groups, Garms (1967) found that college achievers tended to be "conformists, have good study habits, attend, concentrate, and remember with little interference from emotional problems, and to be self-assertive." In contrast, underachievers tended to be "rebellious, experience conflict with authority figures, to be self-debasing, and emotionally passive." Garms concludes that achievers are "better adjusted" and that underachievers are "hostile individuals who find it difficult to relate to others, especially authority figures".

Research on college dropouts usually presents these individuals as "maladjusted". However, in one study in which ability level was included as a variable and held constant, results emphasize a different angle. At the University of Iowa, Helibrun (1964) found that non-dropouts of high ability level tended to experience more physical stress (illness)

while the dropouts experienced more psychological stress. This finding may very well point to important differences in character and defense structure in these groups. What is suggested from this investigation is that dropouts of high ability level may be more actively engaged in a struggle for autonomy than their non-dropout counterparts.

In another study of college overachievers and under-achievers, Stix (1966) demonstrated a significant positive correlation between academic achievement and repression. Overachievers in this investigation were found to score high on scales of defensiveness. The results indicated that "self-reported anxiety served to facilitate achievement for highly repressed males and for moderately repressed females". Defensiveness scores were in turn positively correlated with other scales measuring (1) compliance, (2) respect for culturally "right" rules, and (3) need for structure. They were negatively correlated with scores on scales measuring (1) pleasure in exploring and experimenting, (2) resistance to social pressure, (3) zest for free unstructured life, (4) assertiveness and (5) anxiety. (It is interesting to note that this investigator views the relationship between academic achievement and the above variables as positive and perhaps necessary for success in school.)

In a recent study, (Moses, 1968), investigating the relationship between autonomy and "cognitive expansiveness" in adolescent girls, academic achievement was found to be unrelated to the degree of autonomy. Girls with A, B, and C

averages were distributed fairly evenly over the high, middle and low autonomy groups.

In a detailed, longitudinal study of high academic achieving children, Haggard (1957) found many significant personality differences relating to autonomy within the group. While all the children studied did well in all subjects, Haggard found that children who excelled in spelling and language skills were overly dependent on their parents, tended to be perfectionistic, and were highly anxious about achievement. They seemed to depend a good deal upon outside sources for direction of their actions and thoughts. Children who did particularly well in reading were found to be creative, rather socially detached, but having strong strivings for independence. Haggard noted that the maintenance of a sense of integrity seemed crucial to the "readers", and that they did not appear to suffer from excessive guilt or concern about other people's expectations and opinions. Finally, Haggard found that children who excelled in arithmetic seemed to be most comfortable about expressing their feelings and tended to have independent relationships with others. In contrast to the first two groups, the arithmetic students seemed more mature in dealing with themselves, others and their world in general.

In summarizing his research Haggard states:

This appraisal of motivation differs in many respects from the formula: Grade Point Average = IQ X Motivation.

The findings of this research indicate that as far as academic achievement is concerned, one can have too much of a good thing, and that, if carried to excess, socialization pressures may serve to cripple the child, both emotionally and intellectually.

(Haggard, 1957)

In one of the few depth studies of personality and achievement in college women, Lois Murphy and colleagues (1960) have shown that high academic achievement represents motivational patterns that are extremely various. Murphy's longitudinal study of Sarah Lawrence students is an ideal way to investigate the complex variables involved in achievement and personality.

Summary of Research Findings

1. While there is not an abundance of research in the literature which has dealt specifically with the issue of autonomy, several studies do exist which relate to and demonstrate support for conceiving of the seven processes described in this study as making up a broad and complex concept of autonomy.

2. Studies on the need for approval which have utilized the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale suggest a strong relationship between this motive and processes having to do with autonomy or the lack of it. In general, a high need for approval has been found to be associated with conforming, stereotyped behavior, as well as tendencies to avoid conflict and the direct expression of hostility.

3. The few studies which have dealt with need for approval and academic achievement have yielded results which are equivocal. High need for approval has been shown to be related to high achievement in some cases but not in others. In some instances low need for approval was found to be positively associated with high achievement but not in others.

4. Research concerning autonomy and academic achievement has demonstrated no definitive relationship between these variables. What is clear from these studies having to do with academic achievement and personality is that when high achievers are compared with underachievers, high achievers tend to emerge as "better adjusted" or psychologically more

healthy. However, when achievers and underachievers have been studied separately striking differences in motivation and personality have been found within the groups. For example, some high achievers have been found to be over-controlled, repressive, and highly anxious; others have been discovered to be spontaneous, flexible, creative, and independent. Differential patterns have also been found within groups of underachievers.

All this research seems to indicate that degree of autonomy is by no means related to level of academic achievement. The implication clearly is that there are likely to be significant variations in autonomy strivings within any group of high achieving students (as well as within any group of underachieving students).

The discovery and clarification of these differences should serve as important sources of data regarding the development of autonomy, socialization processes and the achievement of academic success.

CHAPTER III

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY AND HYPOTHESES

Principle Objectives

1. To determine whether there are differences in autonomy in high achievers who are high (HNA) and low (LNA) in need for approval

Expectations About Differences Between HNA Achievers and LNA Achievers in Terms of the Seven Autonomy Aspects Previously Defined.

HNA Achievers

Research using the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale has focused mainly on behavioral and personality characteristics of individuals who obtain high scores on the scale (interpreted by most researchers as indicating high approval dependence). Studies have indicated that such individuals tend to behave in a conforming, stereotyped manner, have difficulty expressing hostility, and are defensively invested in maintaining an 'idealized self-image'. Theoretically, individuals with a strong need for social approval would tend to have difficulty expressing autonomy strivings.

The adolescent academic achiever who is strongly motivated to seek the approval (or avoid disapproval) of others is likely to have serious difficulty around issues of autonomy.

Achievement for such youngsters can be expected to be intimately linked with their need for approval. Thus, achievement may necessarily be a matter of great concern to them; they may place a high value on it and at the same time experience a good deal of anxiety about it. Because of their high achievement, such youngsters may look "competent" on the surface. They may think of themselves as "independent" or "well-adjusted" or rate themselves high in self-esteem. However, genuine autonomy strivings are not likely to be strong in this group.

Because they have become conditioned presumably to depend upon the opinions and expectations of others for a sense of self, these achievers can be expected to have abrogated autonomy to a significant degree. They are apt to show a failure in the development and maintenance of individualized attitudes, values and judgements. This failure to develop autonomy may be pinpointed by an avoidance of the experience of inner conflict, as well as a low tolerance for disagreeing with others and for experiencing friction between others. They can be expected, as well, to be indirect about expressing hostility. They are likely to be defensively invested in maintaining some form of "idealized self-image" and therefore appear closed, rigid and noncommittal when discussing themselves. Because of a lack of autonomy, these youngsters are expected to engage in limited, undiversified interpersonal relationships which lack depth. Their lack of autonomy is likely to limit their degree of physical

independence.

LNA Achievers

While individuals scoring low on the Marlowe-Crowne measure of need for approval have been studied as a comparison group to high scoring subjects, they have not as yet been studied in much depth. It seems clear that high scoring subjects exhibit more "conforming", "defensive" tendencies than low scorers, but it is not fully clear what sort of people low scorers are like. Conceivably, a low scorer could be the opposite from a conforming, dependent, defensive person. He could be more confident about his individual differences, more autonomous and more honest and open about himself. On the other hand, a low score on the M-C scale might represent someone who is negativistic and to whom honesty, openness and idiosyncratic behavior have become part of a rebellious stance aimed at confronting authority figures. Such an individual may exhibit only a sort of pseudo openness and pseudo-independence. In this case, a low score might represent a defensive style, aimed at masking troublesome dependency needs.

In low need for approval groups of the age range in this study, however, there is likely to be more genuine autonomy and one is likely to see stronger strivings in that direction, even if they are in the form of negativism. Achievement is likely to be less important to these youngsters and less likely to arouse anxiety because presumably it is not connected with a strong dependence on the approval of others.

Because of their low need for approval, these young people may behave in more idiosyncratic ways and thus "look" less "well-adjusted" on the surface than those in the high need for approval group.

Because they have been, presumably, less rigidly conditioned to evaluating themselves in terms of others' expectations and opinions, these achievers are more likely to be strongly invested in a struggle for independence. They can be expected to maintain attitudes, values and judgements which reflect individualized development. They will necessarily be expected to demonstrate an openness to their own inner conflicts, as well as a tolerance for the experience of friction with and among others. They can be expected to be fairly direct about the expression of hostility. Because of a sense of growing confidence in their separateness, such youngsters can be expected to be open and fairly free in discussing themselves. As a consequence of their growing autonomy, they are likely to be involved in fairly gratifying interpersonal relationships characterized by depth and diversification. Lastly, their higher degree of autonomy can be expected to facilitate their degree of physical independence.

2. To determine whether the various aspects of autonomy discussed previously are in fact related to one another among the high achievers.

Expectations About Inter-relationships of the Autonomy Variables

The seven aspects of autonomy described and discussed previously have been postulated by various theorists as having to do with psychological independence -- either as processes

necessarily involved in its development or as manifestations or consequences of its development. Therefore, it is expected that these different aspects will be positively interrelated to one another for the group of subjects studied here.

3. To determine whether aspects of autonomy are expressed in the fantasies of high achievers who are high and low in need for approval.

The Struggle for Autonomy in Fantasy

This investigator believes that an important aspect of the late adolescent's struggle for autonomy can be assessed from her TAT stories. Such a struggle may be reflected in TAT stories in the degree to which the heroine (hero) seems to be struggling to achieve her own goals. Along with this struggle there may be a need to rebel against persons whom she feels are attempting to force her to do something against her will, or who are trying to influence her to make certain decisions or judgements. Besides overt rebellious acts and wishes, the struggle for autonomy in fantasy deals with the hero or heroine's need to be separate from others in order to discover his or her own identity, attitudes and values. The struggle for autonomy can be expected to be accompanied by some guilt and conflict. Fantasies completely lacking in a sense of struggle or conflict over a need for separateness and individuality may be an indication that strivings for autonomy are lacking. An autonomy rating scale for the TAT was developed by the investigator and used in the present study to

assess the degree to which a struggle for autonomy is expressed in the TAT stories of high and low need for approval subjects.

Additional Fantasy Measures

In addition to the TAT autonomy measure, two other categories seemed pertinent to the need for approval and autonomy.

The first category is "openness". Studies have shown that low need for approval subjects are significantly more revealing in TAT stories than are high need for approval subjects (Tutko, 1963). An "openness" scale was used to rate the low and high need for approval subjects' TAT stories in the present study. The scale, developed by Hamsher and Farina (1967), assumes that less defensive individuals are more open and revealing in their fantasy productions than are more defensive individuals.

The other area of interest with regard to need for approval and autonomy is the way in which hostility may be expressed on the TAT. Studies have shown that more conforming subjects tend to produce significantly more stories in which hostility is indirectly, or defensively, expressed than do less conforming subjects (Breger, 1963). More specifically, several studies on need for approval have demonstrated significant differences between high and low need for approval subjects in the ability to directly express aggression. High need for approval subjects have been shown to exhibit more inhibition with regard to the expression of hostility than have low

need for approval subjects (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). A scale developed by Louis Breger (1963) was used in the present study to determine the degree to which hostility expression is defended against on the TAT by high and low need for approval subjects.

Secondary Objectives

1. To determine whether one can make use of a depth clinical interview to reliably and validly measure the various aspects of autonomy previously discussed.

Rationale for the Use of a Clinical Interview in Measuring Autonomy in HNA and LNA Subjects.

In the view of this investigator, autonomy (particularly when studied in adolescents) is a complex concept requiring careful definition along several different, but related, lines. The importance of a careful detailed definition of autonomy is demonstrated in an extensive study of motivation and behavior by Else Frenkel Brunswik (1942). In studying adolescent girls and boys, Brunswik found that among several "drives" rated by three judges, "autonomy" proved to be the most difficult to judge. She explained the problem as arising out of the lack of a unified conception of the drive for autonomy among the judges.

In the present study the investigator has made an attempt to clearly define a conception of autonomy in terms of several variables. The judges serving as raters in the study were provided with clear descriptions of the variables to be rated. The depth clinical interview used in this study was designed to tap the various aspects of autonomy discussed earlier. The structure of the interview was based in part upon a lengthy interview used by Moses (1968) which successfully measured autonomy in adolescent girls.

Other researchers who have used interview techniques in measuring such personality variables as dependence have also shown good results (Bard, 1955).

So far, no one has attempted to study high and low need for approval individuals through the use of a depth clinical interview. Furthermore, extremely little attention has been given to subjects exhibiting a low need for social approval, as measured by the M-C scale.

It could be argued that any interview would necessarily be biased by the subject's need for social approval. Thus, one might assume the subject high in approval dependence to be defensive and unproductive in the interview--and even unwittingly untruthful. While this sort of "bias" is expected to occur to some degree in the interview interaction, it is viewed in this study as valuable data about the subjects, which will add to material gathered in support or non-support of the hypotheses postulated.

It should be stressed, however, that the interview used in the present study was designed to probe deeply into several areas of the subjects' personalities and life experiences, and is of such length and complexity as to make it very difficult for subjects to consistently misrepresent themselves successfully. That is, one is likely to observe contradictory statements in subjects who attempt to present themselves (unconsciously or not) as persons different from whom they "truly are."

2. To determine how the need for approval affects reactions to praise for intellectual performance.

Rationale for the Achievement Praise Condition and the Use of the Research Evaluation Questionnaire.

Finally, this study focuses on how high and low need for approval academic achievers vary in response to receiving or not receiving praise for their intellectual performance. Studies have demonstrated that high need for approval subjects tend to respond significantly more positively to praise and reinforcement than do low need for approval subjects (Crowne, et al, 1968). It is assumed by the investigator that approval and praise are particularly important to high achievers who strongly exhibit a need for the approval of others. It is expected that when such subjects are praised for intellectual achievement, their reactions toward the person who praised them, as well as their reactions to the research procedures in which they have participated, will be influenced. What is suggested is that being praised for their performance on intellectual tasks will motivate high need for approval achievers to feel an obligation to respond positively to the interviewer and the procedures rather than to openly admit or express negative or conflicting reactions. Approval and praise for intellectual performance should not have the same motivating effect on the low need for approval achievers, whose independence concerning their own attitudes and judgements may be presumably more important to them than repaying the interviewer for compliments.

Other researchers have successfully used post-experimental questionnaires to assess differences in the reactions of high and low need for approval subjects to the investigator and/or procedures. For example, Fishman (1965) in a study relating need for approval and aggression in college women found that HNA subjects were more in conflict about expressing aggression toward the investigator (who had either arbitrarily or non-arbitrarily frustrated them) than were LNA subjects. "Aggression" was measured by the subject's mean rating on items on a Research Evaluation Questionnaire which the subjects were instructed to mail to someone other than the investigator.

Specific Expectations About the Differential Effects of Praise on HNA and LNA Achievers.

As a result of being praised for intellectual performance, HNA subjects in this study are expected to be more defensive about their feelings toward the interviewer and in their reactions to the research procedures, in general, than are LNA subjects. This defensiveness will likely be disguised by positive rather than by negative responses (out of a fear that expressed negative feelings might elicit disapproval from the interviewer). In addition, the presence of the interviewer during the time the subjects fill out the questionnaire for the first time, should serve to increase a tendency for HNA subjects to respond defensively, particularly if they have just been praised by the interviewer for their intellectual performance. If the subjects are asked to fill out the questionnaire a second time, a week after the interview, and

if they are assured that their responses will be unidentified to the interviewer, HNA subjects who have received praise can be expected to continue to show positive responses. Assuming that the need for praise and approval is particularly important to HNA subjects, praise for their performance will likely have a more permanent effect on their evaluations. LNA subjects may rate the various items on the questionnaire positively or negatively, depending on their feelings, but it is expected that this group will show a consistency in their ratings from the first to the second administration of the questionnaire regardless of whether or not they have received praise from the interviewer. The fact that the interviewer has lavished praise upon them should not serve as a strong motivating factor influencing these LNA subjects to respond differently whether the interviewer is present or not, or able or unable to identify the subject's responses. It is suspected, however, that HNA subjects who have not received praise, may tend to respond more negatively on the second administration of the questionnaire where they do not feel the pressure of the interviewer's presence and where they have been assured that their responses will not be identifiable by the interviewer.

Hypotheses

A. Autonomy Interview Variables

1. Maintenance of attitudes and values: LNA subjects will show greater development and maintenance of their own attitudes, values and judgements than will HNA subjects.
2. Openness to inner conflict: LNA subjects will report more awareness and tolerance of internal conflicts than will HNA subjects.
3. Tolerance of friction: LNA subjects will be more accepting of angry feelings and be better able to express such feelings directly than will HNA subjects.
4. Non-defensiveness in the interview: LNA subjects will exhibit more freedom and openness with regard to discussing themselves in the interview interaction than will HNA subjects.
5. Interpersonal experience: LNA subjects will report more gratification in diversified interpersonal relationships than will HNA subjects.
6. Physical independence: there will be a tendency for LNA subjects to be more physically independent from their immediate families than HNA subjects.
7. The six interview variables will be positively interrelated for both LNA and HNA groups.

B. Fantasy Measures (TAT)

1. A struggle for autonomy will be more pronounced in the TAT stories of LNA subjects than in TAT stories of HNA subjects.
2. There will be more openness in the TAT stories of LNA subjects than in TAT stories of HNA subjects.
3. LNA subjects will show more directness in expressing hostility on the TAT than will HNA subjects.

C. Achievement-Praise Condition and the Research Evaluation
Questionnaire

1. HNA subjects will react to praise for their intellectual performance with more positive feelings than LNA subjects.
2. HNA subjects who do not receive praise for their intellectual performance will become more negative in their feelings over time.
3. LNA subjects, as a group, will be more consistent in how they express their feelings over time than HNA subjects who do not receive praise for their intellectual performance.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The final sample for the present study consisted of 32 subjects, 16 making up the LNA (low need for approval) group and 16 the HNA (high need for approval) group. The range of MC scores for the LNA group was 2-9, with a mean of 6.56 and a standard deviation of 1.69. The range of MC scores for the HNA group was 18-28, with a mean of 21.37 and a standard deviation of 2.91. The age range for both groups was 18-20. There were no significant differences between the mean ages of the two groups. Nor were there significant differences between the mean scores of High School and College GPA's, ethnic and religious backgrounds (there was an equal number of Jewish, Catholic and Protestant girls in each group), birth order, or parental marital status. There were no significant differences between the subjects' reported GPA's and their GPA's as filed in the registrar's office. All subjects were Caucasian and U. S. citizens. Three out of the 32 subjects were born in Europe and came to this country when they were under ten years of age. (All three of these subjects were in the HNA group.)

After randomly assigning one half of the subjects in each need for approval group to the experimental (praise) condition, and one half to the control (no praise) condition, an assistant presented the investigator with the completed list of thirty-two subjects along with their addresses and telephone numbers. The assistant noted whether the subject was experimental or control, but arranged the list so that the investigator would be unaware of the subject's need for approval score. The subjects were invited to volunteer for the study by telephone. All subjects, except one (a HNA subject) agreed to participate in the study. The subject who refused was replaced by another subject with an identical MC score and who met the other requisite criteria.

The final sample of 32 subjects was selected from an original group of 500 female students at the City College of New York. At the beginning of the spring semester, these students filled out the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale and a face sheet, which included pertinent questions regarding necessary biographical data, during large lecture classes in Psychology, Biology, History, English and Political Science. (See Appendix A for MC Scale and face sheet.) The students were told that the investigator was engaged in doctoral dissertation research in psychology. The students were informed that out of a large group of girls who filled out the questionnaires, a few would be selected for further study. The students were told that if selected, they would be paid for participating in the actual research which would

entail a brief psychological testing session and an interview. They were told that those students selected would be notified by telephone within a couple of weeks.

From this N of 500, 77 girls were selected who met the criteria of age (18-20), grade level (sophomore), College GPA (3.0 - 4.0 over the two previous semesters), and over all High School GPA (84-100). The College GPA's for this sample (N=77) ranged from 3.0 - 3.8, with a mean of 3.23. All girls were either upper or lower sophomores and all were full time students at the college. The mean score on the MC Scale for this sample was 13.71, with a standard deviation of 5.30. These values are well within the norms reported by Marlowe and Crowne (1964) for college students, and almost identical with the mean and standard deviation derived from a pilot study conducted by the investigator. (See Appendix B for summary of pilot research.)

An assistant aided in selecting the final sample for the study, so that the investigator would be unaware of each subject's need for approval score. The assistant discarded those subjects whose scores on the MC scale fell in the middle of the range. Working from a master chart, where items pertaining to the subjects' ages, GPA's, socioeconomic levels, and ethnic backgrounds were recorded, the assistant selected the final sample by matching the low and high need for approval subjects as closely as possible on these variables. Socioeconomic level was determined by using the

Hollingshead and Redlich (1959) formula for social class, which utilizes parental educational level, occupation and income as determinants. While classes I, II, III, and IV were all represented in the final sample, there was an approximately equal number of subjects per class in each need for approval group.

Specific Research Procedures

The investigator personally contacted each subject by telephone to introduce the study, secure the subject's cooperation and to set up appointments. Each subject was told that she had been selected to be a participant in the research and that it would involve a brief psychological testing session with a research assistant and a lengthy interview with the investigator. The subject was told that approximately 3 to 6 hours of her time would be required and that pay for participation would be \$2.00 an hour. It was explained to the subject that because of the nature of the research, the purpose of the study and further details could not be revealed to her at this time, but that the investigator would be glad to furnish her with such information after the study had been completed. Upon securing the subject's cooperation, she was informed that the research assistant would telephone her to make the first appointment for the testing session and that following this the investigator would telephone her to set up the second appointment for the interview. All appointments were held at the Psychological Center at the City College of New York.

Session No. 1: The Psychological Testing Session

The subject met with the assistant for approximately one hour. The assistant first gathered the subject's stories to

seven TAT cards, and then presented the subject with a set of "intellectual problems". The assistant introduced the session as follows: "The first portion of this part of the study will assess your responses to seven pictures of people in different situations." Then, utilizing the standard instructions for administering the TAT, the assistant presented the seven cards to the subject in the following order: Cards 1, 2, 3BM, 7GF, 12F, 14, and 18GF. The assistant wrote down the stories verbatim as the subject told them. So that the stories could be rated mainly on the subject's spontaneous reactions to the cards, inquiry was kept to a minimum.

After the TAT had been completed, the assistant instructed the subject as follows: "The second portion of this part of the study will test your ability to handle complex intellectual problems." The three intellectual tasks described below were then presented to the subject in that order.

1. Test B of the Modified Alpha Examination (Form 9)

This brief paper and pencil test was presented to the subject with these verbal instructions: "This is a test to determine how quickly you think. When I tell you to start, begin and continue doing as much as you can until I tell you to stop." The test consists of 20 items, a sample of which is given here:

"Write the smallest of these numbers backwards

13 21 64 18 16 "

The assistant timed the subject. (See Appendix C for Test B-Alpha Examination.)

2. Similarities

The subject was asked to relate the 13 pairs of items on the WAIS Similarities subtest with modified instructions. The instructions were designed to make the subject feel challenged to give quantity, but with quality stressed as being crucial at the same time. The assistant instructed the subject : "Now I am going to ask you to relate different pairs of things or ideas. Your task is somewhat complicated. I want you to think of as many different ways in which these pairs relate in 30 seconds. However, the relationships you name must be relevant. As I said, you will have 30 seconds for each pair of items. Ready?" The assistant timed the subject.

3. Benton Visual Retention Test

Here the subject's task was to draw several geometric designs from memory --ranging from simple to more complex. The assistant, after handing the subject pencils and sheets of paper, instructed her as follows: "Now I am going to test your memory for complex stimuli. I will present each of these designs for 10 seconds and then take it away. You then have to draw it from memory. You will have 30 seconds for each design. Are you ready?" Eight designs were presented to the subject for a period of 10 seconds each. The assistant timed the subject on each design.

None of the three tests were actually scored. During the entire session the assistant made note of the subject's spontaneous comments and questions before, during and after the procedures. If the subject asked questions as to what the study was about, the assistant said, "I can't tell you now, but I'm sure Mrs. Roskam would be happy to give you some details after the entire study has been completed." The assistant also made a note of her general impression of the subject's anxiety level. Before the session was over the assistant reminded the subject of the time for her interview appointment.

Session No. 2 - The Interview and Experimental Condition

The interview was expected to last from 2 to 3 and 1/2 hours depending on the individual subject (this was determined from pilot research). All interviews were tape recorded. Before beginning the interview the subject was told:

In this interview I will be asking you many questions about yourself, and about your life experiences, values and attitudes. This part of the study will be tape recorded, chiefly for my convenience since I cannot talk with you and take exact notes at the same time. The identification of all the subjects in this study will, of course, remain completely anonymous. Since the interview will be fairly long, please let me know when you become tired and we will take a short break.

At the completion of the interview, the interviewer exposed one half of the subjects in the HNA group and one

half of the subjects in the LNA group to the experimental (praise) condition. To each of the experimental subjects, the interviewer said, "Those are all the questions I have to ask you. However, I want to tell you that I have received your scores on the intellectual tests from the first part of the study. They are very very superior. You did extremely well and much better than most people of your general level of ability and age range." The interview was then concluded. The interviewer said nothing about the intellectual tests to the control subjects. If the subject asked questions about the study, the interviewer reiterated that she could not explain details regarding the purpose of the study at this time but would be happy to do so once the entire study had been completed.

Following the interview each subject was asked to fill out the Research Evaluation Questionnaire described in the next section. The interviewer told the subject: "There is an additional part to this study. I have here a questionnaire I want you to fill out which concerns your reactions to this research." The interviewer then handed the subject the questionnaire. During the time the subject worked on the questionnaire the interviewer wandered around the room, cleaning up, putting equipment away, straightening papers, and occasionally glancing at the subject. After the subject finished the questionnaire the interviewer said: "Thank you. There is one final thing required of all subjects in this study. Within 7 to 10 days from now, you must come back here to fill out a follow up

questionnaire, very much like the one you have just completed. That will conclude your part in the research. You will receive your pay for participation in the study at that time." The interviewer then set up a definite appointment time with the subject which fell within a 7 to 10 day period following the interview.

Session No. 3 - The Post-Experimental Condition

The subject was told that when she arrived at the Psychological Center she was to give her name to the secretary and to tell the secretary that she had come to fill out a questionnaire for Mrs. Roskam's research. The secretary then gave the subject an envelope with her name on it. The envelope contained a copy of the Research Evaluation Questionnaire, with slightly altered instructions, and the subject's pay. The altered instructions read: "Please do not write your name on this questionnaire, as the researchers are evaluating responses of the entire group of subjects." After the subject completed the questionnaire the secretary told her to drop it in a box on her desk.

The instructions to the subjects regarding the second administration of the questionnaire were designed to make them feel that since their responses were to be studied as a group, individual identities were not of interest to the investigator. This was done to determine whether or not the HNA and LNA groups differed in the consistency of their item ratings from the first to the second administration of the questionnaire, where the interviewer was not present and where

they were assured their responses would remain unidentified. By re-arranging the order of items on Subscale B for each of the 32 subjects, the writer made it possible to identify individuals. All 32 subjects showed up for the second administration of the questionnaire.

Instruments

The Autonomy Interview

The clinical interview procedure was previously tested in a pilot study and consisted of questions designed to elicit information about the five aspects of autonomy described below. (See Appendix D for the complete interview schedule.)

1. Maintenance of attitudes and values: the subject's struggle to successfully establish and maintain her own attitudes and judgements in the face of pressures exerted by parents, peers or other external forces.

2. Openness to inner conflict: the subject's ability to tolerate the experience of inner conflicts.

3. Tolerance of friction: the subject's ability to tolerate and engage in interpersonal friction with a minimum of anxiety and guilt.

5. Interpersonal experience: the degree to which the subject finds gratification in diversified relationships.

6. Physical independence from immediate family: the subject's nearness to her immediate family, in terms of domicile arrangements, time spent away from the family, physical care, etc.

The fourth autonomy variable, Self-Image and Non-Defensiveness, refers to the degree of non-defensiveness the subject exhibits regarding maintenance of her self-image and was assessed directly from the quality of the interviewer-subject interaction.

The interview was structured in a similar manner to a lengthy autonomy interview designed by Moses (1968), with some questions borrowed from her interview protocol. The interview was designed so that each autonomy variable could be dealt with in a separate section; however, the interviewer felt free to employ flexibility in the order and number of questions asked. It was expected that material belonging to one variable would turn up at times in another section of the interview, and that some questions would be repetitive for some subjects. Thus, all questions were not included for every subject and the interviewer felt free to follow up on relevant information for each category by asking spontaneous questions. Material pertaining to each autonomy variable was rated on a six point rating scale from 0 (none) to 5 (extremely strong).

The Fantasy Measures (TAT)

A battery of seven cards from the Murray (1943) TAT series was used to assess degree of autonomy, openness and defended hostility for each subject. The particular battery of cards was used in this study because they seemed particularly appropriate for eliciting information regarding autonomy for female subjects. These cards are described in Table 1.

TABLE 1

DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVEN TAT CARDS
USED IN THE PRESENT STUDY

Card No.	Description
1	Boy with violin
2	Farm scene, girl with books in foreground
3BM	Figure on floor, head in arm
7GF	Little girl with maternal figure
12F	Young woman with old woman
14	Silhouette of figure at window
18GF	Two women on staircase

The Autonomy Scale

The rating scale for TAT autonomy was developed by the writer for this study and deals with the subject's need for self-differentiation and individuality as expressed in her TAT stories. Each Tat story was rated along a four point dimension, from 0 (no struggle for autonomy apparent in the story) to 3 (strong struggle for autonomy apparent in the story). A category of not rateable was used rarely for stories in which the scale clearly did not apply. (See Appendix E for a description of the scale, definitions of scale points and a rating guide. The rating guide was developed as an adjunct to the scale to facilitate the writer and an independent judge in making ratings. Some

items on the guide were borrowed from a scale developed by Ornitz [1963].)

The Openness Scale

This scale was based on a rating system developed by Hamsher and Farina for the TAT (1967). These researchers considered openness as a dimension of projective test responses. In their research with the TAT, "openness was used in a way consistent with its generally understood connotation of free unrestricted communication of personal information: it was operationally defined as a rating of 1 through 5, based on a manual development in pilot work." The TAT stories in this study were rated according to this scale, along a 5 point dimension ranging from 1 (rejection or mere description of the card; stories stilted, stereotyped, unelaborated to marked degree; restricted range of content, absence of emotional expression) to 5 (stories clearly personalized and fully elaborated; lack previous defensive signs).

The Hostility Scale

The TAT stories in this study were rated on a three part scale developed by Breger (1963) for the TAT. Breger's research indicated that high conforming subjects were significantly more defensive about expressing hostility on the TAT than were low conforming subjects. The rating scale consists of three subscales: expressed hostility (hostility directly expressed towards others --e.g., verbal argument, physical assault, murder), covert hostility (hostility indirectly expressed towards others --e.g.,

sickness, accidents, deaths), and intropunitive hostility (hostility directed against the self --e.g., verbal self-attack, physical injury to self, suicide). Each TAT story was rated on all three scales, from 1 (mild expression) to 3 (severe expression) and the subject received a total score for each scale. A final total score was computed by subtracting the expressed hostility score from the covert and intropunitive scores combined and then adding a constant of 10. This final score is called the "TAT Total Defended Hostility Score ". (See Appendix E for a description of the scoring and scale points for the openness and hostility scales.)

The Research Evaluation Questionnaire

This questionnaire, which was used to determine the subjects' reactions to the experimental (praise) condition, was designed by the writer. Its aim was to get at the subject's reactions to the specific research procedures in which she had participated and her reactions to the interviewer. The questionnaire consisted of two subscales. (See Appendix F for the two subscales.)

Subscale A consisted of ten items concerning the subject's reactions to her participation in the research and the specific research procedures in the study. The ten items were phrased as statements (e.g., "I disliked telling stories

to the pictures." [TAT]) Half the statements were phrased negatively and half positively. The subject was asked to rate each statement on a 7 point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely). The scoring system yielded a total score for each subject. The higher the score, the more positively the subject has rated the research procedures.

Subscale B concerns the subjects reactions to the interviewer. The subject was asked to rate the interviewer on 32 items using the following rating system: 1-very little, 2 - somewhat, and 3 - very much. There were 16 items on the scale which, if rated 3 - very much, connote a negative impression of the interviewer (e.g., anxious, phony, confused); there were, as well, 16 items which if rated 3, connote a positive impression of the interviewer (e.g. intelligent, sincere, perceptive). The scoring was arranged in such a way to yield a total score. The higher the score, the more positively the subject has rated the interviewer.

Scoring and Reliability of the Interview Measures

Each subject's interview was transcribed verbatim from the tape. The investigator rated each subject on all six autonomy variables. The following six point rating scale was utilized:

- 0 none
- 1 mild
- 2 temperate
- 3 moderate
- 4 strong
- 5 extremely strong

The points at either extreme of this scale were defined and described for each autonomy variable. For purposes of reliability and to insure against the possibility of judgements yielding a halo effect, six additional judges were recruited to rate the six autonomy variables for one half of the total sample. All these judges were either experienced, advanced Ph.D. students in clinical psychology (6th year plus) or practicing clinicians. The 16 interview transcripts were made up of 8 interviews selected at random from the HNA group, and 8 interviews selected at random from the LNA group. The rating procedure required each judge to rate a portion of each of the 16 interview transcripts, which covered material pertaining to the variable in question. For example, Judge No. 1 rated each of his 16 interviews on Variable 1, Interpersonal Experience. Prior to giving the judges their interviews, the investigator blocked out pertinent areas for each variable. This made it possible for the judges to rate the

interviews without having to reach them in their entirety. The judge who rated the interviews for Defensiveness, however, was required to reach the complete transcripts and also to listen to portions of the tapes. Before the judges were given transcripts to read, each was given a sheet of instructions and a typed paragraph outlining how the investigator had defined the particular variable, along with a description of end points on the rating scale. (The judges' instructions, definitions of variables, and description of scale end points can be found in Appendix G.) Each judge was also given copies of portions from two sample interviews (from a pilot study conducted by the investigator) which depicted a subject who was rated low on the particular variable and a subject who was rated high on the variable. The judges, of course, were unaware of the subjects' need for approval scores.

To determine the reliability of the investigator's ratings, the judges' ratings were correlated with the investigator's ratings on all six variables. The results of the Pearson Product Moment Correlations for the six variables are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION
COEFFICIENTS FOR INVESTIGATOR AND INDEPENDENT
JUDGES' RATINGS OF THE SIX INTERVIEW VARIABLES. *

Variable	Pearson r coefficient	P
1. Maintenance of attitudes & values	.97	<.001
2. Openness to inner conflict	.98	<.001
3. Tolerance of friction	.95	<.001
4. Defensiveness in interview	.95	<.001
5. Interpersonal experience	.93	<.001
6. Physical independence	.91	<.001

* Note: N=16

As can be observed from the table, all reliabilities were extremely high and significant. Therefore, means and standard deviations for each autonomy variable and mean scores averaged over the six interview variables were computed based upon the investigator's ratings.

Scoring and Reliability of the Fantasy Measures (TAT)

The assistant gave a code number to each subject's TAT so that the investigator's TAT ratings would be unbiased by her knowledge of the subject through the interview.

The TAT Autonomy Score

The investigator rated the TAT stories of all 32 subjects according to the rating scale for TAT autonomy described previously. The stories were rated by card rather than by subject. For example, Card 1 was rated for TAT autonomy for all 32 subjects and then Card 2, and so on. Each story was given a rating of 0, 1, 2, 3, or NR (not rateable). The not rateable category was used as infrequently as possible. To determine reliability of the investigator's ratings, an additional judge was recruited (an advanced Ph.D. Psychology student with considerable clinical experience) to rate stories of 17 of the subjects, selected at random. The total number of stories rated by the judge was 119. The judge also rated the stories by card rather than by subject. The investigator and the judge's ratings were correlated and the resulting Pearson r coefficient was .92, a correlation which is significant at the $< .001$ level. Using the investigator's ratings, scores were totaled and averaged over the seven TAT cards so that each subject was given a mean TAT autonomy score.

The Openness Score

All TAT stories were rated on the Openness scale, each story being assigned a 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 rating. The judge mentioned above also rated the stories of 17 of the subjects. (N = 119 stories). The ratings were made card by card until all stories had been rated. The pearson r correlation coefficient between the judge's and investigator's ratings was .93, which is significant at the $< .001$ level. Mean openness scores were then determined for each subject, utilizing the investigator's ratings.

The Total Defended Hostility Score

The investigator rated all stories for the 32 subjects on each of the three hostility subscales. A rating of 0, 1, 2, or 3 was given to each story. The same judge mentioned above rated the stories of 17 of the subjects (N = 119 stories). Reliability coefficients of the judge's and investigator's ratings for the 3 subscales are presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3

PEARSON R CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR
INVESTIGATOR AND JUDGE'S RATINGS OF THE
THREE HOSTILITY SCALES (N = 119)

Scale	Coefficient	P
Expressed hostility	.94	< .001
Covert hostility	.88	< .001
Intropunitive hostility	.92	< .001

It can be observed from the table that the reliabilities are high and significant. Total scores were computed for each subject for expressed, covert, and intropunitive hostility using the investigator's ratings. From these scores, a final score was computed for each subject called the "Total TAT Defended Hostility Score."

Scoring of the Research Evaluation Questionnaire

Total scores were computed for each subject for Subscale A (reactions to the research procedures) and for Subscale B (reactions toward the interviewer) for the first and for the second administration of the questionnaire. The subject's scores for administration No. 1 were subtracted from their scores for administration No. 2 to determine change scores from first to second administration.

In addition, for each subject, the item ratings for both subscales on the first administration were correlated with the item ratings on the second administration to determine the degree of inconsistency of item ratings from administration No. 1 to administration No. 2. These correlations are expressed in terms of the unexplained variance. That is, the variance would be zero if the correlation in item ratings from the first to the second administration was perfect and would increase with inconsistency in ratings. This measure of inconsistency of response was averaged for each of the four treatment groups and expressed as mean item rating change. It should be noted that this measure is independent of how much an individual on the average changed and is only dependent on the way in which these changes were brought about.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

Association Among the Six Interview Variables

It was assumed that each of the six interview variables represented a measure of some aspect of the construct defined earlier as autonomy. In order to determine how strongly the six variables were interrelated two steps were taken: 1) correlations were computed for each need for approval group separately; and 2) correlations were computed for the total sample ignoring the differences between the two need for approval groups.

The first method expresses how closely associated are the aspects of autonomy controlling for the need for approval. The second expresses the degree of these associations independent of the need for approval.

The results of the intercorrelations for the HNA group are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4
PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS,
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE SIX INTERVIEW VARIABLES
FOR THE HNA GROUP. *

Measure	2	3	4	5	6	Mean Rating	S.D.
1. Maintenance of Attitudes & Values	^d .73	^d .70	^c .61	^e .79	^d .75	1.31	1.26
2. Openness to Inner Conflict		^b .50	^c .67	^d .70	.31	.81	.80
3. Tolerance of Friction			^a .48	^c .66	^b .56	1.37	.78
4. Non-defensiveness in Interview				^e .88	.39	2.37	1.61
5. Interpersonal Experience					^d .66	1.87	1.16
6. Physical Independence					_____	1.93	1.19

* Note - N = 16; (0 - 5 rating scale)

a - p = <.10

b - p = <.05

c - p = <.02

d - p = <.01

e - p = <.001

The table indicates that most of the correlation coefficients are significant at the .05 level and beyond.

The correlations for the LNA group are presented in Table 5.

In comparing the two sets of correlations, it can be seen that the correlations of the LNA group are slightly lower than the correlations of the HNA group. However, the majority of the coefficients for the LNA group are similar to the correlations for the HNA group and are significant at the .05 level and beyond.

It can be observed that Variable 4, Non-Defensiveness, has rather low position correlations with the other five variables for the LNA group. This is due to the fact that variation for this variable was extremely low, as can be noted by the size of the standard deviation. All LNA subjects received high ratings of 4 or 5 (the maximum score) on this variable, and, consequently, the scale did not discriminate well among the LNA subjects. If the defensiveness scale had been expanded at the upper end to provide greater discrimination, larger correlations would probably have resulted.

Table 6 presents the results of the correlations among the six interview variables for the total sample.

TABLE 5

Measure	2	3	4	5	6	Mean Rating	S.D.
1. Maintenance of Attitudes & Values	.79 ^d	.62 ^c	.18	.63 ^c	.56 ^b	3.75	1.08
2. Openness to Inner Conflict		.53 ^b	.28	.42 ^a	.28	3.81	.80
3. Tolerance of Friction			.09	.35	.49 ^b	3.56	1.11
4. Non-defensiveness in the Interview				.20	.02	4.81	.39
5. Interpersonal Experience					.62 ^c	3.50	1.17
6. Physical Independence						3.37	.85

* Note: N = 16 (0 - 5 rating scale)

a - p = <.10

b - p = <.05

c - p = <.01

d - p = <.001

TABLE 6
PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS,
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE SIX INTERVIEW VARIABLES
FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE. *

Measure	2	3	4	5	6	Mean Rating	S.D.
1. Maintenance of Attitudes & Values	.88 ^c	.83 ^c	.75 ^c	.81 ^c	.79 ^c	2.53	1.69
2. Openness to Inner Conflict		.82 ^c	.80 ^c	.72 ^b	.61 ^a	2.31	1.70
3. Tolerance of Friction			.67 ^b	.68 ^b	.69 ^b	2.46	1.45
4. Non-Defensiveness in Interview				.77 ^c	.59 ^a	3.59	1.69
5. Interpersonal Experience					.75 ^b	2.68	1.42
6. Physical Independence					_____	2.65	1.26

* Note: N = 32 (0 - 5 rating scale)

a - p = < .02

b - p = < .01

c - p = < .001

Table 6 demonstrates that when the total sample is considered, all six interview variables are positively and significantly related to one another.

The higher correlations for the total sample vs. the correlations for the separate need for approval groups is due to the fact that there are significant differences between the mean autonomy ratings of the two need for approval groups.

To summarize, the above sets of correlations indicate that all six interview variables are meaningfully related to one another. The fact that a few correlations in both the HNA and LNA groups were insignificant is likely due first, to the small samples and, consequently, unreliability of the coefficients and, second, to the lack of discrimination of the Non-defensiveness scale (No. 4) among the LNA group.

Because of the small samples it is also impossible to determine whether some pairs of variables are more closely related to one another than other pairs or whether the correlations differ between the HNA and LNA groups.

Association Among the Three TAT Variables

While it was not hypothesized that the three TAT measures would be interrelated for the two need for approval groups, correlations were computed for each need for approval group separately and for the total sample, to determine what relationship, if any, existed among these variables.

The results of the correlations for the HNA group are presented in Table 7.

TABLE 7

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS,
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE THREE TAT
VARIABLES FOR THE HNA GROUP. *

Measure	2	3	Mean	S.D.
1. TAT Autonomy	-.05	-.46 ^a	.87	.28
2. TAT Openness		.35	2.25	.94
3. TAT Defended Hostility			15.68	3.68

* Note: N = 16 a - p = < .10

From the Table it can be observed that none of the correlations are significant at the .05 level.¹ It should be

¹

The rather high positive correlation between TAT openness and TAT Defended Hostility for the HNA group is due to the manner in which Defended Hostility was scored. For example, a portion of the total Defended Hostility Score was made up of stories representing "intropunitive hostility". Thus, stories dealing with strong suicide and depression themes were rated as indirectly hostile, in that the hostility was expressed intropunitively, but also as "open" in style.

noted, however, that the negative correlation between TAT Autonomy and TAT Defended Hostility is significant at the .10 level of confidence. Thus, there may be some tendency for TAT Defended Hostility to be inversely related to TAT Autonomy for HNA subjects. In other words, the greater the expression of autonomy on the TAT, the less defensive HNA subjects seem to be about expressing hostility. And the weaker the expression of autonomy on the TAT, the more defensive are HNA subjects about expressing hostility on the TAT.

The results of the intercorrelations for the LNA group are presented in Table 8.

TABLE 8

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS,
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE THREE TAT
VARIABLES FOR THE LNA GROUP. *

Measure	2	3	Mean	S.D.
1. TAT Autonomy	.46 ^a	.09	1.92	.34
2. TAT Openness		-.01	3.50	.77
3. TAT Defended Hostility			9.31	2.65

* Note: N = 16 a - $p = < .10$

It can be observed from the table that for the LNA group, TAT Autonomy is positively related to TAT Openness. Thus, TAT stories of LNA subjects expressing more autonomy may also be more open in style. The other TAT measures are unrelated to one another.

The correlations among the three TAT variables for the total sample are presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9
PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS,
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE THREE TAT
VARIABLES FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE. *

Measure	2	3	Mean	S.D.
1. TAT Autonomy	.58 ^a	-.68 ^a	1.39	.61
2. TAT Openness		-.28	2.87	1.06
3. TAT Defended Hostility			12.50	4.50

* Note: N = 32 a - $p \leq .001$

As can be observed, when the total sample is considered, the correlations are higher and reach significance in two cases. TAT Autonomy is positively and significantly related to TAT Openness and has a significant negative association with TAT Defended Hostility. The pattern of these correlations is chiefly attributable to the fact that there are significant differences between the two need for approval groups on these TAT measures.

The Association Among Mean Interview
Scores and the Three TAT Variables.

Correlations were calculated among the autonomy interview ratings and TAT Autonomy, Openness and Defended Hostility ratings to determine whether the TAT variables represent measures which are similar to or different from the interview measures. Because the six interview variables were shown to be so strongly interrelated, the mean interview scores (averaged over the six variables) were used in computing the correlations among the three TAT variables.

As was done previously, the correlations were computed for the two need for approval groups separately and then for the total sample. Results of the correlations for the HNA group are presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS,
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF MEAN INTERVIEW
SCORE AND THE THREE TAT VARIABLES FOR THE HNA GROUP.*

Measure	TAT Autonomy	TAT Openness	TAT Def. Hostility	Mean Interview Score	S.D.
Mean Interview Score	.03	-.19	-.01	1.61	.95

* Note: N = 16

For the HNA group there is no correlation between Interview Autonomy and Autonomy as expressed on the TAT. There is a negative relationship between Interview Autonomy and Openness on the TAT, but the correlation is not significant.

There is no correlation between Interview Autonomy and TAT Defended Hostility ratings.

The correlations for the LNA group are presented in Table 11.

TABLE 11

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS,
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF MEAN INTERVIEW
SCORE AND THE THREE TAT VARIABLES FOR THE LNA GROUP.*

Measure	TAT Autonomy	TAT Openness	TAT Def. Hostility	Mean	S.D.
Mean Interview Score	.25	^a -.41	.01	3.79	.68

* Note: N = 16 --a-p = >.10

It can be observed that while TAT autonomy is positively related to Interview Autonomy for the LNA group, the correlation is not significant. There is a negative correlation between Interview Autonomy and Openness on the TAT; however, the coefficient is slightly greater than the .10 level of confidence -- not high enough for one to draw a conclusion as to the meaning of this inverse relationship.

The correlations among mean interview scores and the three TAT variables for the total sample are presented in Table 12.

TABLE 12

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS,
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF MEAN INTERVIEW
SCORE AND THE THREE TAT VARIABLES FOR THE TOTAL
SAMPLE.*

Measure	TAT Autonomy	TAT Openness	TAT Def. Hostility	Mean	S.D.
Mean Interview Score	b .72	a .33	b -.56	2.70	1.37

* Note: N = 32 a - p = <.05 b - p = <.001

The high and significant correlations for the total sample among these variables are a result of the influence of the need for approval variable. When HNA and LNA groups are combined, higher Mean Interview Scores are positively associated with higher TAT Autonomy scores. The relationship between Mean Interview Scores and TAT Openness is also positive, but less strong. As would be predicted, there is a significant inverse relationship between Interview Autonomy and defensiveness about expressing hostility on the TAT. The fact that these correlations are significant can be explained by the fact that there are significant differences between the two need for approval groups on these variables.

To summarize, the intercorrelations of the three TAT variables demonstrate a different pattern for the two need for approval groups. However, none of these correlations reach the .05 level of significance and it seems most

parsimonious to conclude that the three TAT variables are relatively independent of one another when the need for approval is held constant.

The insignificant correlations between the Mean Interview Scores and the three TAT variables indicate independence of the Interview Autonomy ratings from the TAT variables, when the need for approval is held constant.

Differences Between the Groups on the Interview Measures

Table 13 presents means, standard deviations and results of T test comparisons for the two need for approval groups on the six interview variables.

As can be observed from the table, the mean ratings of the LNA group are consistently higher than the mean ratings of the HNA group on all six interview variables. The groups differed least on variable 6, physical independence, as had been predicted. All six differences were significant at the .001 level.

The significant differences between the two groups indicate greater autonomy in LNA subjects than in HNA subjects, thus confirming all the hypotheses relating to the interview variables.

Because the six interview variables were shown to be positively and significantly associated, mean interview scores (over all six variables) were computed for each subject in the two need for approval groups. Table 14 presents the

TABLE 13

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RESULTS OF T TEST COMPARISONS
BETWEEN THE TWO NEED FOR APPROVAL GROUPS ON THE SIX INTERVIEW
VARIABLES.

Measure	HNA (N = 16)		LNA (N=16)		Differ.	T	P
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.			
1. Maintenance of Attitudes & Values	1.31	1.26	3.75	1.08	2.44	5.66	<.001
2. Openness to Inner Conflict	.81	.80	3.81	.80	3.00	10.17	<.001
3. Tolerance of Friction	1.37	.78	3.56	1.11	2.19	6.22	<.001
4. Non-defensiveness in Interview	2.37	1.61	4.81	.39	2.44	5.68	<.001
5. Interpersonal Experience	1.87	1.16	3.50	1.17	1.63	3.80	<.001
6. Physical Independence	1.94	1.19	3.37	.85	1.43	3.78	<.001

the means, standard deviations and results of a T test comparison for the mean interview scores of the two groups.

TABLE 14

A COMPARISON OF MEAN INTERVIEW SCORES
(OVER ALL SIX VARIABLES) FOR HNA AND LNA GROUPS.

	Mean	S.D.	Difference	T	P
HNA (N=16)	1.61	.95	2.18	7.19	<.001
LNA (N=16)	3.79	.68			

As is indicated in the table, the mean interview score for the LNA group is significantly higher than the mean score for the HNA group, demonstrating that, overall, LNA subjects were rated as significantly more autonomous on the interview variables than were HNA subjects.

Differences Between the Two Groups on the Fantasy Measures (TAT)

The TAT Autonomy Ratings

The means and standard deviations of the Autonomy ratings for the HNA and LNA groups, as well as the results of a T test comparison, are presented in Table 15.

TABLE 15

A COMPARISON OF MEAN TAT AUTONOMY RATINGS
FOR HNA AND LNA GROUPS
(HIGHER RATINGS = MORE AUTONOMY: RATINGS 0 -3)

	Mean	S.D.	D	T	P
HNA (N=16)	.87	.28			
LNA (N=16)	1.92	.34	1.05	9.18	<.001

It can be observed that the TAT stories of LNA subjects were rated as indicating a stronger struggle for autonomy than were the stories of HNA subjects. The difference between the mean autonomy ratings for the two groups is highly significant. Thus, hypothesis B-1, that LNA subjects would exhibit greater autonomy than HNA subjects in their TAT stories, is confirmed.

The TAT Openness Ratings

Table 16 presents the means, and standard deviations of the TAT Openness ratings for the two groups, along with results of a T test comparison.

TABLE 16

A COMPARISON OF MEAN TAT OPENNESS RATINGS FOR THE
HNA AND LNA GROUPS. (HIGHER RATINGS = MORE OPENNESS;
RATING SCALE 0 - 5)

	Mean	S.D.	D.	T.	P.
HNA (N = 16)	2.25	.94			
LNA (N = 16)	3.50	.77	1.25	3.96	<.001

The mean ratings clearly shown that the TAT stories of LNA subjects were rated as more open than were the stories of HNA subjects. The difference between the means is significant and demonstrates confirmation of hypothesis B2, that LNA subjects would be more open in their TAT stories than would HNA subjects.

The Hostility Ratings

Means and standard deviations were calculated for the three hostility subscales: expressed, covert, and intro-punitive, as well as for the final scale rating --the Total Defended Hostility Score. These results are presented in Table 17, along with the results of T test comparisons.

TABLE 17

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF RATINGS ON THE THREE HOSTILITY SUBSCALES, AND MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF TOTAL TAT DEFENDED HOSTILITY SCORES FOR LNA & HNA GROUPS. (HIGHER RATINGS = MORE DEFENDED HOSTILITY)

	HNA (N=16)		LNA (N=16)		D	T	P
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.			
Expressed Hostility	1.62	1.89	4.12	2.17	2.50	3.35	<.001
Covert Hostility	2.62	1.61	1.25	1.03	1.37	2.77	<.01
Intropunitive Hostility	4.68	2.97	2.18	1.18	2.50	3.02	<.01
Total TAT Defended Hostility Score	15.68	3.68	9.31	2.56	6.37	5.49	<.001

As can be observed, the means of the two groups are in the predicted direction on all subscales. TAT stories of LNA subjects show a significantly greater incidence of directly expressed hostility than do the stories of HNA subjects. Also, as expected, HNA subjects express significantly more covert hostility in their TAT stories than do LNA subjects. Similarly, HNA subjects demonstrate a significantly greater incidence of intropunitive hostility in their TAT stories than do LNA subjects. Finally, as indicated by the final mean scores representing Total TAT

Defended Hostility, the HNA subjects show significantly greater defensiveness about expressing hostility on the TAT than do LNA subjects. Thus, hypothesis B3, that LNA subjects would be more direct about expressing hostility in their fantasies, is confirmed.

In summary, LNA subjects are significantly more likely to be concerned with the issue of autonomy in their TAT stories than are HNA subjects. They are also more likely to tell stories which are relatively open in style. HNA subjects in this sample are much more likely to be defensive about expressing hostility in their fantasies than are LNA subjects.

The Reaction to the Achievement-Praise Condition

Means and standard deviations were computed for Subscale A scores (subject reactions to the research procedures) and for Subject B scores (subject reactions to the interviewer) separately for each of the four treatment groups and for each administration of the Research Evaluation Questionnaire (REQ). Table 18 presents the means and standard deviations of Subscale A scores, Administration No. 1, for the four treatment groups, followed by a two-way analysis of variance of the means.

TABLE 18

A COMPARISON OF SUBSCALE A SCORES FOR THE FOUR
TREATMENT GROUPS, ADMINISTRATION NO. 1 (HIGHER
SCORES = THE MORE POSITIVE THE SUBJECTS HAVE
RATED THE RESEARCH PROCEDURES)

	LNA Exp. (N=8)	LNA Cont. (N=8)	HNA Exp. (N=8)	HNA Cont. (N=8)
Mean	47.50	54.75	59.00	48.25
S.D.	5.65	5.14	6.70	5.21

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Praise	24.50	1	24.50	0.65	NS
Need for Approval	50.00	1	50.00	1.33	NS
P X NA	648.00	1	648.00	17.36	<.001
Within	<u>1,045.00</u>	<u>28</u>	37.32		
TOTAL	1,767.50	31			

The analysis of variance yielded no significant treatment effects, but did produce a highly significant interaction effect between praise and need for approval. The interaction effect is due to the fact that the HNA experimental group mean is much higher than its control group mean. The interaction demonstrates that praise had a positive effect on HNA subjects but may have had a negative effect

on LNA subjects. Also, no praise may have had a negative effect on HNA subjects.

Table 19 presents means and standard deviations for Subscale B scores (reactions to the interviewer) Administration No. 1, followed by a two-way analysis of variance of the means.

TABLE 19

A COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR SUBSCALE B,
ADMINISTRATION NO. 1, FOR THE FOUR TREATMENT
GROUPS, (HIGHER SCORES = MORE POSITIVE RATINGS
OF THE INTERVIEWER)

	Treatment Groups			
	LNA Exp. (N=8)	LNA Cont. (N=8)	HNA Exp. (N=8)	HNA Cont. (N=8)
Mean	38.25	39.50	42.37	34.00
S.D.	3.66	2.78	3.35	8.61

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Praise	101.53	1	101.53	3.33	NS
N Approval	3.78	1	3.78	0.12	NS
Praise X N Approval	185.28	1	185.28	6.07	<.05
Within	<u>853.38</u>	<u>28</u>	30.48	----	----
TOTAL	1,143.97	31			

By inspection, it can be seen that the HNA experimental group has the highest mean score, indicating positive ratings of the interviewer, and the HNA control group the lowest mean score. The results of the analysis of variance show non-significant treatment effects but, again, a significant interaction effect between praise and need for approval. The interaction effect is due to the fact that there is a reliable difference between HNA experimental and HNA control groups but no significant difference between the LNA experimental and LNA control groups. In other words, HNA subjects who were praised tended to rate the interviewer positively (relative to HNA controls) but LNA subjects who were praised did not do so.

From the analysis of the ratings of the groups for both subscales, it can be concluded that hypothesis C1, which stated that HNA experimental subjects would rate the research procedures and the interviewer more positively and that for the LNA experimental subjects the ratings would be relatively independent of praise, has been confirmed.

The Effect of Praise Over Time

To determine whether there were differences among the four treatment groups in the degree and direction of change in ratings from the first to the second administration of the REQ, total change scores were computed for each subject for Subscales A and B and then were calculated for the four treatment groups.

A comparison of the mean changes for Subscale A (reactions to the research procedures), followed by the results of a two way analysis of variance, are presented in Table 20. (To facilitate statistical computation, a constant of 10 was added to all mean scores.)

TABLE 20

A COMPARISON OF MEAN CHANGES IN SUBSCALE A SCORES FROM ADMINISTRATION 1 TO 2 FOR THE FOUR TREATMENT GROUPS. (HIGHER SCORES = MORE POSITIVE THE CHANGES.)

1

Treatment Groups				
	LNA Exp. (N=8)	LNA Cont. (N=8)	HNA Exp. (N=8)	HNA Cont. (N=8)
Mean	7.75	9.00	9.25	11.00
S.D.	3.99	1.06	2.98	2.59

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Praise	18.00	1	18.00	1.91	NS
N Approval	24.50	1	24.50	2.61	NS
Praise X N Approval	0.50	1	0.50	----	NS
Within	263.00	28	9.39	----	--
TOTAL	306.00	31			

1

It should be noted that mean scores under 10 indicate a decline in ratings.

The analysis of variance revealed no significant treatment or interaction effects indicating that the average change in ratings was about the same for all four groups. However, because of natural regression phenomena scores tend to change over time (e.g., higher scores tend to drop, while lower scores tend to rise). Therefore, the above results may not be validly reflecting differences in the degree of change among the four groups. For example, since the HNA experimental group had a higher original score, "regression" would predict that this group should drop more. In fact this is not the case, suggesting that if "regression" effects were taken into account the HNA experimental group would show less change relative to the other three groups.

In order to take into account the level of the original scores and thus control for "regression effects", an analysis of covariance was performed on the data. This analysis adjusts the mean change scores of the four groups taking into account the scale score on the original questionnaire. Specifically, the subjects' original (first administration) scores on Subscale A were covaried with their change scores to determine what difference, if any, would have occurred among the four groups if they all had the same scores on the first questionnaire.

Table 21 presents the means of the original scores, the mean change scores and the adjusted mean scores (adjusted for original questionnaire scores) for the four treatment

groups. This is followed by the results of the analysis of covariance.

TABLE 21

MEAN SCORES FOR SUBSCALE A, ADMINISTRATION NO. 1,
MEAN CHANGE SCORES AND ADJUSTED MEAN SCORES FOR
THE FOUR TREATMENT GROUPS

Scores	Treatment Groups			
	LNA Exp. (N=8)	LNA Cont. (N=8)	HNA Exp. (N=8)	HNA Cont. (N=8)
Mean Original Score	47.5	54.75	59.0	48.25
Mean Change Score	7.75	9.00	9.25	11.00
Adjusted Mean Score	7.09	9.32	10.15	10.44

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Praise	12.3	1	12.3	1.33	NS
N Approval	32.6	1	32.6	3.54	< .10
Praise X N Approval	4.1	1	4.1	.45	NS
Within	248.4	27	9.2		
TOTAL	737.4	30			
[Slope b -- .136]					

The adjusted mean change scores indicate that HNA subjects do not decline as much in their ratings of the research procedures as do LNA subjects, particularly LNA subjects who were praised for their intellectual performance. However, the F derived from the analysis of covariance for the effect of need for approval is only at the .10 level of significance.

While this level of confidence does not allow an unequivocal interpretation it does suggest that LNA subjects tend to react more negatively over time in their feelings about the research procedures than do HNA subjects. While the ratings of LNA experimental subjects decline more than any other group, suggesting a sharpened negative reaction for this group, the interaction effect was not significant.

A comparison of the mean change scores for Subscale B (reactions to the interviewer), followed by the results of a two way analysis of variance, are presented in Table 22. (To facilitate statistical computation, a constant of 20 was added to all scores.)

The analysis of variance yielded no significant effects. The groups did not differ in the degree and direction of mean changes in ratings for Subscale B from Administration 1 to Administration 2. Because of the extremely large variation in the original scores (See Table 19) no analysis of covariance was performed.

TABLE 22

A COMPARISON OF MEAN CHANGES IN SUBSCALE B SCORES
FROM ADMINISTRATION 1 TO 2 FOR THE FOUR TREATMENT
GROUPS.

(HIGHER SCORES = MORE POSITIVE THE CHANGES.)

1

	Treatment Groups			
	LNA Exp. (N=8)	LNA Cont. (N=8)	HNA Exp. (N=8)	HNA Cont. (N=8)
Mean	19.37	17.75	19.75	21.00
S.D.	3.16	7.58	3.37	4.10

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Praise	0.28	1	0.28	0.01	NS
Need for Approval	26.28	1	26.28	1.58	NS
Praise X N Approval	16.53	1	16.53	0.68	NS
Within	<u>672.88</u>	<u>28</u>	24.03	----	--
TOTAL	715.97	31			

From the results of the analyses of variance and co-variance for both sets of mean change scores (Subscales A and B) it can be concluded that hypothesis C2, which stated that HNA control subjects would become more negative in their ratings over time, is not supported. In fact, there seems to be a slight tendency for the ratings of LNA subjects to decline more over time.

1

It should be noted that mean scores under 20 indicate a decline in ratings.

Inconsistency of Individual Item Ratings

To determine whether or not there were differences among the four treatment groups in their inconsistency of item ratings within each subscale of the REQ, ratings of individual items on Subscale A and Subscale B were compared for each subject from Administration 1 to Administration 2. A score derived from this comparison was expressed as the mean item change from Administration 1 to Administration 2. This score was treated as a measure of inconsistency in individual item ratings from the first to the second administration of the REQ.

Means of item change scores were computed for each of the four treatment groups. The means and standard deviations of these item change scores for Subscale A are presented in Table 23, followed by the results of a two-way analysis of variance. (To facilitate statistical computation, decimal points were moved two places to the right for all scores.)

It can be observed that the standard deviation of the HNA experimental group represents a variance which is very large and unequal to the variances of the other three groups. Nevertheless, an analysis of variance was carried out on the means which indicated no significant differences among them.

TABLE 23

A COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL SUBJECT VARIATIONS
IN ITEM RATINGS FROM ADMINISTRATION 1 TO
ADMINISTRATION 2 PER TREATMENT GROUP FOR SUB-
SCALE A (REACTIONS TO THE RESEARCH PROCEDURES.)

	Treatment Groups			
	LNA Exp. (N=8)	LNA Cont. (N=8)	HNA Exp. (N=8)	HNA Cont. (N=8)
Mean	12.17	12.06	13.42	10.90
S.D.	4.47	7.41	17.43	7.27

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source					
Praise	13.93	1	13.93	0.128	NS
Need for Approval	0.02	1	0.02	0.001	NS
Praise X NA	11.68	1	11.68	0.10	NS
Within	<u>3,030.54</u>	<u>28</u>	108.23	-----	--
TOTAL	3,056.16	31			

The means and standard deviations of the item change scores for Subscale B are presented in Table 24, followed by the results of a two-way analysis of variance. (To facilitate statistical computation, decimal points were moved over two places for all scores.)

TABLE 24

A COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL SUBJECT VARIATION
IN ITEM RATINGS FROM ADMINISTRATION 1 TO
ADMINISTRATION 2 PER TREATMENT GROUP FOR SUB-
SCALE B (REACTIONS TO THE INTERVIEWER).

	Treatment Groups			
	LNA Exp. (N=8)	LNA Cont. (N=8)	HNA Exp. (N=8)	HNA Cont. (N=8)
Mean	17.95	15.18	12.76	19.36
S.D.	9.16	13.39	7.54	7.92

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Praise	29.47	1	29.47	0.26	NS
Need for Approval	2.06	1	2.06	0.01	NS
Praise X N Approval	175.31	1	175.31	1.59	NS
Within	<u>3,068.72</u>	<u>28</u>	109.60	----	--
TOTAL	3,275.55	31			

The analysis of variance yielded no significant differences among the means of the four groups.

The results of both analyses on the differences between the experimental and control need for approval groups on mean item changes do not support hypothesis C3 which stated that LNA experimental and control subjects would show more

consistency in their individual item ratings over time than would HNA control subjects.

Summary of Findings for the Achievement-Praise Condition

In summary, praise for intellectual performance seemed to have the effect of motivating HNA subjects to rate the interviewer and research procedures positively, whereas praise directed toward LNA subjects seemed to influence them to respond somewhat negatively in their ratings of the research procedures and, possibly, the interviewer. Withholding praise had neither of these effects on LNA subjects, but seemed to have motivated a negative response in HNA subjects. From the first to the second administration of the Research Evaluation Questionnaire, the ratings of HNA subjects, as a whole, tended to decline less than did the ratings of LNA subjects. There were no differences among the groups with regard to individual inconsistency in item ratings from the first to the second administration of the questionnaire.

Clinical Observations of Subjects in Testing Session Number 1

During the first testing session, the assistant was asked to make brief clinical observations of each subject. It was interesting to note that she observed significantly more overt anxiety in HNA subjects than LNA subjects in the testing situation. She also noted more defensiveness on the part of HNA subjects. In addition, HNA subjects seemed to need structure and reassurance and demonstrated this need by asking the assistant questions about the tests, or asking her to repeat instructions. The assistant noted that a few LNA girls seemed to feel a need to structure the situation for themselves --e.g., by rearranging the test papers to suit themselves, by placing TAT cards in a way that made them easier to see, etc. They also tended to ask fewer questions about the tests or research procedures. (It should be noted that these observations may have been colored by the fact that the assistant was aware of the subjects' need for approval scores. However, in later discussions with the assistant she reported that she honestly could not recall which subjects were in the low or high need for approval groups.)

Subjects' scores were computed for the number of pairs of items given on the Similarities test, and for the time taken in completing the designs on the Benton Visual Retention test. Whether or not the subject completed the Alpha test was also recorded. No differences were found between the two need for approval groups on any of these three measures.

Qualitative Findings on the Differences Between High and Low Need for Approval Achievers

The HNA Achievers

The HNA achievers in this study can best be described as individuals who have, to a marked degree, abrogated their autonomy in order to preserve a somewhat fragile and deceptive sense of psychological and emotional "security". These girls seem to feel safe in so long as they remain within a familiar structure, wherein they can maintain the approval of certain significant others. They are threatened by the new, the different, and the unfamiliar, and do not often allow themselves to venture out into new situations.

The attitudes and value systems of HNA achievers most frequently reflected those of their parents or peer group. In general, these girls tended to be conventional. The majority of them disapproved of student protest, black protest, the "hippie" movement, premarital sex, abortion reform, and any use of drugs. (With regard to marijuana, most HNA girls claimed that they were not even curious about the drug and said they would never even try it.) None of the HNA girls expressed an interest in Women's Liberation. When asked what she felt about the Woman's Movement, one girl said:

That's a lot of nonsense (laughs). I wasn't aware that we were being oppressed, to tell you the truth. I mean, I've had several (women) approach me in school and say "We don't get this and we don't get that." Personally, I'm happy with what we do have. I don't think women

-
1. See Appendix H for more complete samples from the interviews representing extreme ratings on the autonomy scales.

should run things. I think women can contribute to society, but I don't think it's necessary for women to run it. I think it's a man's place to run it. I don't think we are being oppressed. I think we have very good jobs, and I don't think there's any reason to complain. I don't see it.

Most HNA girls were apolitical. A few girls who held political views -- such as being against the war in Vietnam -- could not explain how they had arrived at their views and did not actively pursue their beliefs. When presented with a hypothetical situation -- "What would you do if you were a guy and were drafted to go to Vietnam?" several HNA girls said they would go. One girl, whose family had a strong sense of national pride, said in discussing Vietnam:

I feel like a lot of guys today who refuse to be drafted are just cowards. They just hate to die. They have no sense of national pride! This is your nation. I mean, if the people aren't going to back a nation, who is? I would say to my children "You're American. You were born here and you must learn to love it."

Most HNA girls (except one who was deceptively rebellious with her parents) felt that their attitudes and values were fairly similar to those of their parents. One girl, in comparing herself to her sister, said:

My sister is a typical teenager. I don't think I was ever a typical teenager. I grew up very fast. Very mature already when I was 14. My sister's going through all these phases -- she doesn't like school, she doesn't want to go to college, she smokes cigarettes, she runs around with boys out of the faith. She's everything that I wasn't. She has a complex, there's no question about it, inferiority complexes. She wants to blaze her own trail. I don't think she's doing a very good job of it to tell you the truth. She is inclined to accept the standards of her friends. They take first preference over her mother and father. Whereas, I would listen first to what my parents say and second

to what my friends have to say....I am more my parents' child --more their child than I am a child of today's world, you know?...There are times when I think I should have lived at a different time ...when there wasn't all this confusion and disorder and questioning .

While a few HNA girls claimed to be seeking independence from their parents, most admitted to not having achieved much in the way of independence. One girl, when asked what becoming independent meant to her, said,

It was never one of my goals. I don't know. I never wanted to be independent. I like to be dependent on someone else.

A great many HNA achievers denied experiencing anxiety or inner conflict and tended to minimize their problems. Hardly any HNA subjects recalled their dreams or showed much interest in them. One HNA subject, who said she often awoke in the middle of the night screaming, denied ever having had nightmares. Another HNA subject who occasionally remembered her dreams said she sometimes had nightmares of people trying to kill her. When asked if she tried to think about these dreams or figure them out she said,

No, I won't. Because I never can, you know? I tell them to my therapist and see what he can do with them. A lot of times I come in and say (to him) 'You've just got to do something about these dreams! Like I refuse to have them anymore! I don't want to have them anymore --do something!'

While a few HNA girls consciously experienced conflict and anxiety, they did not seem able to cope with problems adequately and most frequently felt so overwhelmed by their feelings or so powerless that struggles they were involved in were easily abandoned. One girl who had felt quite conflicted

and unhappy over whether or not to continue seeing a young man her parents disapproved of said,

I had to stop seeing him. I always have to do things their way. I must say I have been very tense. But I let my parents dominate. And I really thought I would be stronger but it was always that way. I sort of just let things go by.

When asked whether she had any idea why she let things "go by" she said, "I like it better that way. It's safer. But I don't know why. I don't like violence and I just turn the other cheek."

Several HNA girls viewed the resolution of problems or worries in terms of magical solutions . For example, one girl when asked what worried her most about herself, said:

I don't know. I guess it would be the future --I'm ~~very~~ preoccupied with the future as far as what I'm going to do and getting married.

(To your boyfriend or to anybody?)

To anybody I think. Just the idea of being alone doesn't thrill me at all. You know, I guess it's very important to me to get married. But it has to be the right person. It wouldn't just be getting married to get married. But somehow I guess my worries really stop at getting married. Somehow I think that things after I get married will work out.

When asked how she saw herself resolving some of her problems she said: "Everything for me is very dependent upon if something else works out. I don't think there's anything I can do except wait it out and see if things get better."

HNA girls showed a strikingly low tolerance for friction between themselves and others and for arguments and disagreements between others in situations where they

were merely observers. Many girls were extremely fearful of disagreeing with their parents or of expressing anger towards them. One girl said that she could not get angry at her father or disagree with him because "I like my father and I don't want him to get sick". When asked to explain further she said that her father got physically sick when he became emotionally upset. "So I figured, I'm not on my own yet. You know, cool it. Listen to him. If you're good, then he'll be healthy." Another girl claimed that she never fights with anyone, "Because it makes me physically sick." This girl recalled being spanked by her mother, whenever she attempted to disagree with her in her younger years.

HNA girls rarely reported expressing anger directly. Usually they rationalized that the other person would "understand" that they were angry from the tone of their voice or from their silence. One girl openly admitted that her reluctance to enter into arguments with others stemmed from a fear of disapproval. HNA girls rarely participated in arguments in classes and insisted they were only interested in "rational" discussions. Many girls claimed they had never felt "really angry". One girl stated that

I don't get angry. People don't usually bother me. I mean, they bother me, but like usually I take it and I don't know --I don't really get angry. Like, ah, I sort of accept a lot of things. I don't do anything as a matter of fact. Like, nobody has really done anything to make me angry enough to have a fight with them. I usually don't get into situations where that happens. That doesn't usually happen. I don't know. Nobody really bothers me.

Most HNA girls were defensive with the interviewer in the way they discussed themselves. The defensiveness was demonstrated in several ways. Some HNA subjects were extremely flippant in answering questions. Others tended to constantly repeat the interviewer's questions or to try to get the interviewer to rephrase the question or to clarify it. Many subjects' first response to a question was "I don't know." Several subjects used "I don't know" frequently throughout the interview. Some HNA subjects seemed to be looking for cues from the interviewer which they could use in arriving at "acceptable" answers to questions. With a few highly defensive subjects the interviewer had the feeling experience of "pulling teeth" in order to get at issues and answers. One very defensive subject continually evaded questions as exemplified by the following interchange:

I. What things about yourself worry you the most?

S. Worry me? Worry me?

I. Yes.

S. Oh, I don't know. Lately I've been in a very --what worries me though --I don't know. Like I used to be very worried about like little things and everything. But I've reached the point --well, I'm much calmer now than I used to be, much more relaxed, you know. I don't know -- nothing --

I. Nothing major worries you?

S. At the moment? No. I don't think so. No. It's quite possible that something might be bothering me but I just ---

I. You don't know what it is?

S. No. I'm sort of just disregarding it, disregarding it. I don't know. I'm not upset about anything.

I. What things do you like about yourself?

S. About myself? (giggles) Are these questions interspersed for any particular reason?

I. No, they're just mixed up.

S. Oh. What do I like about myself? I think I'm very lucky. But that's not really liking something about myself.

I. What do you mean, "very lucky"?

S. I don't know. I just think I'm lucky (giggles).

I. In what way?

S. I don't know.

Two HNA subjects were extremely undefensive in the interview. Both these girls had obvious strong dependency problems and seemed to use the interview situation to unburden themselves.

The interpersonal relationships of HNA girls seemed for the most part limited in variety and depth and tended to be overly dependent. In many cases their relationships were limited to people with whom they felt a strong bond of familiarity --their family and/or a few friends of similar background and ideas.

While HNA girls frequently claimed to be "close" to their mothers, quite often their relationship with their mothers seemed to be severely lacking in warmth or emotional depth. One subject in discussing her relationship with her mother said,

I never talk to her a lot. Everyone in our house has like barriers.....I never know what's going on with my

mother. I have never seen her crying, except on her birthday....Like she was never the type to kiss me hello or kiss me goodbye. I mean even now if I went to kiss her I don't think she would want me to. It doesn't matter because I am a lot closer to her than a lot of people are to their mothers anyway.

In forming relationships, HNA girls appeared to be more strongly motivated by their dependency needs than by a desire to broaden their view of themselves and others. As one girl said of her friends:

All my friends are very emotional. I'm very emotional. I get so involved with other people's problems. I could be depressed for a week on somebody else's problem."

When asked to explain why she couldn't help her best friend if she had a problem, she replied, "Because if she'd cry, then I'd just cry. I wouldn't be able to do anything else. I couldn't help her." This girl's view of the role of friends in a person's life was "I think friends are like a basic security."

Finally, HNA girls seemed in many ways to be physically dependent on their parents. While several girls worked part-time or had held summer jobs, all relied heavily on their parents for financial support. One girl's parents insisted she put away all the money she earned from her part time work into a savings account so that she couldn't spent it. They then continued to dole out an allowance to her and even financed a vacation the girl took to Florida. Many HNA girls shopped for their clothes with their mothers and felt that they had similar tastes. Several HNA girls ~~ate~~ almost all their meals at home. In many of the households the mothers of the girls did all the cooking and laundry. Most HNA

girls had not given much thought to attending an out of town college. The great majority said they would not consider moving out of their parents' home until they got married. As one girl put it:

I haven't really thought of moving out or something. I guess I would be married and then leave or something. But I don't know. I suppose on the one hand it's convenient where I am now. It's also because I've never really thought in terms of like having a job and really having to support myself. There's never been a need for me to really be trained for something. Probably when I get out of college I can't do anything.

Many HNA girls said they would not like to live far away from their parents after they got married.

The TAT stories of HNA achievers were characterized by a low incidence of themes representing a struggle for autonomy. More often their stories reflected submission and defeat or a happy acceptance of a symbiotic solution on the part of the heroine. These themes are exemplified by the following two stories told by HNA girls.

Card 12F (old woman with younger woman)

The two figures --one is the mother in law of the other -- resembles her a little bit --but she's not her mother. She's making life very difficult for her daughter in law. I think the mother in law is very happy about it. Maybe she didn't want her son to marry or she just doesn't feel she likes her enough to get along with her. The mother in law seems tricky, very cranky. The daughter in law is very sad. She's thinking "What should I do about her? How can I make her like me and treat me a little better?" I don't think she'll reach a solution because it's very hard to make someone like you who hates you. She'll just go on and on and keep trying to get along with her mother in law until she dies or goes into a nursing home or something. She can't do anything because you can't change people.

Card 7GF (maternal figure with little girl)

I don't think the child should be looking away from the mother unless she's looking away to fantasize on what the mother is reading to her. The mother is reading Grimms Fairy Tales and from the mother's part there seems to be so much love involved, and from the child's part, too, in a way. Just by holding the doll and playing house, trying to be like the mother in some ways. This is something a mother and daughter would do some afternoons, just take time to be alone together and communicate, which I think is important. Before this the mother was doing housework and the girl was just playing near her.

Stories of HNA girls were rated as significantly less open in style than were stories of LNA girls. This defensiveness most often took the form of mere card description and a tendency to reject the stimulus. The stories below illustrate this defensive style.

Card 12F (old woman with younger woman)

I saw this card in the textbook. An older and younger woman. I don't know if they're related. I don't know how I'm supposed to build a story around this picture. I really don't. They're looking in different directions. (Shrugs shoulders and pushes card to one side.)

Card 14 (figure silhouetted at window)

Hmmm --it doesn't make much sense. Usually if you're in a dark room with an open window the light rays will come in and light up the room. Hmmm --it doesn't hit me.

HNA girls were much more defensive than LNA girls about expressing hostility on the TAT. The indirectness with which HNA subjects expressed hostility in their fantasies is

exemplified by the following stories. The first is an example of a story with covert expression of hostility; the second is an example of hostility which is expressed intropunitively.

Card 18GP (two women on staircase)

B. A picture of a woman with a sad remark on her face --she's the mother or sister of the other woman who's sick and nearly dying. She's wondering about all the happy times they've had together.

Card 3BM (figure slumped on floor)

A. She looks like just a very tired sufferer. I don't even know where she is, but it looks like she's looking for rest somewhere, the first opportunity for rest from what's on her mind. The object looks like a gun that dropped out of her hand. She may have been trying to escape from what was bothering her, and that may have been a better escape than laying down her head. I can't tell if she did kill herself or fell out before she did. I hope she just kind of fell out and is thinking about what she's going to do, but she may have killed herself.

The LNA Achievers

The LNA achievers in the present study can best be described as individuals who are rather deeply involved in a personal struggle to arrive at an awareness of themselves as separate entities, as individuals in their own right. What characterizes these girls is an openness to inner and outer experience -- a willingness to experiment with the new and unfamiliar even though it may involve anxiety, conflict, and some risk of psychological security.

LNA girls on the whole held rather unconventional attitudes

and values. While none of them were devoted or strongly active members of the radical left, many held leftist or radical views. One girl considered herself "a serious radical" and explained that she felt she held radical beliefs but they were not necessarily part and parcel of a movement. LNA girls did not tend to discuss their values and attitudes via rhetoric. The majority of LNA girls approved of protest. While some had come intellectually to believe that societal change could only take place with violent revolution, they were personally frightened and threatened by violence and doubted whether they themselves could act violently. Several LNA girls supported and were actively and personally involved with the Women's Liberation Movement. One girl described what the movement meant personally to her.

I feel that it's put me in an existential position much more. I mean, I feel that I'm much more aware that I have to face things. It's less easy for me to cop out of facing the reality of my own life, my own problems. I feel more than ever that I have to make my own decisions. You know, I used to fall very easily into the idea of well, I'll get married. Then I would have solved all my problems. And I always sort of looked at it as a kind of death. But now I realize I can't die. I've got to live. I've got to make some kind of affirmation. And I've got to make me a stronger person.

Many LNA girls approved of premarital sex and held tolerant views with regard to abortion. Many had negative or at best ambivalent attitudes about marriage. While all LNA girls were wary of any habitual use of drugs, several had experimented with drugs (mainly marijuana) or admitted to having some curiosity about them. Most LNA girls were political in terms of their interests and attitudes, regardless

of whether or not their parents were. Some were politically active. All opposed the war in Vietnam on moral grounds. LNA girls tended to question the values and attitudes of their parents and, on the whole, seemed to have arrived at their attitudes fairly independently. Most girls held different ideas from their parents as to who they were and who they wanted to become as individuals. They seemed to consider their striving for independence not only a very important process, but a necessary one for their sense of individual growth. One girl who felt she was slowly becoming more emotionally separate from her parents discussed it this way:

When you're a child your parents tell you how to feel -- sort of give you a moral judgement on things -- so you can know what's good and bad. Then certain things don't fit into either category and you have to feel them out for yourself. I think emotional independence is feeling something and not feeling guilty about it. Having feelings that may be different from other people's and taking them for what they are. It's to know what you think is good and what is bad and not being forced by other people to accept things that you think are bad or do things you don't want to do or not do things you want to do.

In contrast to HNA girls, LNA girls seemed rather intensely involved in thinking about and experiencing inner conflicts -- even at the expense of feeling unpleasantly anxious. Few had "pat" ideas about possible solutions to the problems they faced. They seemed to possess a realization that it is often necessary to wade through a painful period alone before a resolution can be reached.

LNA girls, in general, reflected an impressive capacity for being alone with themselves. One girl expressed being alone and thinking about her problems as a very positive

aspect of her development.

When you're alone, you know, you think a lot. You're not forced to, but sometimes you admit things. Admitting to yourself that you have certain feelings is a big step...You see all kinds of feelings that you have when you think about it.

Most LNA girls recalled their dreams and were interested in them. Several thought about their dreams in a psychological manner. One girl related the following dream which she reported having had several times.

I had to drive a car. I wasn't really forced to--not thrown into it. But I felt that I had to drive it. And I got in and didn't even know how to drive. But I knew that I would sort of make it. ~~The~~ scary part about the dream was the feeling that I had when I was in there. I always reached my destination. It was never like I was crashing all over the place or anything like that. The main thing was just that feeling of myself forcing myself into that car. I had to do it.

When asked what she thought about the dream she said:

I think it's symbolic of the way I view my life and situations: I'm in it. I'm sort of forced into it by myself. I know I have to do something. There's no way I can get out of it. I know I have to commit myself to life and do something. But yet there's an element of fear --a feeling of an inability to do it --a fear that I wouldn't be able to do it. But the thing is, I always do, you know? I always come out of it, as much as I feel I'm not going to, even though it's a struggle, I always do come out of it.

LNA girls freely admitted to having worries and conflicts. Many admitted to having conflicts concerning sex. One girl who had had experience with premarital sex had difficulty having orgasms. She was troubled by this but interested in resolving her problem.

I just found out I had a clitoris this year. I sort of knew about it but I didn't know exactly where it was. I never had the guts to really talk to a doctor about sex. So I went to the doctor and asked, "Well, is this it?" (clitoris) I would imagine my girlfriend having this

great sex life and found out she had the same problem as me. I thought at first I had to be a very sexual person and to have negative thoughts about sex was bad. Then I realized there's a reason for it and it's important to accept your feelings and then to work on them. But first of all to say at least, "Yeah, I do have these feelings. It's okay. It's me. I can fight it but I don't have to deny I have them."

LNA girls generally seemed to feel fairly free in expressing anger toward others without experiencing strong guilt feelings. More often than not they reported engaging in open and direct conflict with their parents and friends. One girl who reported rather frequent, heated arguments with her parents over their attempts to impose their value system unto her told of an argument she had with her father.

I explained to him ---'You're so middle class. (worrying about her having a date in front of his friends) Do you hear what you just said to me? Is this what you're going to impress your friends with? That your daughter has a date? Should I call up an agency and say, "Send over a boy?" This is going to impress your friends? This is what you call friends?'

I was explaining to him but I was yelling. We always yell. It's kind of impossible not to yell when your heart is pounding the way mine was.

When asked how she felt about this argument, she said,

I don't feel guilty. I feel angry and I feel lousy because I have to live in this house and it's unpleasant.

Even when disagreeing with others was difficult, LNA girls seemed to feel an inner drive to assert themselves,

I push myself. A little voice in me says, 'Be honest.' I might have to push myself and have a little difficulty expressing my anger but after awhile I'll blow up and I'll just express it.

Some LNA girls recalled themselves as children who entered freely into friction with other children. One girl remembered this incident:

I'd see this bully coming up the block and I decided this time I'm going to punch him back. And it hurt when he was punching me (laughs) but I just kept punching him back. And I felt good. I really felt good.

LNA girls were strikingly open and free in discussing themselves in the interview. None were rated as highly or even moderately defensive. They appeared to be genuinely and honestly searching within themselves for answers to the interviewer's questions. The girls as a group, seemed to enjoy the interview experience. And when some experienced ambivalent feelings about their participation in the research they were not afraid to say what they felt. When one girl was asked, "How do you feel about being here?" she replied,

I feel a little tight. I'm very self conscious. But I was interested in the experiment. That's why I did it because I was interested in it. And I looked forward to this (the interview). When you told me it was going to be an interview --some kind of personal contact --well, then I liked it. So that's really why I decided. But about the first part of the experiment (the TAT and intellectual tests) I hated that. I don't like to be in a situation where I feel I'm being measured like that.

While not all LNA girls had a history of comfortable, gratifying interpersonal experience, all of them considered relating to others in depth a very important personal goal. While a few LNA girls were rather socially isolated, many seemed open to relating to and communicating with a wide variety of others, aside from their immediate families and school friends. Few LNA girls belonged to a set peer group. One girl who was part of a peer group in her elementary school days said,

By eighth grade, instead of having ten girls who did everything the same way, I started having one or two friends and they weren't necessarily in the same crowd.

The group didn't seem to matter so much...peers shouldn't mean that much to you all your life. You should start meaning more to yourself than other people mean to you.

Most LNA girls seemed rather selective in their choice of close personal friends, and described their reasons for choosing particular friends in terms of a capacity for honesty and genuineness. One girl stated,

I like people who are very tolerant. I don't like people who go around labelling other people. I like people who have a sense of the absurd and who can play crazy games. I like people who aren't too hung up so that if I say something that's outrageous they won't get all upset. I like people who can have a certain kind of emotional reaction --like you can say "I care about you" and they can say, "I care about you". I like people who will tell me what they think of me or who will try to be as honest as possible in our relationship.

The relationships of LNA girls were not typically dependent or clinging. Most LNA girls could see themselves as "separate" in their relationships with other people and viewed honesty and candidness as being crucial. As one girl put it:

In most relationships, even what's considered a good relationship, I don't think it is. I don't think people are being honest. I think they'll hold back things for the sake of security or fear of hurting the other person. I don't say that you should hurt them, but I don't think that very often the things we consider to hurt people really do --they're things you have to do.

(For example?)

If you feel very honest with another person, telling them what you want and telling them what you think of them.

Several LNA girls described their relationships with their mothers as conflictual but in ways emotionally close. While they might disagree with their mothers, they felt their

mothers were people with whom they could share thoughts and feelings.

While only one LNA girl had moved out of her parents' house and was living alone, LNA girls on the whole tended to be more independent from their families in a physical sense than did HNA girls. Few spent more time with their families than with their friends. Most had individual responsibility for taking care of their clothes, cleaning their rooms and helping with the cooking or housework. The majority of LNA girls had a work history. Some girls had contemplated going to an out of town college but for most it was financially unfeasible. The majority of LNA girls had thought about moving out of their parents' homes and most said they would do so after they graduated. One girl had moved out and was living in her own apartment. Her decision to move out was accompanied by some stormy conflict with her mother. Even though she felt her mother would feel lonely and "abandoned" by her leaving, "I wasn't going to not become an independent person because of that." In general, LNA girls did not feel compelled or desirous to live near their parents once they had begun a life of their own.

The TAT stories of LNA achievers were characterized by a high incidence of themes representing a struggle for autonomy. Their stories reflected attitudes of resistance, defiance, self-searching and separation on the part of the heroine or hero. These themes are exemplified by the following stories told by LNA achievers:

Card 7GF (maternal figure with little girl)

Looks like the little girl is very bored with whatever her mother is telling her. She's reading her a story or the Bible or something. The little girl couldn't care less. She'd like to be a thousand miles away. She probably has religious parents. She wants to say, "Oh, mother, leave me alone! I don't want to listen to you." As soon as her mother's finished, she'll probably walk away. She looks like she'll probably go off for a walk --go someplace by herself. She looks like she wants to be alone.

Card 12F (old woman with younger woman)

It's a boy and his grandmother. The boy is grown up a bit and he's taking care of his appearance. Grooming himself well. Looks like he spent time combing his hair. He's talking about political ideas and social change. The grandmother is thinking, "What am I going to do with this kid?" She thinks he's funny, doesn't take him seriously. She thinks he's going to end up with conventional views once he passes through this stage. She's wrong. This kid is going to stick by his views.

The stories of LNA girls were found to be more open and undefensive in style than were stories of HNA girls. The following two stories illustrate this openness.

Card 12F (old woman with younger woman)

It's a daughter and her mother. I think the mother has a witch like face. She might be trying to hold on to her daughter. The daughter's pretty old. I don't think she's married. The story doesn't fit the faces exactly. If I were to follow this I would say that the daughter wants to be free of the mother but can't break away. The mother's face is strange---it has a smirk like look. The daughter has her eyes in a sideward glance. She wants the future for herself. The mother's eyes are looking in the opposite direction. She might be going back to her past when she was a little girl. The mother expects the daughter to stay by her and the daughter doesn't want to. That's it.

Card 14 (figure silhouetted at window)

He seems to be mulling over some kind of problem. Maybe he's in a whole house full of relatives he can't stand and he just has to go off by himself and get some fresh air. It's only a temporary thing. He's going to leave soon. He's just looking out at the sky for some inner peace because he feels confused about the day's events. And also he doesn't feel he knows who he is and what he's going to do. He'll probably go back downstairs pretty soon. He feels a little relieved having spent a little time alone.

LNA girls were much more direct about expressing hostility on the TAT. The two stories below reflect this directness.

Card 18GF (two women on staircase)

A. I think this is a family picture. I think it's a daughter fighting with her mother. She's becoming very violent for some reason, and the mother can't do anything. She looks like she's quite a bit older. The daughter is almost crying but is very angry and her hands are grabbing at her mother.

B. To me it seems like this girl is strangling her mother. I'm going to make you think I hate my mother. She has an extremely bitter hatred. From the outline I imagine her mouth to squirm in pain. The daughter has forced her mother against the bannister and is strangling her. It could also be that the daughter walked in and found the mother dead. But the position doesn't fit. If she found the mother dead, she'd be carressing her head and her facial expression would be different. The first story fits better because the tenseness in the girl's arm doesn't go along with carressing. It think it's more an act of bitterness against the mother.

Summary of Clinical Findings

In summary, marked differences were found between HNA and LNA achievers along several dimensions of autonomy.

HNA achievers typically held conventional, stereotyped attitudes reflecting those of their parents or peers. They expressed a low tolerance for interpersonal friction and intrapsychic conflict. Their interpersonal relationships were limited in variety in depth and were characterized by strong dependence. These girls were defensive in the interview interaction and were relatively physically dependent on their immediate families. Their TAT fantasies reflected a low incidence of themes representing a struggle for autonomy, were relatively defensive in style, and indicated discomfort over the direct expression of hostility.

In contrast, LNA achievers maintained individualized values and attitudes which were relatively non-conventional. They expressed an impressive tolerance for interpersonal friction and the experience of inner conflict. Their interpersonal relationships were characterized by variety, depth and openness. These girls were strikingly undefensive in the interview, and were relatively physically independent from their immediate families. The TAT fantasies of LNA girls reflected a high incidence of themes representing a struggle for autonomy, were relatively open in style, and indicated a freedom in directly expressing hostility.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

The results confirm the major hypotheses of this investigation. Significant differences in the predicted direction were found between HNA and LNA groups on all six interview variables and on the three TAT variables. The experimental condition also yielded significant effects in the expected direction.

Specifically, LNA subjects showed significantly more struggle than HNA subjects to develop and maintain individualized attitudes and values apart from those of their parents and peers. They were also much more open to the experience of internal conflict, and possessed a higher tolerance for friction between themselves and others than did HNA subjects. LNA subjects were strikingly more undefensive and genuine in discussing themselves than were HNA subjects. Unlike the interpersonal relationships of HNA subjects, the relationships of LNA girls were characterized by diversification and depth. LNA subjects were physically more independent from their families than were HNA subjects.

While the three TAT measures were not related to the interview variables nor significantly related to one another when need for approval was held constant, the three scales did successfully discriminate between the LNA and HNA groups. The TAT stories of the LNA group contained significantly more themes representing a struggle for autonomy than did the stories of the HNA group. LNA subjects told TAT stories which were rated as significantly more open in style than were stories told by HNA subjects. In addition, HNA subjects were significantly more defensive about expressing hostility on the TAT than were LNA subjects.

The above findings are generally consistent with results of other studies which have investigated differences between high and low need for approval groups, as well as between high and low conforming subjects (Breger, 1963; Crowne & Marlow, 1964; Tutko, 1963; Burhenne & Mirels, 1970).

Finally, high academic achieving HNA subjects were shown to be significantly more strongly affected by praise for their intellectual performance than were high academic achieving LNA subjects. As was expected, HNA subjects who received praise responded more positively toward the research and the interviewer than did LNA subjects.

The Interview As a Measure of Autonomy

The highly reliable differences between the HNA and LNA subjects on each of the six interview variables demonstrate that the clinical interview employed in the present study is a valid and reliable tool by which to measure facets of autonomy.

The effectiveness of this interview, and the earlier success of a similar autonomy interview designed by Moses (1968), lends strong support to the idea that such clinical measures as depth interviews --as opposed to more standardized paper and pencil tests of personality --can be of important use in personality research, particularly in research with small, carefully selected samples. The high degree of reliability between judges in their ratings of the protocols on each of the six autonomy variables shows that such interviews can be handled in a systematic manner by trained coders, provided an intelligent and well defined coding guide is provided.

While the interview technique is more time consuming and the rating procedures more laborious, the richness of the data produced by this method provides a basis for reliably and validly measuring a large number of important personality variables simultaneously.

The Need for Approval and Autonomy

The fact that the HNA and LNA subjects differed reliably on each of the six autonomy variables as measured by the interview and the three fantasy variables as measured by the TAT, strongly suggests that need for approval is in some way at the heart of the concept of autonomy and could even be interpreted in part as a core definition of the concept. This idea is strengthened when it is considered that the subjects' fantasies of autonomy (TAT) and more behavioral measures of autonomy (clinical interview) were not correlated when the need for approval was held constant, but were highly correlated when need for approval was disregarded. For example, the correlations between the mean autonomy score (clinical interview) and TAT autonomy was .25 for the LNA group, .03 for the HNA group, but +.72 for the total sample. To rephrase these correlations, fantasies of autonomy and various aspects of autonomous behavior are highly related to one another because both are reflections of "autonomy"; but among groups of individuals who are more or less equally autonomous, these aspects of autonomy are not related because the only thing they share is "autonomy". Autonomy (in terms of how it is represented by need for approval) links the facets of behavior and fantasy.

The various aspects of behavioral autonomy present a different picture. While the correlations between the six interview variables are larger in the sample as a whole, they

are still significant when the need for approval is held constant. The need for approval (or this aspect of a core definition of autonomy) helps link these various aspects of autonomous behavior, but does not entirely explain them. Here, it would help to be able to obtain more reliable correlations among the six variables holding need for approval constant so as to be able to define a "structure" of autonomy.

The intercorrelations for the three TAT variables indicate that need for approval (autonomy) does link them. (It should be mentioned that there may be more complicated reasons why interview autonomy and the TAT measures were not related when LNA and HNA groups were considered separately. It is possible that autonomy as measured in the interview and autonomy as measured in fantasy are expressions of different dimensions and levels of the variable. For example, for some subjects, TAT Autonomy may be more reflective of unconscious struggles for separateness, while interview autonomy may be reflective of conscious efforts to separate. In addition, some subjects who are free and open in discussing themselves in an interview may feel less free in a projective test situation which might stimulate deeper unconscious material which they may experience as threatening.)

Praise for Intellectual Performance and the Need for Approval

This investigation demonstrated a significant interaction effect between praise for intellectual performance and the need for approval. HNA subjects who were praised rated the interviewer and the research procedures more positively than did any other treatment group. Praise, directed toward HNA subjects apparently aroused in them a feeling (conscious or unconscious) to respond positively when rating the interviewer and the research procedures. Being praised for their intellectual performance had no such effect on LNA subjects. If anything, it may have had an opposite effect. LNA experimental group ratings of the research procedures were lower than their control group ratings and significantly lower than the ratings of the HNA praised group. Also ratings of LNA subjects, particularly LNA experimental subjects, tended to decline more over time than did ratings of HNA subjects.

LNA subjects may have reacted somewhat negatively to the interviewer's praise, particularly if they did not believe it to be genuine. It was noted by the interviewer that of the LNA girls who were praised, some either expressed no spontaneous reaction or frankly expressed disbelief -- e.g., "Oh, you're talking about that testing stuff? (the intellectual problems). That was a lot of nonsense (laughs). I couldn't have done well. I didn't even finish one of the tests. It was pretty ridiculous, I thought." This reaction was in contrast to HNA praised subjects who typically

reacted spontaneously with such comments as "Oh, thank you!" or "That's so good to hear." If they did express doubt or disbelief about their performance it was in the form of a pleased sense of surprise. "Oh! I did well? I thought I didn't. Oh, I'm glad!" It seems clear that among the subjects who were praised, more HNA subjects than LNA subjects conceived of the intellectual problems as representing a true reflection of their intellectual ability.

The groups did not differ with regard to individual item variation from the first to the second administration of the REQ. It had been hypothesized that LNA subjects in both experimental and control groups would show more consistency in their ratings than HNA control subjects. The absence of the interviewer during the second administration of the REQ, as well as the added instructions to the subjects that their responses would remain unidentified, did not seem to "free" any group to respond any more differently on individual questionnaire items than another. Differences in item change from the first to the second administration of the REQ could be attributable more to individual differences in recall than to actual changes in subject attitudes or reactions.

Implications of the Findings

This investigation has demonstrated a definite relationship between a high need for social approval and problems in developing autonomy in late adolescent girls who are high academic achievers. In addition, the study shows that a low need for approval seems to be linked with a strong pursuit of autonomy in such high achieving girls. Several implications emerge from the findings of this study.

1. The Importance of Studying Within Group Differences

This study reflects rather clearly, as other researchers have demonstrated (Haggard, 1957, Murphy, 1960, Heilbrun, 1964, Stix, 1966, and Kisch, 1967), that the motivations and personality patterns of high achievers are qualitatively different, and that neither achievers nor underachievers can be treated as homogeneous groups. This investigation points up the fact that research which does not take into consideration and control for varying personality differences within groups, cannot come to reliable conclusions with regard to important differences between groups.

2. The Effects of Need for Approval and Educational Processes on Autonomy and Creativity.

Society highly values its normal man. It educates children to lose themselves and to become absurd, and thus to be normal.

R.D. Laing
The Politics of Experience

The results of this study imply a strong need for continuous re-evaluation of our educational methods and goals and the motivations and goals of our students.

In the present American academic system (in most large schools and universities) where competition for grades is stressed, where classes are large, and where pupil-teacher interaction is minimized, it may be that HNA achievers are in a better position to succeed. Their tendency toward repression of inner conflicts, their conformity to more conventional attitudes and values, and their tendency to remain placid in situations which might arouse anger or disagreement --all would seem likely to facilitate and foster the formation of compulsive study habits and a sort of tunnel vision directed toward piling up good grades. The high need for approval in such achievers might also help them to take and pass exams, since they may be more highly attuned to figuring out more exactly what a teacher wants than would persons who are low in need for approval.

While some teachers and school administrators may look for, and even welcome, autonomy in their students, the present day educational system seems to work against autonomous growth on the part of its students. Brilliant and creative students in high school, for example, are frequently pressured to attend college upon their graduation even though they do not often have a clear notion of what subject they wish to pursue. In most colleges, rather than being allowed time for trial and error, the student is pressured by the end of her sophomore year to make a decision about her major subject --frequently a decision which involves not only the remainder of her undergraduate years but years in graduate school as well.

This confining pressure to define for one's self one's life work through academic interest comes at the very time when an adolescent needs most psychological space to begin to achieve a more permanent sense of individual identity and personal integrity. While popular humanistic psychologists such as Paul Goodman (1960, 1964) have stressed the importance of the late adolescent's being encouraged or allowed to take time off from high school and entrance into college in order to experiment with life, few young men or women make such a choice.

The fact that several LNA subjects in this study spoke of wanting to "drop out" points to a feeling in them that their sense of autonomy, growth and creativity is being stifled in school. It is noteworthy that not one HNA subject spoke of a desire to leave school. While both need for

approval groups in this study had equally high grades, there were qualitative differences between them with regard to how they felt about their achievement. LNA girls, in general, expressed a stronger dislike of school (e.g., were critical of poor teachers, meaningless exams and grades, etc.) than did HNA girls. LNA girls, more than HNA girls, had fantasies of dropping out of school or of letting their grades slide to spend their time with what they considered to be more meaningful activities. Most LNA girls expressed a strong dislike of the pressures resulting from the grading system and felt they would do better in a pass/fail system. HNA girls seemed to be more conformist in their study habits and more driven by competition. A few HNA girls appeared to use almost all their spare time for studying and gave the impression of being "grinds". While HNA girls often expressed dislike for the pressure they felt to compete academically, they seemed, more often than not, to be caught up in the system.

In comparing choices of major subjects for the two groups, it was interesting to note that the majority of girls in the HNA group were interested in education, math or the physical sciences; whereas, the majority of LNA girls were interested in art, literature or psychology. This may serve as a further indication that HNA girls seem geared to more highly structured, "outer" interests, while LNA girls are geared to less highly structured, "inner" interests.

The two groups of subjects in this investigation are somewhat reminiscent of the High IQ students (HNA subjects in this study) and the High Creative students (LNA subjects in this study) in the work of Getzels and Jackson (1962) ,

and seem somewhat akin to the high achieving language and spelling students (HNA subjects in this study) and the high achieving readers (LNA subjects in this study) described by Haggard in his research on elementary school achievers (1957).

While the two groups of subjects in this study were not compared with regard to creativity, it is likely that, if tested, the LNA group would emerge as the more creative. In contrast to some HNA girls, whose drive toward academic achievement seemed to derive from a need to emulate parents or to fulfill and please parents, LNA girls seemed to place less value on such achievement per se, and more value on individual learning through curiosity and creative search and a desire to please themselves. One LNA girl vividly recalled her strong curiosity and creative drive from a very early age and just as vividly recalled her teachers' attempts at squelching her interests.

I remember myself in elementary school. The teacher always saying, 'Don't rock the boat, kid.' (laughs) You know, I would try to do something new or different and they'd say, "Oh, yeah. Right, right. That's okay, kid but don't get so involved." or 'Don't bother me now.'

...When I was in the Fifth grade I discovered this radio-meter. I saw it somewhere with these things that swirl around when the heat or light is on. I thought that it was the greatest thing in the world! I wrote this report all about it and I brought it into school with me and the teacher said, "oh, yeah. That's nice." and she put it aside.... I had these kinds of teachers...they just want to teach you how to add fractions, they don't care about what you think or feel.

This girl reacted to her teachers' disinterest in her curiosity and creativity by becoming interested in activities outside

of school.

I began to see that when you tried to do something different or something that's not straight according to the books, it's not rewarded. So I began to do things not related to school. I'd do things more for myself. I used to draw pretty well and would draw for me and that would please me. I also sew a lot and I can do a lot of different things with that. Things that I know would be good, things that I wouldn't need anyone to tell me were good, Now when I do something like that I tell people it's good. I know it is.

No HNA girl reported experiences similar to the experiences related by the LNA girl above. (It should be noted that it does not necessarily follow that all creative individuals must be autonomous. Creativity might also grow and flourish within the context of a strong and happy symbiosis wherein the individual feels no need to struggle for separateness, but rather feels buoyed by the strength and support provided by the symbiosis. One HNA girl in the present study who was developing as a successful choreographer in creative dance was involved in such a symbiosis with her parents.)

3. The Effects of Parent-Child Interaction on the Development of Autonomy and Implications for Child Rearing

The origins of a high and low need for approval in individuals need much further study. The interaction between the child and its parents in the early formative years is clearly a source of crucial data in determining how a high or low need for approval is developed and how autonomy is either facilitated or stifled in the child. While the interview used in the present study dealt in part with the subject's recall of her early years with her family, the

data gathered was not a complete account for any of the subjects. However, in discussing their interaction with parents, some possible findings did emerge. There was a tendency for HNA girls to have more early memories in which they expressed feelings of incompetence and a fear of their parents as authorities than did LNA girls. More HNA girls than LNA girls reported instances in childhood where their parents withheld love and approval in order to encourage them to conform to their wishes. One HNA girl recalled a striking example of such coercion. During this girl's toilet training her mother was continually pressuring and disapproving. At one point she remembered her mother threatening her by throwing her out of the house.

She threw me out and she closed the door....
I had the conception that she would never open
the door again...and, I said I'd never do it
again. And it worked. She never had any
trouble after that. If I'm not mistaken, she
did the same thing with my sister. It was very
effective.

Often mothers of HNA girls, as described by the subjects, gave an impression of being rigid, inflexible individuals who were overinvested in the lives of their children. Mothers of LNA girls more often gave the impression of being fairly flexible, open individuals with personal interests apart from the lives of their children. The picture of the subjects' fathers was less clear. Interestingly, there was a tendency for LNA subjects to view their parents as two separate individuals and for HNA subjects to see their

parents as a single unit. This finding is in line with results of a study (Webster et.al.,1960) which investigated personality differences between college students who demonstrated "much change" in the direction of "liberalization" after one year in college and students who showed no such change. The "non-changers", who were characterized by a dependent orientation, viewed their parents in a positive and undifferentiated way. The "changers," who were described as independent, understood their parents rather well.

[Their] parents emerge more as human beings, and they are described with an admirable detachment. This detachment in turn makes possible a wide variety of positive and negative emotional expressions about the parents and about all manner of other things as well (p. 9).

What is implied from the above is that parents who use withdrawal of love and approval, as well as excessive praise for achievement, as pressure tactics in making their children conform, are encouraging them to depend upon the evaluations of others for their self-esteem and sense of identity. Such children grow up fearing the very idea of uniqueness and separateness. It seems clear from this study that the development of a strong need for approval serves as an extremely destructive barrier to the growth of autonomy.

Parents wishing to facilitate the development of autonomy in their child might do this most effectively by setting firm limits without introducing frequent comments

and/or actions which imply that the child himself is not loved if he (she) behaves in a way which displeases the parents. It would seem also important for parents to avoid reacting to their child's achievements with excessive praise and approval.

4. High and Low Need for Approval and Differences in Superego Development.

A related implication arising out of the differences observed between HNA and LNA achievers is that superego development is different in the two groups. The HNA achievers appear to have rather rigid, harsh and punitive consciences, while the LNA achievers seem to have relatively non-punitive, more flexible, humanistic consciences.

It would be interesting to compare the groups on such variables as "superego structure" and "ego strength." Conceivably, there may be individuals in both need for approval groups with non-punitive and punitive superegos, as well as individuals in both groups with varying degrees of ego strength. (For example, HNA individuals who develop in the context of a highly destructive symbiotic relationship with their parents are likely to be weak in ego strength and have more punitive superegos, than are HNA individuals who are immersed in a less destructive symbiosis.)

Shaham (1970) in a study on superego patterns and ego strength, selected college men who were all high in ego strength but who were either punitive or non-punitive in terms of superego structure. She then demonstrated

that the punitive and non-punitive groups reacted significantly differently to success and failure and also tended to express hostility differently. It could be informative to compare the reactions of LNA and HNA subjects of varying ego strength and superego structure to success and failure. (The problem, of course, in the selection of subjects on such measures when need for approval is a variable, is that need for approval itself may affect the way the subjects fill out other questionnaire material --such as "superego" scales, or questionnaires designed to measure degree of "ego strength".)

5. Blind Compliance vs. Dissociation, Isolation and Negativism.

With regard to the issue of autonomy in HNA subjects, there is a need for such individuals to be studied further to determine to what degree they are blindly compliant in their lack of autonomy and to what degree they demonstrate a split within themselves between an inner "real" self and a "pseudo" self which they present to the world. Laing (1958), Gruen (1968), and Hertzman (personal communication) have made sharp distinctions between these two types of personalities. The blindly compliant individual may appear to be more adjusted and "normal" on the surface; the second group may appear "pathological" (e.g., schizoid or schizophrenic). The distinction made between the two types of individuals is that while the blindly compliant have more completely abrogated their struggle for autonomy, the

dissociated individuals have not given up the fight to retain a sense of a real self.

No depth effort was made to distinguish between these two types in the present study. However, it did seem clear that while some HNA subjects seemed to be like the blind conformists described above, a few more frequently reflected a discrepancy existing between inner wishes and their outward conforming behavior. These individuals usually seemed to feel powerless and helpless about resolving this split.

6. Implications for Psychotherapy

Studies have shown that persons high in need for social approval are more likely to terminate psychotherapy prematurely than are persons low in the need. Patients high in approval dependence seem to find demands for personal revelation threatening. This leads to resistance in the form of early termination from treatment. In one study, a significant inverse correlation ($-.63$) was found between therapists' ratings of the patients' degree of personal integration and "defensiveness" (Strickland & Crowne, 1963).

While girls in both need for approval groups in this study had obvious personal problems which might require therapeutic intervention, LNA girls appeared to be more likely candidates for insight psychotherapy. Such girls, with their awareness of inner conflicts and willingness to acknowledge positive and negative thoughts and feelings, are likely

to establish trust with a therapist more rapidly and are less likely to act out resistances by leaving treatment prematurely. HNA girls, who reflect a low tolerance for experiencing inner conflict and who are defensive about acknowledging feelings and thoughts, are more likely to view their therapist in idealized terms and to expect therapy to provide them with magical solutions to their problems. Underneath their defensiveness, HNA girls may be extremely fearful, making the establishment of trust difficult. They are likely to be highly resistant to change and more likely to terminate treatment prematurely.

From the above discussion, the question arises as to what sort of therapy approach would be most beneficial with HNA individuals. The degree to which such individuals are "dissociated" or "blindly compliant" would be an important determinant in the decision as to type of treatment. Whereas some form of insight psychotherapy may be useful with some dissociated HNA individuals, a supportive approach with the addition of some form of behavior therapy might be more appropriate for HNA individuals who tend to be more blind in their tendencies to conform.

Limitations of the Study

Availability of results for generalization.

While the results of the present study are generally in accord with the findings of the previous studies on the need for approval, it should be kept in mind that these findings pertain specifically to how autonomy is demonstrated in academic achieving college girls who differ in need for approval. It is not clear how autonomy would be expressed in low achievers or underachievers of varying need for approval levels. It is also not clear how autonomy would be demonstrated in male achievers or underachievers of different need for approval levels. In addition, while the two groups in this study were carefully matched for social class (an equal number of social class levels were represented in each need for approval group) it may be that in a larger sample, differences in autonomy might be found between subjects of varying social class levels. It should also be mentioned that all the subjects in this study were Caucasian and most were of Eastern United States Jewish backgrounds. There were a few Catholic and Protestant girls in each need for approval group. Conceivably, results could be different with a population consisting of individuals of different racial, geographical, cultural or religious backgrounds.

Experimental Condition

The focus of the experimental condition in this study was to determine how praise for intellectual performance would affect the reactions of HNA and LNA achievers to the interviewer and the research procedures. Other variables could be introduced which might have different effects on subject reactions. For example, different means of praise could be used with someone other than the interviewer giving the praise. Also, instead of being praised, the subjects could be criticized for their performance on intellectual tasks. In addition, different post-experimental measures might be tried. For example, it would have been interesting in this study to have obtained a measure of "attitudes toward the self" to determine what effect praise may have had on the subjects' feelings about themselves in the research situation.

The Research Evaluation Questionnaire used in this study might have been improved. For example, Subscale A, the questions which dealt with the subjects' attitudes toward the research procedures, was more effective in producing differences in group ratings than was Subscale B, which had to do with the subjects' reactions toward the interviewer. Subscale A was composed of statements to be rated along a seven point scale, whereas Subscale B was composed of adjectives (with negative or positive connotations) to be rated along a three point scale. A seven point rating scale for the adjectives may have yielded better results. Also, all the adjectives

in subscale B may not have been truly discriminating in terms of negative or positive connotations. An adjective checklist similar to the one used by Shaham (1970) may have been more effective in getting at subject attitudes toward the interviewer.

Size of Sample

Because of the small size of the sample in this study, and the fact that it was made up of persons with extreme scores on the M-C scale, the structure of the intercorrelations among the six interview variables could not be analyzed. With a larger sample whose M-C scores represent a wider range, it would be possible to analyze differences between the correlation coefficients, as well as to determine whether the correlations do indeed fit a particular theoretical structure or pattern --i.e., the theoretical framework for the autonomy syndrome described earlier in Chapter II.

Autonomy Measures Based on Subjects' Self-Reports

The interview ratings in the present study do not represent a true behavioral measure of autonomy. As is clearly apparent, the ratings relied heavily on the subjects' self reports. The non-defensiveness variable was the only autonomy measure in the interview which was derived from the subjects' actual behavior. While it is well known that the self-reports of subjects are open to distortion, as is amneistic data gathered from subjects, the clinical interview employed

in the present study was of sufficient depth and length to make it fairly difficult for a subject, regardless of her level of need for approval, to distort or exaggerate throughout the interview. It could be observed, for example, that some subjects who tended to skirt a particular problem area when first questioned about it, would elaborate about it later on in the interview. Or, some subjects who denied that a certain issue was a problem in their lives, would contradict themselves later when material would emerge via another, related interview question. This tendency was also observed by Moses in her study with adolescent girls in which a similar depth interview was the measure of autonomy (Moses, 1968).

While it may have proved valuable to have utilized some behavioral measure of autonomy to further clarify or support the interview results, the addition of such a measure was beyond the scope of this study.

Suggestions for Future Research

Several possibilities for related research are generated by the results of the present investigation.

First, men could be studied instead of women or in contrast to women. Different autonomy patterns might be expected for male achievers than for female achievers of differing need for approval levels.

With the recent interest in and emphasis on the changing role of women in our society, issues such as the ones dealt with in this study may become increasingly relevant to the study of sex role differences. For example, it has become evident that women in our society experience more conflict over autonomous achievement than do men. Presumably, such conflict arises in part out of confusion in women as to what they conceive of as their "socially acceptable" role. Autonomous achievement for women has been more the exception than the rule, whereas men in our society have almost always been encouraged to achieve and become "independent".

Our of such a context, it seems plausible to assume that women high in need for approval would tend to experience more conscious conflict over autonomous achievement since such achievement, for women, may not be rewarded with the approval of society and the culture. On the other hand, women who are less dependent on the approval of others, may feel freer to achieve in an autonomous manner.

Achievement in men who are high in need for approval may

not involve much conscious conflict because their achievements are typically rewarded with social approval. However, men who are pressured to be "independent" and to achieve may actually be encouraged to become persons they are not. Although they may not experience conscious conflict over their male role and may pride themselves on their "independence", they are likely to exhibit only a pseudo autonomy. (In contrast to the high need for approval female achievers in this study, many of whom admitted being dependent, it is suggested that male high need for approval achievers would tend to regard themselves as independent.)

On the other hand, achieving men who are low in need for approval may be more truly autonomous in their achievements, but are likely to experience more conscious conflict about "independence", achievement, and the male role.

Several studies could be designed to test these hypotheses.

Secondly, underachieving students, in contrast to achieving students, of high and low need for approval levels could be studied for different patterns of autonomy. The issue of autonomy is likely to be different in underachievers than in achievers.

Another possibility for further research is that behavioral measures might be designed and used to test the hypothesis of high and low autonomy in low and high need for approval subjects. Some behavioral measures might be derived

from the interview variables used in the present study. For example, some sort of confrontational method might be used to get at how subjects handle their anger in situations of interpersonal friction. "Asch-like" situations might be useful in obtaining measures of the subjects' conforming or independent behavior. (Asch, 1951). It would also be interesting to see how high and low need for approval subject react in group situations (e.g., T groups) in terms of revealingness and defensiveness.

The difficulty, of course, with "life-like" experimental situations is that they often seem contrived and are seldom experienced by subjects as "real". Therefore, they are often not reacted to as one might react in an actual life situation.

Research on the need for approval, autonomy, and academic achievement could be undertaken with children, although the autonomy measure would have to be age-appropriate. Child-parent interaction is another very important area in which research on the need for approval and autonomy needs to be done. Parental levels of autonomy and need for approval could be studied in relation to their children's levels, and pertinent relationships explored. Such research with parents and children, and specifically parent-child interaction, poses many difficulties in terms of measurement, but with small, carefully selected samples, depth research might prove extremely valuable.

More experimental research needs to be carried out with regard to how achievers of varying need for approval levels

actually perform in cognitive tasks which relate to academic achievement and creativity. For example, one might expect LNA achievers to function more independently and more creatively in less highly structured tasks and HNA achievers to function less independently and less creatively in such tasks. HNA achievers, on the other hand, might be expected to function more efficiently in tasks which are highly structured than would LNA subjects. Moses, (1968) for example, found that girls rated high in autonomy were freer, more creative and open on an ambiguous task such as the Rorschach than were low autonomy girls. However, girls ranked low in autonomy performed significantly better than high autonomy girls in a highly structured color sorting task.

It would be interesting also to obtain ratings from the instructors of achievers with regard to "independent" or "conformist" study habits and to correlate these with autonomy ratings in low and high need for approval groups.

Another area of fruitful research would be to carry out longitudinal studies with high achieving children who differ in need for approval. It would be extremely interesting to observe how autonomy is expressed in these children in the midst of adolescence. Longitudinal studies might also be attempted with a population like the one used in the present study. For example, it would be very interesting and informative to observe how these girls emerge as thirty year old adult women. While the longitudinal method

naturally involves many problems and much time, it is potentially one of the most valuable and important ways in which to study personality development in individuals.

Finally, this study, along with previous research on the need for approval, demonstrates a need for a serious re-evaluation of current criteria which are used by professionals as well as lay people to define and describe mental health.

What we call "normal" is a product of repression, denial, splitting, projection, introjection and other forms of destructive action on experience. It is radically estranged from the structure of being.

R. D. Laing
The Politics of Experience

* * * * *

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alden, Vernon R. "What Kind of Excellence?" Saturday Review, July 18, 1964, pp. 52-53.
- Asch, S.E. "Effect of Group Pressure Upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgments," Groups, Leadership and Men; Research in Human Relations. Ed., H. Guetzkow. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Press, 1951.
- Bard, Morton. "The Use of Dependence for Predicting Psychogenic Invalidism Following Radical Mestectomy," Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, 1955, 122, pp. 152-60.
- Bettleheim, Bruno. The Empty Fortress: Autism and the Birth of the Self. New York: Free Press, 1967.
- Blair, A. W. and Burton, W.H. Growth and Development of the Adolescent. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1951.
- Brunswik, Else Frenkel. "Motivation and Behavior," Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1942, No. 26 (November).
- Breger, Louis. "Conformity as a Function of the Ability to Express Hostility," Journal of Personality, 31, pp. 247-257.
- Burhenne, Diane and Mirels, Herbert L., "Self-Disclosure in Self-Descriptive Essays," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 35, pp. 409-413.
- Chickering, Arthur W. "The Development of Autonomy," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1967, 37(a), pp. 203-204.
- Crandall, Virginia C. "Personality Characteristics and Social Achievement Behaviors Associated with Children's Social Desirability Response Tendency," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, Vol. 4, pp. 477-487.
- Crandall, V.C., Crandall, V.J., and Katkovsky, W. "A Children's Social Desirability Questionnaire," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, pp. 349-354.

- Crowne, D.P. and Marlowe, D. "A New Scale of Social Desirability Independent of Psychopathology," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, pp. 349-354.
- Crowne, D.P. and Marlowe, D. The Approval Motive: Studies in Evaluative Dependence, New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Crowne, D.P., Stephen, M.W., Kelly, R. "The Validity and Equivalence of Tests of Self-acceptance," Journal of Psychology, 1961, 51, pp. 101-112.
- Crowne, D.P., Holland, C.H., and Conn, L.K. "Personality Factors in Discrimination Learning in Children," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 420-430.
- Dyk, Ruth and Witkin, Herman. "Family Experiences Related to the Development of Differentiation in Children," Child Development, 1965, 36 (1), pp. 21-55.
- Domino, George, "Differential Prediction of Academic Achievement in Conforming and Independent Settings," Journal of Educational Psychology, 1968, 59 (4), pp. 256-260.
- Douvan, Elizabeth and Gold, Martin. "Modal Patterns in American Adolescence," In Lois W. Hoffman and M. Hoffman (eds.) Review of Child Development Research, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964, pp. 469-528.
- Edwards, Allen L. Experimental Design in Psychological Research, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.
- Erikson, Erik. Childhood and Society, New York: W.W. Norton, 1950.
- Erikson, Erik. Identity and the Life Cycle, New York: International University Press, 1959.
- Erikson, Erik. Insight, Youth and Crisis, New York: W.W. Norton, 1968.

Erikson, Erik. Young Man Luther, New York: W.W. Norton, 1958.

Fishman, Claire G. "Need for Approval and the Expression of Aggression Under Varying Conditions of Frustration," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 2 (6), 1965, pp. 809-817.

Garms, Joe DeWayne. "Predicting Scholastic Achievement with Non-Intellectual Variables," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, 1967.

Getzels, Jacob W. and Jackson, Philip W. Creativity and Intelligence, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.

Goodman, Paul. Growing Up Absurd, New York: Random House, 1960.

Goodman, Paul. Compulsory Mis-education, New York: Horizon Press, 1964.

Gruen, Arno. "Autonomy and Identification: The Paradox of Their Opposition," International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1968, Vol. 49, (4), pp. 648-655.

Haggard, E. A. "Socialization, Personality and Academic Achievement in Gifted Children," School Review, 1957, 55, pp. 388-414.

Hamsher, Herbert J. and Farina, Amerigo. "Openness as a Dimension of Projective Test Responses," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, pp. 525-528.

Heilbrun, Alfred B., Jr. "Personality Factors in College Dropouts," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1964, 49 (1), pp. 1-7.

Holt, John. How Children Fail. New York: Pitman, 1964.

Holt, John. How Children Learn. New York: Pitman, 1967.

Holt, John. "The Fourth R --the Rat Race," New York Times Magazine, May 1, 1966.

Horney, Karen. Neurosis and Human Growth: The Struggle Toward Self-Realization, New York: W.W. Norton, 1950.

Jackson, Lydia. "Anxiety in Adolescents in Relation to School Refusal," Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 1964, 5 (1), pp. 59-73.

Keniston, Kenneth. The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1965.

Kisch, Jeremy M. "A Comparative Study of Patterns of Underachievement Among Male College Students," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, U. of Michigan, 1967.

Klein, Edward B., Gould, Laurence J., and Corey, Michael. "Social Desirability in Children: An Extension and Replication," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, p.128.

Kovar, Lillian. Faces of the Adolescent Girl, New York: 1968.

Kroeber, Theodore C. "The Coping Functions of the Ego Mechanisms," in A Study of Lives, Robert W. White, ed., New York: Atherton Press, 1963.

Laing, R.D. The Divided Self, London: Tavistock, 1960.

Laing, R.D. The Politics of Experience, New York: Pantheon Books, 1967.

Laing, R. D. and Esterson, A. Sanity, Madness and the Family, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971

Lefcourt, Herbert. "Need for Approval and Threatened Negative Evaluation as Determinants of Expressiveness in a Projective Test," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 46-102.

Mahler, M.S. "Ego Psychology Applied to Behavior Problems," In N.D.C. Lewis and B.C. Pacella (Eds.) Modern Trends in Child Psychiatry, New York: International University Press, 1945, pp. 43-56.

- Martin, Alexander Reid. "Self-Alienation and the Loss of Leisure," In "A Symposium on Alienation and the Search for Identity," American Journal of Psychoanalysis, Vol. 21, No. 2, 1961, pp.
- Maslow, Abraham. A Psychology of Being, Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1962.
- Murphy, Lois; (ed.) and Raushenback, Esther (ed.). Achievement in the College Years: A Record of Intellectual and Personal Growth, New York: Harper, 1960.
- Murphy, Lois. The Widening World of Childhood: Paths Toward Mastery, New York: Basic Books, 1962.
- Moses, Helen M. "The Relation of Degree of Autonomy to Degree of Cognitive Expansiveness in Adolescent Girls," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, City College of New York, 1968.
- Moustakas, Clark E. Creativity and Conformity, Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1967.
- Rapaport, David. "The Theory of Ego Autonomy: A Generalization," (1957) In M. Gill (ed.) The Collected Papers of David Rapaport, New York: Basic Books, 1967, pp. 722-745.
- Rosenfeld, John M. "Some Perceptual and Cognitive Correlates of Strong Approval Motivation," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31(5), pp. 509-512.
- Sanford, Nevitt. "The Freeing and Acting Out of Impulse in Late Adolescents: Evidence from Two Cases." In A Study of Lives, Robert W. White, ed. New York: Atherton Press, 1963.
- Shaham, Nanette. "The Effects of Differences in Ego-superego Patterns on Reactions to Success and Failure," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, City College of New York, 1970.
- Singer, Erwin. Key Concepts in Psychotherapy, New York: Random House, 1965.
- Stix, Daniel. "Overachievement in College as a Function of Anxiety, Repression and Attitudes," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Temple University, 1966.

- Strickland, Bonnie R., and Crowne, D.P. "Need for Approval and the Premature Termination of Psychotherapy," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, pp. 95-101.
- Sullivan, Harry Stack. The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry, New York: W.W. Norton, 1953b.
- Tutko, R.A. "Effects of Need for Social Approval on Responses to Projective Tests." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1963.
- White, Robert W. "Motivation Reconsidered: The Concept of Competence," Psychological Review, 1959, 66, pp. 297-333.
- Witkin, H.A., Dyk, R.B., Poterson, H.F., Goodenough, D. R., and Karp, S.A. Psychological Differentiation, New York: Wiley, 1962.
- Webster, Harold, Heist, P., and Williams, Phoebe. "Value Contrasts Between Family and College and the Effect Upon Student Development," Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, September 2, 1960.
- Wynne, L., Ryckoff, I.M., Day, Juliana, and Hirsch, S.I. "Pseudomutuality in the Family Relationships of Schizophrenics," Psychiatry, 1958, 21, pp. 205-220.
- Ziller, Robert C., Hagey, Joan, Smith, Mary Dell H., and Long, Barbara H. "Self-Esteem: A Self Social Construct." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 84-95.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Personal Data Sheet

Name _____ Age _____
Address _____ Phone No. _____
Marital status: Married _____ Single _____ Divorced _____ Separated _____
Place of Birth _____
Residence: With family _____ Other _____
Year in College _____
Student Status: Full time _____ Part time _____
High School attended _____
Grade Point Average over last two semesters _____
High school grade point average (approximate) _____

Parents: Married _____ Separated _____ Divorced _____
Both parents living? _____
Father's age _____
 education _____
 place of birth _____
 type of work _____
Mother's age _____
 education _____
 place of birth _____
 type of work (if any) _____
Sex and age of siblings: _____

Approximate Family Income: Below \$5,000 _____
 \$5,000-10,000 _____
 10,000-15,000 _____
 Above \$15,000 _____

APPENDIX A CONT'D

(The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale)

Personal Reaction Inventory

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally. Write "T" or "F" after each statement.

1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates. (T)
2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble. (T)
3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. (F)
4. I have never intensely disliked anyone. (T)
5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life. (F)
6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. (F)
7. I am always careful about my manner of dress. (T)
8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant. (T)
9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it. (F)
10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. (F)
11. I like to gossip at times. (F)
12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right. (F)
13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener. (T)
14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something. (F)
15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. (F)
16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake. (T)
17. I always try to practice what I preach. (T)
18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people. (T)

19. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget. (F)
20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it. (T)
21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. (T)
22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way. (F)
23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. (F)
24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings. (T)
25. I never resent being asked to return a favor. (T)
26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. (T)
27. I would never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car. (T)
28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. (F)
29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off. (T)
30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. (B)
31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause. (T)
32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved. (F)
33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. (T)

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF PILOT RESEARCH

A pilot study was run in July and August using girls from summer session psychology classes at City College. Subjects were asked to fill out a face sheet of biographical data questions and the M-C scale and to return these to class the following day. Subjects were told that a few girls would be selected to participate in a depth interview having to do with personality and life experience, and that they would be paid \$2.00 an hour for their time. (It was not possible to have ⁿ subjects fill out the face sheet and/approval scale in class (which would have been ideal) due to the lack of cooperation on the part of instructors who had 'had it' with researchers using their class time, and some antagonism on the part of students who felt sated with participation in research.)

From an N of 65 girls who were given the scale and face sheet, 45 were returned. From this N of 45, 8 girls were selected who fitted the criteria of high academic achievement and either a high or low score on the M-C scale. It was not possible to match the girls on grade level, but all eight were sophomore or juniors. The mean score on the MC scale for the N of 45 was 13.86. Standard deviation was 5.0. These values correspond well with norms Marlowe & Crowne report for college students (See Marlowe & Crowne, 1964). The girls who made up the low need for approval group (n=4) had scores of 3,4,6 and 6. The girls making up the high n approval group had scores of

18, 19, 19, and 21. The girls' GPA's ranged from 3.2 to 3.8.

Each of the eight girls was contacted and an appointment made for the interview. (It was interesting that 3 out of 4 high need for approval subjects seemed resistant in making the interview appointment, although each of them did so. Two of these girls cancelled their first appointments and another had to be arranged.) All girls were interviewed in my home. Each girl was exposed first to 7 TAT cards to which she told stories. She was next instructed that she would be given some tasks having to do with intellectual achievement. (These consisted of some of the Information items on the WAIS, the Vocabulary Subtest, and the Digit Symbol Subtest. These items were not suitable, as the subjects could pretty well tell how they had performed on the tasks. Knowledge about the quality of their performance was a variable we want to control.) Following this the subject was interviewed. The interview essentially followed the schedule in Appendix C. All interviews were taperecorded. At the end of the interview all subjects were told that they had done "extremely well" on the intellectual achievement tasks and were asked some general questions about their scholastic performance, as well as how they felt about exams, grades, etc. Then the subjects were asked to fill out a one page rating scale designed to assess their reactions to the interviewer, the interview, and feelings they experienced during the interview. (For several reasons, the scale did not yield meaningful material.)

The pilot research was carried out with two purposes in mind: 1) to test out the clinical interview, and 2) to see generally whether the autonomy interview does in fact discriminate between achievers who score high on the M-C scale and achievers who score low.

Results: The clinical autonomy interview seemed successful in tapping the aspects of autonomy of interest to me. The interview schedule has been modified somewhat with some repetitive questions deleted, as well as some which proved to be unproductive.

In general, the girls high in need for approval come across differently than girls low in need for approval -- particularly with regard to defensiveness, openness to inner conflict, and gratification in interpersonal relationships. There seem to be clear differences, too, in their ability to maintain attitudes and values distinct from those of their parents. The girls low in need for approval seem to be significantly more autonomous along most of the aspects outlined in the proposal.

TAT stories, at a glance, possibly will yield some interesting findings, particularly with regard to conflict as it is expressed in the stories.

The rating scale used at the end of the interview was not properly designed to elicit subjects' reactions to the procedures or to me and did not yield significantly meaningful material. I have modified this procedure.

APPENDIX C

MODIFIED ALPHA EXAMINATION FORM 9

TEST B

Samples: Write a 6 on the dotted line.....
 Write the smallest of these numbers backwards:
 13 21 64 18 16

-
1. Write the middle letter of the longest of these words:
 shoe string cobbler -----
 2. Write the second figure of the largest of these numbers:
 3165 1993 6727 5842 2819-----
 3. Write the largest of these numbers backwards:
 25 69 16 94 33-----
 4. Write the third letter of the word that means the
 shortest distance: yard foot rod mile-----
 5. Write the third letter of the word that means the
 opposite of tall-----
 6. Give the letter of the alphabet that is midway between
 P and T-----
 7. In the following list of words find the word that begins
 and ends with the same letter, and write the letter:
 storm thunder threat stream-----
 8. Write the last letter of the longest word and middle letter
 of the shortest word of the list in No. 7-----
 9. Write with a capital the first letter of the word that
 tells where the sun sets:
 north south east west-----
 10. If the difference between 53 and 61 is greater than the
 difference between 17 and 25, write a; if less, write b;
 if it is the same, write c-----
 11. Give the total number of letters contained in this list,
 not counting the letter e: n e g t u r e e h y
 m e v d x e w b l o e z-----
 12. Write the letter of the alphabet that is as far beyond L
 as M is beyond H -----

13. If 8 is more than 7, write 16 on the dotted line, unless the sum of 8 and 7 is more than 16, in which case write one-half the sum-----
14. Notice these numbers: 354 417 349 303 352.
Write the last figure of the number which would be the middle one if the five numbers were arranged in order of size-----
15. Write the last letter of the first of these three words which contains a letter that is in neither of the other two: terse error stencil-----
16. Write the second letter before p in the alphabet, then the letter before p, and then the second letter after p, unless these letters spell a familiar word; in which case write only the middle letter of the word-----
17. If the sum of the two numbers 14 and 23 is greater than the difference of the two numbers 289 and 327, write a on the dotted line; if less, write b; if it is the same, write c-----
18. Find the third figure from the end of the next to largest number in this series, and add 4 to it:
88739 85244 88846 8630-----
19. Write the second letter from the end of the word that would come second in this series if the words were arranged alphabetically:
mixing nourish labor marvel punish
20. If the sum of the two numbers 43 and 26 is more than 59 and less than 67, write a number less than 55 into which 17 and 3 both go evenly; if not, write a number greater than 18 which goes evenly into the sum-----

DO NOT TURN THIS PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO

APPENDIX D

THE AUTONOMY INTERVIEW *

The interview is designed to measure aspects of the autonomy concept, described previously.

Specifically, autonomy measurements will consist of judges' ratings (on a 6 point scale) of clinical interview material gathered from each subject. The autonomy material will be based on the subject's answers to questions designed to explore her life experience in 5 different areas, each presumed to contribute to autonomy (the quality of the subject's interaction with the interview will also be considered in making ratings regarding degree of "defensiveness"). The core data upon which aspects of autonomy will be judged, then, will consist of samples from the life experience of each subject.

* Note: Some of the questions in this interview were borrowed from an autonomy interview designed by H. Moses (1968).

Interpersonal Experience

1. What is the earliest thing in your life that you can remember?
2. What is your earliest memory involving your mother?
3. What is your earliest memory involving your father?
4. Do you remember your first day at school?
5. How did you like elementary school?
6. Did you have any special friends in your early school years? Still friendly?
7. What did you do after school?
8. Whom did you enjoy being with most in those years? Friends or family?
9. Same questions re: high school (5,6,7, and 8).
10. Were there any adults other than your parents who were particularly important to you during your childhood years? How about now?
11. Are there any relative you're especially friendly with outside your immediate family?
12. Do you generally visit relatives by yourself or with your family?
13. Did you have any hobbies or interests outside of school? With whom do you share them? How often?
14. What sorts of people do you enjoy having as friends?
15. How many really close friends do you have? What are they like?
16. Are your close friends generally known to one another? Are they all close? (or are they members of different groups?)
17. What sorts of things do you usually do with your friends?
18. Do you generally feel free or cautious in talking with close friends about yourself? vice-versa?
19. Who is your "best" friend? What do you like about her (him)? What do you dislike about her (him)? What do you have in common? What topics would avoid discussing with her (him)?
20. Do you date different boys or the same one? (If the same one, do you go steady?)

21. (If dates different boys): Would you like to have a steady boyfriend?
22. Do you date boys of similar religion to your? of similar ideas and attitudes?
23. Have you ever begun an acquaintanceship with somebody outside of school or work --just spontaneously?
24. How do you feel in a situation where you are meeting new people? What do you usually think about? (example)
25. If you wanted to go to a discotheque and didn't have anybody to go with, would you go? (same for movie or concert)
26. What would you do if a friend came to you in trouble? (example)
27. How quickly (or slowly) do you feel you form opinions about other people with regard to liking them or not liking them?
28. What does the marriage relationship mean to you?
29. Who (or what) in your life do you think has been most influential in your choice of friends and your feelings about people?
30. What role do you think friends play in one's life?
31. Can you think of a time in your life when you particularly enjoyed the company of another person? (example) What was that like?
32. Whom would you turn to if you were deeply troubled about something?

Openness to inner conflict

1. Do you recall a dream you had as a child? What?
2. Is there something you have dreamed over and over? What?
3. Do you dream often or infrequently? How often would you say you dream --a week?
4. Can you tell me a recent dream? (If subject gives example, ask, Did you make anything of that dream?)
5. Do you think much about your dream?
6. How often do you spend time alone?
7. How do you feel about being by yourself?
8. What sorts of things do you do when you're by yourself? (e.g., do you sit around and just think? Or do you try to keep busy with some activity?)
9. When have you been aware of being lonely?
10. What sorts of things do you think about right before you go to sleep?
11. What things in your life or about yourself worry you the most? How often do you think about these things? What have you done to resolve problems which cause you worry or anxiety?
12. Can you think of something your parents or a friend would ask you to do or want you to do that would place you in a situation where you would feel very conflicted inside? (example) How would you feel in that situation? How would you resolve the conflict?
13. Have you been troubled with problems pertaining to sexual matters? (example) How have you tried to resolve these?
14. What does becoming 'independent' mean to you? What are your feelings about your own independence or dependence?
15. Have you felt conflicted about your future? career? marriage? How do you see yourself dealing with these conflicts?

Maintenance of attitudes, values and judgements

(Attitudes and values of parents and friends contrasted with subject's own)

1. What would your mother think would be the greatest thing that could happen in your life?
2. What would your parents like to see happen to you eventually in terms of your general life situation? (about your getting married, working, etc.)
3. What does your mother think are your strong points? (talents and aptitudes) What does she think are your weak points?
4. What place does your mother think friends have in one's life?
5. What kinds of people does your mother admire? Does she seek them out?
6. What do your parents feel about the educational system? What kinds of complaints do they have about it?
7. How do your parents feel about religion? How important is it to them?
8. What does your mother think of girls your age going steady? (getting married?)
9. What do your parents think of student protests?
10. What do your parents think about young people taking drugs?
11. What is your mother's view with regard to premarital sex?
12. What are you parents' views on Vietnam?
13. At what age do you think you will get married? What do you plan to do after marriage?
14. What do you want to be doing (see yourself doing) at 35?
15. What do you like about yourself? (personality)
16. What do you dislike about yourself?
17. What sorts of people do you admire? Do you seek them out?
18. Where do you think your present family will fit in --in fifteen years?
19. What do you think about girls your age going steady? getting married?

Maintenance of attitudes & values, Cont'd.

20. Do you have or have you had any good friends whom your parents know about but don't know well? Do you have any your parents don't know at all?
21. Are any of your friends people your parents would disapprove of? How do you feel about that?
22. What do you think would be the most wonderful thing that could happen in your life? Currently?
23. What are your special talents or aptitudes?
24. Are there areas you're particularly weak in?
25. How do you feel about the educational system? (any complaints about it?)
26. What are your feelings with regard to student protests?
27. What are your attitudes about young people and drugs?
28. What is your attitude about religion? How important is it to you?
29. How do you feel about premarital sex?
30. How similar would you say your values and attitudes are to those of your friends? (If there are differences, ask: How do you feel about the differences?)
31. What is your view on the Vietnam War?
32. Whom do you turn to typically for advice when you have an important decision to make about something?(example)
33. When you face a major decision, or have to make a judgement about something, do you ever think about how your parents would feel? (examples)
34. How would you say your parents affect your making decisions and judgements? (same for friends)
35. Do you have any part in making the rules at your house? (If no): Do you think you should?
36. Are you expected home at a particular time? What do you do if you're late (or going to be late)?
37. Do you generally tell your mother where you are going and whom you'll be with?
38. Do you tell your mother what goes on on your dates? (If no): What would happen if she asked you?

Maintenance of attitudes & values, Cont'd.

39. Are there things about you that you definitely wouldn't want your parents to know? (If yes): A few? Many? What would happen if they found out?
 40. In general, how similar or how different would you say your values and attitudes are from those of your parents? (Example) Are differences discussed openly?
-

Tolerance of Friction

1. How often is there quarreling in your family?
2. Who quarrels most in your family?
3. How would you characterize the quarreling? (e.g., loud and violent? irritable and tense? low-keyed and nagging?)
4. How do your parents typically resolve arguments?
5. What is your response to conflict between other persons in your family --usually? (Do you engage in it? How? Do you withdraw? In what way? Do you object and try to stop it?)
6. With whom do you argue most at home? (If no one): Whom did you used to fight with when younger? What about?
7. Do you remember the first time you disagreed with either of your parents? When? What happened?
8. When did you argue last with your mother? (example)
9. How do you feel during an argument with your mother? (example)
10. How do you feel afterwards? a) toward yourself? b) toward your mother?
11. How is a typical argument with your mother resolved? (example)
12. How often do you get into arguments with friends? What sorts of things do you argue (disagree) about?
13. What is an argument like with a girl friend?
14. What is an argument like with a boy friend? (your husband?)
15. How do you feel during the argument? How do you feel afterwards: a) towards yourself? b) towards the other person?
16. Has anyone very close to you ever been very angry at you? When? How did you feel then?

Tolerance of Friction (cont'd)

17. How do you feel about arguments in classes?
 18. Did you ever participate in one? With other students?
(example) How did you feel during? Afterwards?
 19. Have you ever argued or disagreed with a teacher? (example)
How did you feel about it? During? Afterwards?
 20. As a child, do you remember arguing a lot or a little
with other children or parents?
 21. When is the last time you've been really angry at someone?
(example) How was the anger expressed? How did you feel
afterwards? How do you feel about it now?
 22. If someone says something you disagree with, what do you
typically do? (Is your tendency to keep silent and think
of your argument or is your tendency to speak up?)
 23. How would you say that you feel generally about disagreements?
Do you feel uncomfortable? Do you feel indifferent? Do you
enjoy disagreements?
-

Physical Independence from Family

1. With whom do you spend most of your spare time?
2. How did you spend this summer? Last summer? Summer before?
3. Whose opinion do you rely on in choosing clothes?
4. Who takes care of cleaning your clothes?
5. Do you eat most of your meals at home? Who prepares them?
(If not at home: Where?)
6. Do you have your own room at home?
7. Who takes care of cleaning your room?
8. Did you give any thought to going to an out-of-town college?
9. Have you ever given any thought to having your own apartment?
10. Do you work (currently)? Have you worked in the past to
make your own money? (When?)
11. Do you usually stay in town on weekends? (If not): What do
you do?
12. How much time would you say you spend with your family
currently?

APPENDIX E

TAT SCALES

Struggle for Autonomy Scale - TAT

This deals with the subject's need for self-differentiation and individual growth. It is reflected in the TAT in the degree to which the heroine (hero) seems to be struggling for her own (his own) goals. Along with this struggle there may be a need to rebel against persons whom she (he) feels are attempting to force her (him) to do something against her (his) will, or who are trying to influence her (him) to make decisions or judgements. Besides overt rebellious acts and wishes, it deals with her (his) need to be separate from others in order to discover her (his) own identity. This struggle for autonomy may be accompanied by guilt and conflict.

Scale points 0 - 3 are characterized as follows:

- 0 No struggle for autonomy is apparent in the story. Heroine is seen as totally accepting other people and the situation she is in. There may be a happy acceptance of a symbiotic solution.
- 1 Mild struggle for autonomy. The Heroine (hero) is viewed as wanting something different for herself or wanting to separate self, but seems overwhelmed with guilt and/or fear at this idea and ends up resigning herself toward remaining in the situation, submissive or trapped or dead (suicide). Suggestions of separate wishes are mild.
- 2 Moderate struggle for autonomy. Rebellious acts or wishes are expressed. They may be in the form of anger toward or even murder of another person with whom the heroine (hero) is in conflict. Strong guilt and ambivalence may be expressed. Moderate themes of separateness occur and/or struggling for one's own goals.
- 3 Strong struggle for autonomy. This is seen in stories where there seems to be a clear need for self-differentiation and individual growth on the part of the heroine. Rebellious acts or wishes may be accompanied by some guilt but there is the sense that the heroine is aware of conflicts and is actively working with them. There are rather strong signs of a need for separateness. There heroine, hero seems struggling for her (his) own goals.
- NR Not rateable. Use very sparingly, only for those stories which do not fit any of the above 4 categories.

Guide for rating stories on autonomy scale for Cards 1, 2, 3BM,
7GF, 12F, 14, and 18GF

Card 1 (boy with violin)

Criteria for 0 and 1 ratings

- S sees violin as welcome gift
- S seen as fitting into the existing situation
- No implied or overt struggle is indicated in the story.
- No mention made of S's desires or wishes.
- S has no understanding of the present task and makes no effort to understand it.
- S plays the violin to please parent(s) or some authority figure.
- S expresses some dislike about having to play the violin, but this is mild.

Criteria for 2, 3, ratings

- S seen as clearly struggling for his own goals in playing the violin.*
- S sees the violin as damaged, impaired or broken under conditions of forced practice.
- S sees the violin as an unwelcome gift.
- S shows preference for other activities or rejects, or wants to reject the violin as something he does not want
- S shows some degree of critical self-appraisal or evaluation of task.

(* S seen as emulating some idol in playing violin would not be rated as struggling for his own goals.)

Card 2 (girl in farm scene)

Criteria for 0, 1 ratings

- Girl seen as perhaps wanting to leave but is resigned to staying in the situation.
- Girl viewed as integral part of family scene. No hint of separateness and no mention of individual desires or wishes.
- Girl viewed as wanting to stay with the family.
- Mild hints at separateness but these are not elaborated.

Criteria for 2,3 ratings

- Girl may be in conflict with one or more people in the story and working at resolving the conflict.
- Girl viewed as distinctly separate and qualitatively different from the other people in the story --with different needs wishes, values.

Girl seen as leaving or wanting to leave to live a life of her own.

Card 3BM (slouched figure)

Criteria for 0, 1 ratings

S commits suicide.
 S seen as hopelessly depressed, resigned to his/her situation.
 S seen as not responsible for his/her own actions in the situation. Whatever has happened is seen as being forced upon him or as coming from some external source.
 S solves problems through magical solutions.
 A rebellious act might be mentioned but is followed by overwhelming guilt.

Criteria for 2, 3 ratings

S seen as muddling over and thinking deeply about something that troubles him/her.
 S committed some rebellious act but is not overwhelmed with guilt, although he (she) may feel upset.
 S seen as angry and/or depressed about something but seems to be coping with it realistically. Not giving up, and not looking for escape.
 S is seen as responsible for his/her own actions in the situation.

Card 7GF (little girl with doll and maternal figure)

Criteria for 0, 1 ratings

No mention of separateness or distance between the two people in the picture.
 If mention of distance does occur, it is denied by S making the two people very close.
 No mention of girl's individual desires or wishes.
 Girl viewed as being positively involved with maternal figure.
 There are hints that the girl may not want to leave or not listen to the maternal figure, but there is no follow through --she ends up fitting into the situation with the maternal figure.

Criteria for 2, 3 ratings

Girl feels separate from the maternal figure.
 Girl viewed as being involved with her own fantasies and wishing she were somewhere else.
 Girl seen as not listening or not wanting to listen to maternal figure.
 Girl seen as wanting to leave, leaving, or leaving at some future date.

Card 12F (old woman and young woman)Criteria for 0, 1 ratings

The 2 women are viewed as being very friendly.
 Young woman seen as influenced by old woman.
 No overt struggle between the two women
 No sense of conflict within the young woman.
 Old woman seen more positively than young woman.
 Some mild suggestions of separateness between the two women.
 Some mild suggestions of conflict between the two.

Criteria for 2,3 ratings

Young woman seen in conflict with the old woman.
 Young woman viewed as not wanting to accept, or as not
 accepting what the old woman says or does.
 Young woman seen as separate and qualitatively different
 from the old woman.

Card 14 (figure at window)Criteria for 0, 1 ratings

S commits suicide.*
 S seen as solving problems via magical, stereotyped
 dramatic solutions.
 S seen as wanting to break free or as depressed about some
 situation but is hopeless and unable to do anything
 about it.

Criteria for 2, 3 ratings

S seen as alone, separate from mothers, involved with himself
 in an introspective thoughtful way.
 S seen as grappling with some problem concerning himself
 without giving up and without feeling hopeless or
 resigned to his situation.
 S seen as wanting to break free of restrictions which he
 feels bind him and there is the sense that he intends
 to do that.

(* When suicide is mentioned at all --even in terms of "He doesn't
 look like he's going to jump" --and if it is later denied --
 it should be scored anyway --in most cases as a 1 or 0 if
 it is tentatively mentioned.

Card 18GF (two women on staircase)Criteria for 0, 1 ratings

No struggle is mentioned between the two women.
One woman is seen as helping another person who may be sick or dying.
Some struggle may be mentioned but heroine gives in, feeling hopeless about it.
Some rebellious act may be committed, but there is no sense of follow through or struggle.

Criteria for 2,3 ratings

There is an angry conflict (physical and/or verbal) between the two women. Murder may be a result of the conflict.
Younger woman is eager to free herself from the older woman's dominance and rebels against her.
There is a sense of individual struggle in the story.'

APPENDIX E (Cont'd)

TAT Openness Scale

(Based on a scale developed by J. Herbert Hamsher and Amerigo Farina: "Openness as a dimension of projective test responses." J. of Consulting Psych, 31:525-8, 1967)

"Openness was used in a way consistent with its generally understood connotation of free, unrestricted communication of personal information; it was operationally defined as a rating of 1 through 5, based on a manual developed in pilot work." *

Below are story characteristics associated with each scale point.

1. Rejection or mere description of the card; stories stilted, stereotyped, unelaborated to marked degree. Restricted range of content. Absence of emotional expression.
2. Above features to more limited degree; infrequent suggestions of desire to communicate.
3. Equal proportions of indicators of openness and guardedness.
4. Apparent identification with story characters and personalization of theme. Stories freely elaborated with some involvement with plot development. Some indication of reservations, holding back.
5. Stories clearly personalized and fully elaborated, lack previous defensive signs.

* Openness on any particular card is a function of objective characteristics of the card, as well as attributes of the subject.

APPENDIX E

TAT Hostility Scale (I)

(Developed by Louis Breger --Conformity as a function of the ability to express hostility. J. of Personality, 31: 247-57, June, 1963)

(Takes into account overt and covert expressions of hostility)

3 scales used to obtain a final overall score called
TAT Total Defended Hostility Score

Scale 1 - Expressed Hostility

This reflects the ability of the subject to deal with hostile content in a direct and undefended manner as exemplified in themes of arguments, anger, fighting, revenge, murder, etc. Themes are scored along a three point dimension.

- 1 - Mild for stories in which fighting is not the central theme or in milder arguing or intent to fight themes.
- 2 - Moderate for stories about fighting, physical aggression intense verbal hostilities.
- 3 - Severe for stories about murder, strangulations, etc.

Restrict scoring to 1 unit per card, except in rare instances where 2 or more distinct themes are present.

Scale 2 - Covert Hostility

This reflects what is typically assessed clinically as repressed hostility and its emergence via defended or unconscious channels. The general principle involved is that the consequences of hostile motivations are visited on the fantasy characters in a disguised manner, the most obvious example being deaths, accidents and sicknesses.

Covert hostility themes are scored along a 3 point dimension.

- 1 - Mild for stories in which they are not the central theme.
- 2 - Moderate for stories dealing with sickness, accidents, etc.
- 3 - Severe for stories in which the "tragedies" are of major proportions such as deaths, heart attacks, serious accidents, etc.

Scale 3 - Intropunitive Hostility

For themes of depression, guilt, dejection, and suicide.

Scored along a 3 point dimension.

- 1 - Mild in which intropunitve is not the central theme. May be mild depression or guilt.
- 2 - Moderate in stories where themes of depression and/or guilt is strong. May result in psychological and/or physical punishment to the self.
- 3.- Severe in stories where depression and/or guilt is extreme, resulting in serious injury to the self or in suicide.

Stories are scored using each scale and a total overall score is computed by subtracting the Expressed Hostility Score from the Covert Hostility + Intropunitve Hostility Score, and then adding a constant of 10. This computation yields a final score which is called the TAT TOTAL DEFENDED HOSTILITY SCORE.

APPENDIX F

Research Evaluation Questionnaire

(REQ)

Subscale A

INSTRUCTIONS: Below are 10 items which pertain to your feelings about the various procedures you have participated in in connection with this research. In rating the items, circle the number (from 1 to 7) which best reflects your feeling. Answer ALL items.

1. The interview left me feeling happy and satisfied.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at					extremely	
all						

2. I disliked telling stories to the pictures (TAT).

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at					extremely	
all						

3. In general, I felt the study was interesting.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at					extremely	
all						

4. I found the intellectual tasks challenging and fun.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at					extremely	
all						

5. I felt the interview was poorly designed and incomplete.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at					extremely	
all						

6. I felt relaxed and free telling stories to the TAT.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at					extremely	
all						

Research Evaluation Questionnaire (Cont'd)

7. Before coming to the interview I felt calm and relaxed.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at						extremely
all						

8. I felt uneasy doing the intellectual problems.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at						extremely
all						

9. I felt nervous and uncomfortable with the interviewer during the interview.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at						extremely
all						

10. All the interview questions were appropriate, intelligent, and non-threatening.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at						extremely
all						

APPENDIX F Cont'd

Research Evaluation Questionnaire

(REQ)

Subscale B

INSTRUCTIONS: Below are 32 items which concern your reactions to the person who conducted your interview. Next to each item write in the number you feel applies best.

1. -very little
2. -somewhat
3. -very much

You must rate every item

In general, how did the interviewer appear to you during the interview. The interviewer seemed:

- | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|
| + 1. competent | _____ | + 17. relaxed | _____ |
| - 2. anxious | _____ | - 18. confused | _____ |
| + 3. sincere | _____ | + 19. alert | _____ |
| - 4. bored | _____ | - 20. brusque | _____ |
| + 5. sympathetic | _____ | + 21. confident | _____ |
| - 6. annoyed | _____ | - 22. tense | _____ |
| + 7. cheerful | _____ | + 23. sensitive | _____ |
| - 8. frustrated | _____ | - 24. tired | _____ |
| + 9. involved | _____ | + 25. interested | _____ |
| - 10. phony | _____ | - 26. unsure | _____ |
| + 11. intelligent | _____ | + 27. kind | _____ |
| - 12. distant | _____ | - 28. detached | _____ |
| + 13. effective | _____ | + 29. perceptive | _____ |
| - 14. demanding | _____ | - 30. distracted | _____ |
| + 15. mature | _____ | + 31. affectionate | _____ |
| - 16. apprehensive | _____ | - 32. perplexed | _____ |

APPENDIX G

Instructions to Judges Re: Ratings of Subjects

Your ratings of each subject will be based on the interview material provided. First, read the description of the variable you are to rate and then read the two interview examples which follow. The first sample interview (A) is of a girl judged as low in the variables; the second (B) is of a girl judged as high. Then read through the interview material and rate each subject according to the scale provided. Feel free in utilizing the full range of the scale in rating your subjects. If you find yourself feeling doubtful about a particular rating, or ratings, it is suggested that you put that interview (or interviews) aside and come back to them at a later time.

Variable 1. Maintenance of attitudes and value system: the subject's struggle to successfully establish and maintain her own attitudes, values and judgements in the face of pressures exerted by parents, peers or other external forces.

This refers specifically to the degree to which the subject seems to be struggling to define her own values and attitudes and to decide things for herself, without continual and constant reference to the structure provided by the opinions and approval of others. Important here is the subject's most typical reaction when faced with values and attitudes which differ from or threaten her own. The degree to which she is able to hold onto her own judgement, value or attitude, in spite of pressure to change is crucial for a high rating on this variable. Also crucial for

a high rating is the subject's ability to tolerate differences of opinion in other people. A rigid, very nonflexible maintenance of value system would not yield a high rating.

Rate the subject according to the following scale, utilizing the brief descriptions of scale end points as a guideline.

- _____ 0. Values and attitudes of subject almost totally reflect parental values and attitudes. Subject seems to be making little effort to define things for herself and tends to conform with parents or peers in the face of pressure.
- _____ 1.
- _____ 2.
- _____ 3.
- _____ 4.
- _____ 5. Subject seems to be struggling successfully to arrive at her own definition of things. She does not sway easily when confronted with differing opinions, although she will listen to them. Her right to her own thought out opinions and ideas seems crucial to her sense of self.

Variable 2. Openness to inner conflict: the subject's ability to tolerate the experience of internal conflicts.

This refers to the subject's tendency to reflect on and be interested and involved in her own inner life (e.g., dreams, fantasies, worries, etc.) Such a tendency included the ability to tolerate some degree of anxiety without being severely debilitated or overwhelmed by it. In assessing the subject's openness to inner conflict, it will be useful to look at whether or not problems are faced --and how directly --and at how the subject seems to view and deal with her specific problems.

Rate the subject according to the following scale, utilizing the brief descriptions of scale end points as a guideline.

- _____ 0. There is much denial of conflict. Subject seems uninterested and uninvolved in her inner psychic processes. Copes with problems by not facing them, by denying they exist.
- _____ 1.
- _____ 2.
- _____ 3.
- _____ 4.
- _____ 5. Subject can tolerate a significant degree of inner conflict. Very interested and involved in her own inner life. Attempts to integrate aspects of it with her day to day living, and therefore experiences self as changing, moving, etc. Shows impressive tolerance for attempting to work through problems in spite of anxiety.

Variable 3. Tolerance of friction: the subject's ability to tolerate and engage in interpersonal friction with a minimum of anxiety and guilt.

This refers to the degree to which the subject seems capable of entering into arguments and disagreements with others (parents, peers, siblings, teachers, etc.) and of expressing anger towards others, without feeling overly guilty or anxious. It also refers to the subject's capability to tolerate dissension among others without feeling she must remove herself from the scene or stop the fight.

- _____ 0. Subject cannot tolerate friction to much degree, Avoids it whenever she possibly can. May say that arguments are "silly" or a waste of time". Very rarely expresses anger or hostility, as this elicits much guilt and anxiety. Usually expresses hostility indirectly.

- _____ 1.
- _____ 2.
- _____ 3.
- _____ 4.
- _____ 5. Subject shows high tolerance for interpersonal friction. She can argue and disagree and express anger with little threat to her sense of self. She usually speaks up --even heatedly --and even when it is sometimes difficult --when she disagrees. Dis-sension among others is tolerated to a significant degree.

Variable 4. Self image and non-defensiveness: the degree of non-defensiveness the subject exhibits regarding maintenance of her self image.

This refers to the subject's behavior in the interview interaction as a whole. The subject who is defensive with the interviewer, who is eager to present an idealistic image of herself, is less likely to be open in the way she discusses issues and problems. She may be less likely to admit weaknesses as well as strengths. She may be more likely to deal with questions superficially and less likely to go into detail in her answers unless prodded by the interviewer. She may try to divert the interviewer from the area being discussed by shifting the focus of the question. It should be stressed that the manner in which the subject discusses things with the interviewer is more important than whether or not she is willing to discuss everything of interest to the interviewer. (For example, any subject engaged in a depth interview with someone she has barely met may feel the need to reserve her right to discuss a particular problem. If the subject declines to discuss

an issue with the interviewer, it is crucial to note the way in which the refusal is made. That is, does she decline openly and honestly, or indirectly and defensively?

Rate the subject according to the following scale, utilizing the brief descriptions of scale end points as a guideline.

- _____ 0. Subject seems extremely defensive. Seems particularly unwilling to discuss problem areas. The unwillingness is manifested indirectly. Subject tends to skirt issues. Seems eager to present a rather superficial picture of herself.
- _____ 1.
- _____ 2.
- _____ 3.
- _____ 4.
- _____ 5. Subject is unusually open and undefensive in the way in which she discusses herself and issues concerning her life. Seems spontaneous, sincere in interaction with the interviewer. Discusses weaknesses as well as strengths and vice versa. Seems free in talking about her feelings to the interviewer. Deals with questions directly and on depth level.

Variable 5. Interpersonal experience: the degree to which the subject experiences gratification in diversified relationships.

This refers specifically to the degree to which the subject seems to find gratification in relating to different kinds of people --e.g., people outside her immediate family, persons of different religions, races, class groups, ages, etc. This rating should be based on the subject's report of interpersonal experiences from childhood to present. The number of relationships

is not as important as their variety. And here, there may be diversification without much gratification (e.g., superficial acquaintances without meaningful friendships).

Rate the subject according to the following scale, utilizing the brief descriptions of scale end points as a guideline.

- ____ 0. Finds very little gratification in diversified relationships. Interpersonal experience in general seems ungratifying and limited and has little depth. No really close friends.
- ____ 1.
- ____ 2.
- ____ 3.
- ____ 4.
- ____ 5. Finds a great deal of gratification in unusually wide diversification of relationships. Has very close friends from different backgrounds than hers. Eagerly seeks out different sorts of people. Maintains relationships over significant periods of time. Finds friendships very meaningful.

Variable 6. Physical independence from immediate family: the subject's nearness to her immediate family, in terms of domicile arrangements, amount of time spent away from the family, physical care (meal preparation, room cleaning, clothes, etc.).

The subject who is physically dependent on her immediate family is one who spends most of her spare time with her family, and who, aside from living at home, allows her mother to prepare all her meals, relies on her mother in choosing clothes, does not take responsibility for taking care of her room, clothes and other responsibilities. Financial independence is not considered a crucial factor with regard to physical

independence in this sample, although work history is considered important.

Rate the subject according to the following scale using the brief descriptions of scale end points as a guideline.

- _____ 0. Extremely physically dependent. Subject spends most of her spare time with her immediate family or close relatives. Her meals are almost always prepared by her mother and she eats most meals at home. She does not choose clothes often without consulting her mother, nor does she take much responsibility for the care of her room, clothes, etc.
- _____ 1.
- _____ 2.
- _____ 3.
- _____ 4.
- _____ 5. Extremely physically independent. Subject spends most of her spare time away from her immediate family. She feels free to arrange her own eating habits. She takes responsibility over choosing clothes and her own belongings. May live out of the home in her own apartment or a shared one. Probably has held jobs -- probably makes some of her own money.

APPENDIX H

Qualitative Samples of the Differences Obtained Between High and Low Need for Approval Achievers

The Interview Results

What follows are examples taken directly from the interview transcripts which illustrate the differences obtained between high and low need for approval achievers on the six autonomy variables.*

Variable 1. Maintenance of attitudes and values.

The following is an example of a HNA subject who was given a rating of 0 on this variable. Her values and attitudes are almost totally a reflection of those of her parents.

RUTH (HNA)

I. You say your mother would like you to be teacher?

S. Yes. We've thought about it. It has all the advantages that anything could have. I spoke to her about the idea of running off to France and galloping around (laughs) and becoming a connoiseur but it all seemed so flimsy. It didn't have any substance. It seemed that it would **never be a reality**. A teacher is a reality to me. I know that I can do that. Anything else-- I think is --it's a little bit of being afraid that I'm not capable of doing it. So, why bother?

I. You mean learning French?

S. Yes. I know I'm not capable of learning a language thoroughly to the point where I can translate and interpret and really work at it. The more I thought about it the more ridiculous it just seemed. It just did. I think it's my

* In an interchange between the interviewer and a subject, the interviewer is depicted as I and subject as S.

environment -- the kind of girl I am. Middle class values -- I am to an extent very narrow minded.

I. So what do you want to do?

S. Well, the common thing to do. What I'll probably end up doing is teaching. I really wish sometimes I was more ambitious to be something different. I'm not. I will fall into the same old thing that everybody does. I'll be a teacher and that's it. I just felt--I'm just a girl. Be what everybody else is and don't deviate. You know, stay in your little circle (giggles). Being a teacher -- I can't explain. It's just a secure feeling about it. You'll know it's there. Whereas, if I dropped out of school, say, to become a performer like some people do, the chances are I'd never get anywhere. I'm a realist.

I. What are your mother's views about premarital sex?

S. She doesn't believe in that.

I. How do you feel about it?

S. Again, I say if it's right for you, fine. I don't feel it's right for me. I don't condemn anybody.

I. What does your mother feel about drugs?

S. Well, they (parents) have a business. People come in -- young boys, girls, with their eyes glazed, half knocked out. This, according to my mother, isn't necessary--to walk around like this. She's right. It's not. I mean I don't get any pleasure talking to somebody who's high and looking at me half-crazy. I mean, I just don't see that. If you want to, you know, escape from your problems, I think there are less dangerous ways of doing it than taking LSD and other drugs.

I. How do you feel about marijuana?

S. I won't smoke pot. I wouldn't even dream of trying it. I'm not open minded -- it's true. I'm not going to say it's wrong. I won't say that. It may be right for them, but I just don't feel it's right for me.

I. Why wouldn't it be right for you?

S. I just don't think it would benefit me in anyway. That's saying something without even trying it, I know. But I just wouldn't bother with it. I don't know why.

I. What do you think young people are depressed about these days?

S. I don't know. I feel I'm not typical of young people.

I. Why?

S. Because like most of the people I know that are with drugs and things like that -- most of them, I don't know-- are trying these things because they're curious and they want to try new things. A lot of them have very genuine problems and they turn to these things because it's there. If I came from a broken home, if I didn't love my parents the way I do, and if I wasn't brought up the way I was, chances are I'd be with those people, you know. But I'd still never do anything. I don't care anymore about myself. It's this thing I have about my mother and father. They've done so much for me that even if I did something which was wrong and they didn't know about it, I'd feel that I did something wrong. Whether they knew about it or not, I couldn't live with myself.

I. Can you give me an example of what that might be?

S. Ah, take LSD -- something like that. Or sleep with somebody just for the hell of it. That to me is nonsense.

I. Would you ever consider marrying anyone outside your religion?

S. I feel I should go out with people who are not of my culture, not of my faith, just to become more openminded about it. But, for some reason I always tend to avoid it. I go where I'm sure I won't have to decide whether I should see somebody of so and so religion or whether I should stay within my own. Wherever I go there just happen to be people of my faith. This is just the way it is. It has nothing to do with prejudice or anything like that.

I. How do your parents feel about the war in Vietnam?

S. I really don't know. I've never even discussed it. My father thinks we should pull out of there immediately --it's enough -- all this killing and all those dead bodies. But they're very much against the freedom in this country. Let me phrase this right. Freedom is a wonderful thing, they say. This is what they hear. But lately, I think and they think, there's a little bit too much freedom here. You know? When it comes to burning draft cards, stepping all over the flag, and not having any kind of respect at all for the country you live in, that I think is taking advantage of freedom, if you know what I mean.

I. Are you talking, too, of protests that are occurring on campus?

S. Yes. It's not even safe to walk to class! Anything can happen! There's just too much. I mean there has to be a limit somewhere! Like my father is always saying how this would never happen in Russia. They'd be shot on the spot, all these people who riot, these instigators. People shouldn't be running around and screaming and yelling about how the

president is this and that, get rid of this and that, let's have a revolution. I mean, this country is in shambles! True or false? There's got to be some kind of order here!

I. How do you feel about the black protest?

S. If they have a legitimate gripe, fine. As far as the black people are concerned, they do have a legitimate gripe. But they are handling it in the wrong way -- what they're doing with the Panther party or whatever it is -- is not going to get them what they want. It's not. Because what they are looking for they're not going to get now anyhow.

I. How do you feel about Women's Liberation?

S. That's a lot of nonsense (laughs). I wasn't aware that we were being oppressed, to tell you the truth. I mean, I've had several approach me in school and say "We don't get this and we don't get that." Personally, I'm happy with what we do have. I don't think women should run things. I think women can contribute to society, but I don't think it's necessary for women to run it. I think it's a man's place to run it. I don't think we are being oppressed. I think we have very good jobs, and I don't think there's any reason to complain. I don't see it.

I. How are you different from your sister?

S. My sister is a typical teenager. I don't think I was ever a typical teenager. I grew up very fast. Very mature already when I was 14. My sister's going through all these phases--she doesn't like school, she doesn't want to go to college, she smokes cigarettes, she runs around with boys out of the faith. She's everything that I wasn't. She has a complex, there's no question about it, inferiority complexes. She wants to blaze her own trail. I don't think she's doing a very good job of it to tell you the truth. She is inclined to accept the standards of her friends. They take first preference over her mother and father. Whereas, I would listen first to what my parents say and second to what my friends have to say.

I. How similar would you say your values and attitudes are to those of your parents?

S. I am more my parent's child --more their child than I am a child of today's world, you know, I should have lived -- there are times when I think I should have been a country girl who lived years ago. Do you understand? I feel that I should have lived at a different time.

I. In the 1800's?

S. No, I'm not saying in the 1800's. Just in a different era

when there wasn't all this confusion and disorder and questioning. Everyone I've come into contact with has told me -- either they'll say "You're square" or "It's strange to meet a girl like you, there aren't too many left." Or they'll simply say "Open your eyes, you're not living in the dark ages anymore. It doesn't bother me. It did at first. Now I don't care very much. It's just the way I am I can't change, I mean.

I. How do you mean you can't change?

S. I really can't change my values. They're so instilled in me already.

Below is an example of a LNA subject who was given a rating of 5 on this variable. Her efforts to think for herself and to make her own decisions are crucial to her growing sense of autonomy.

LINDA (LNA)

I. What sorts of people does your mother admire?

S. She admires youth and people who work hard. And then who do something really groovy with what they worked for. She admires efficiency in production. That sort of turns me off a lot. She really admires industriousness. She admires people who are self-reliant.

I. What turns you off?

S. The whole idea of being industrious. I mean, I'm sort of lazy. I'm sort of different from her. I'm not so sure that there are such great gains to be made. I'm not so sure that if you work hard you really get rewarded. Maybe my feeling is that if you work hard, very often you just get to work harder.

I. You mean it becomes an end in itself really?

S. Yes. Also the things that this society has to offer people who work are not that great. It's sort of motivated by--this is just my feeling--something like guilt. I know if I would work very hard it would be motivated by guilt. My mother's really into this whole thing about how you have to struggle to survive. She sort of brought me up on the "Threepenny Opera". I have very mixed feelings about what she admires.

I. How did she react to your dropping out of school? (S dropped out of school for one year)

S. She didn't want me to do it at all. She had always talked to me about how if I was dependent on them for money I couldn't make my way in the world. Then I did something about it -- quit school because I was so tired of it and started working -- and then they wanted me to go back to school. But I sort of just told her, "look, this is my decision and shut up about it."

I. You're not happy being back in school now?

S. No. I really don't like it here. I feel sort of funny -- betraying myself by coming here. I don't want to be a student at all really. I'd sort of like to really drop out and do something completely different -- maybe have a craft.

I. Why did you finally decide to go back to school?

S. I was sick of the office. It wasn't meaningful work. Also last spring it was getting warm and it was time for me to start wearing sandals and I couldn't wear sandals to my office. I was completely bored by the place. The people were getting me down. And I really felt lonely to meet other people. I started getting jealous of my friend who was in school, instead of feeling superior to her. I just got sick of it and didn't know where else to go so I went back to school.

I. When you face a major decision or have to make a judgment about something, do you think about how your mother would feel?

S. In terms of school, yes. Moving out, yes. I think of how she'll feel. I don't necessarily take it into consideration as far as letting it influence me. I'll override it. But I'll think about it.

I. What kinds of conflicts went on about your moving out? (S lives alone in her own apartment)

S. She wanted me to be home so she could protect me and take care of me and make sure I would eat. She always wants me to get a good balanced meal and doesn't believe for some reason that I can get it myself. I think it really had a lot to do with her own feelings of loneliness, too. We had one very stormy session in which she started crying and I started to cry. She sort of gave me a real picture of something that was deep inside her -- from the point of view that she was an older person and she's always felt alone. I basically feel that that is just man's condition -- being alone. It's something you can feel unhappy about, but it's there and one has to accept it. Then I realized that like when you have a kid you kind of expect that here is someone who is going to

love you unconditionally. You know, I'm his mother. And what happens when they turn 15 and stop speaking to you and then they move out? She just felt abandoned. And it really tore my heart up. There wasn't much I was going to do about it though. I wasn't going to not become an independent person because of that. But it was a pretty stormy scene.

I. How do you feel about judaism and religion?

S. I have mixed feelings. This summer I was in Colorado and everyone else had long straight blonde hair and they were all tall and thin. They looked like they came from Kansas and Oklahoma. I'm very semetic looking compared to them. I feel like a New York Jew a lot too. Compared to the people I met this summer I was pretty happy to be from the kind of environment I was. On the other hand, I really can't stand Jewish Nationalists who think Israel is right no matter what and who think that the Black Panthers deserve to be put in jail because a couple of them made anti-semetic remarks. I'm offended by anti-semitism, but on the other hand, I really give support to the Panthers. I like going with Jewish guys, but I have gone with about 50-50 (half Jewish, half non-Jewish). I am also attracted to non-Jewish looks.

I. How do your parents feel about protests?

S. It's mixed. My mother is now much more establishment than my father. My father really supports the black struggle more than my mother does.

I. How about you?

S. My intellect and my emotions are all screwed up on politics. Intellectually, I feel that it's going to take violence to accomplish anything. Power doesn't respond to anything but power. And that if there ever is a revolution, it's going to be a violent one. On the other hand, I'm scared of it emotionally. Because I'm not willing to be a violent person. I'm afraid of violence. I was at a demonstration at Fort Dix and I got tear gassed. We weren't even being violent and we got gassed. It scared me. I'm cowardly in a way -- about letting my body get hurt. I saw this Bergman movie in March and it really affected me. Until then I'd been talking about violence but I really didn't see it so much as a bad thing. And although I have been involved with pacifist groups in the past, I had just come around to thinking -- well, violence is only practical. Pacifism is very nice but it doesn't really work. And I saw this movie and it really turned me off to violence. It makes you think-- really think about whether you're willing to be one of the people who treats other people like animals. It really scared me and impressed me. Also I started getting turned off to some of the left movement here. Like the people who consider themselves big revolutionaries.

I. You mean radicals like the Chicago Seven?

S. No. I really sympathized with the Chicago Seven. But when I went to a rally when Jerry Rubin was here the speakers would wait for everyone in the audience to say "Right on!" And that bothered me. It seemed they were treating us like robots. There are a lot of people who just go "Right on!" That's the same thing that the system does to you. That's what I want to get away from -- not being Pavlov's dogs. And I suddenly realized that I didn't have to feel guilty for not going along with what the left was doing. I could disagree.

I. How do you feel about the black-white conflict?

S. It seems some kind of lawlessness is happening in this city and it's getting worse and worse. It's on the part of blacks versus whites. I also see that the whites have institutionalized violence towards blacks. If I were black, I'd probably be a Panther. The prices that are charged to black people --that's violence. The fact that abortions up to now were illegal and yet the rat control law was not passed --that's violence. And to live the kind of life most black people have to live --that's violence of white America toward black America. And it's terrible. But I feel that being a white person I'm in a very funny position: because I don't have to really deal with that kind of violence. But I have to deal with the black violence toward the white, which makes me feel very much like a white. It's very painful.

I. What do you feel about the Women's Liberation movement?

S. Well, it's kind of done a lot for me. It's coincided with a lot of things that have happened in my life. It just came at the right time, you know? It happened and I feel it's part of me. It's made me love other women in a way that I didn't before. I sort of like 50% more people -- here are a whole 50% of the population (women) who I'm open to and who I'm happy to see and who I can have much deeper relationships with and that really means a lot. I feel, too, that it's put me in an existential position much more. I mean, I feel that I'm more aware that I have to face things. It's less easy for me to cop out of facing the reality of my own life, my own problems. I feel more than ever that I have to make my own decisions. You know, I used to fall very easily into the idea of well, I'll get married. Then I would have solved all my problems. And I always sort of looked at it as a kind of death. But now I realize I can't die. I've got to live. I've got to make some kind of affirmation. And I've got to make me a stronger person.

Variable 2. Openness to inner conflict.

What follows is an example of a HNA subject who was given a zero rating on this variable. The interview excerpts exemplify a girl who is uninterested in her own intrapsychic phenomena and who denies herself the experience of inner conflict. She imagines the resolution of her problems as having magical solutions and finds being alone rather intolerable.

SANDRA (HNA)

I. Do you dream often?

S. No. I hardly ever dream now. At least maybe I dream. But I hardly ever remember them.

I. Can you tell me a recent dream?

S. No. I don't think I've dreamt in about a year.

I. What about before that? Is there any dream you had a few years ago that you could tell me.

S. (Pause). No. I can't remember any.

I. You don't think much about your dreams then?

S. Well, It's not a matter of --there's nothing to think of.

I. What things about yourself worry you the most?

S. I don't know. I guess it would be the future --I'm very preoccupied with the future as far as what I'm going to do and getting married.

I. To your boyfriend --or to anybody?

S. To anybody, I think. Just the idea of being alone doesn't thrill me at all. You know, I guess it's very important to me to get married. But it has to be the right person. It wouldn't just be getting married to get married. But somehow I guess my worries really stop at getting married. Somehow I think that things after I get married will work out. Even though that's not the way things are.

I. What do you mean --even though you know that's not the way things are?

S. Just because you get married, you know, that doesn't mean you live happily ever after. There are plenty of problems, I guess--

I. But you don't think about those?

S. No. I guess when I get married that's when I'll think about them.

I. Do you have any problems with regard to sex?

S. No.

I. Why not?

S. Because like I guess I have no inner conflicts. I have certain morals and---

I. Where do your values stand with regard to premarital sex?

S. As far as for myself, it wouldn't work for me.

I. You wouldn't do it?

S. No, I wouldn't. Because I don't think I could live with myself afterwards.

I. Why not?

S. I guess maybe it's because of my background. My parents are, I guess, very puritanical and it's rubbed off on me. I don't say that it's wrong, I just don't think it would be right for me.

I. Do you ever feel though when you are with your boyfriend that you want to go further?

S. Yes.

I. So you do have a conflict about it?

S. No. It's not a conflict. It's just mind over body (giggles). Even though I know that I want to I know that this desire is not going to last and it's how I'll feel afterwards --that feeling is going to last. So I don't do it.

I. What do you get depressed about?

S. I'm not very happy with things as they are now.

I. What are you unhappy about?

S. I'm not very happy living with my parents. I have mixed feelings concerning my boyfriend. I'm unhappy about that. I don't usually feel dedicated to anything. I have no specific goals. Everything for me is very dependent upon if something else works out.

I. How do you see yourself resolving these problems?

S. I don't think there's anything I can do except wait it out and see if things get better.

I. What don't you like about your boyfriend?

S. Well, as far as ambition --like wanting to go out and get a job --he really has no desire. Because he's going to college and any money that he needs is handed to him on a silver platter. It's just that everything he wants he usually gets from his parents. He has no desire to go out and get anything and earn it for himself. I guess it bothers me a little bit and when I'm thinking about marriage I want somebody who's dependable and who's ambitious.

I. How do you feel he's going to get this way?

S. I really don't know. I just hope that as he gets older and as he matures he'll, I guess, put things in a different order.

I. Does he talk to you about his problems?

S. When he does get nervous usually there's nothing really that he can say about it. Because there will be no circumstance that will cause him to be nervous. He'll just get nervous usually when there's nothing wrong and everything seems to be going right. So there's nothing you can say.

I. Does his nervousness upset you sometimes?

S. Yes, because I've seen what nerves can do to somebody. A psychiatrist can come up to a lot of money. It can be very expensive. And, you know, he's (the husband) the breadwinner of the family. He's the man. He's supposed to be the strong one. At least more so than the woman. And it should be the woman who's leaning on him for support. It shouldn't be the other way around.

I. What does becoming independent mean to you?

S. Being independent --is not depending on anyone for anything. You'd be able to make it by yourself without any help.

I. With regard to everything?

S. You'd be able to support yourself and furnish yourself with all the necessities of life. And as far as being able to handle your emotions and your problems by yourself -- think things out for yourself instead of going to somebody else for help.

I. What problems do you feel you have around this issue? Where do you feel you stand?

S. As far as what?

I. As far as being independent according to your definition.

S. At this time -- right now I'm not independent at all. I rely on my family for basic needs and also for, I guess, moral support. And I do turn to other people when I do have problems. I don't think that I'm really able to work things out to that great an extent on my own. I guess I'm not independent.

Below are excerpts from the interview of a LNA subject who was given a rating of 5 on this variable. The examples illustrate this girl's openness to her own sense of psychic struggle as it relates to an ongoing sense of change and growth. What is also significant is her capacity to be alone with herself.

JUDITH (LNA)

I. Do you remember your dreams often?

S. Yes, I remember them.

I. Can you tell me a recent dream?

S. Yes. One dream I've had -- a recurring theme -- is that I had to drive a car. I wasn't really forced to -- not thrown into it. But I felt that I had to drive it. And I got in and didn't even know how to drive. But I knew that I would sort of make it. The scary part about the dream was the feeling that I had when I was in there. I always reached my destination. It was never like I was crashing all over the

place or anything like that. The main thing was just that feeling of myself forcing myself into that car. I had to do it.

I. How many times have you had that dream?

S. Two or three times.

I. Did you make anything of the dream? Have you thought about it?

S. Yes. I think it's symbolic of the way I view my life and situations: I'm in it. I'm sort of forced into it by myself. I know I have to do something. There's no way I can get out of it. I know I have to commit myself to life and do something. But yet there's an element of fear -- a feeling of an inability to do it -- a fear that I wouldn't be able to do it. But the thing is, I always do, you know? I always come out of it, as much as I feel I'm not going to, even though it's a struggle, I always do come out of it.

I. Do you go places by yourself?

S. Yes. There are some things that you like to experience by yourself, some things that you really can't share. In a museum I at times prefer to be alone, if there are certain things that I'm feeling -- because I want to experience it. You have to experience some things alone, that are really personal.

I. Did you have any close friends in high school?

S. Not close friends, no. I was going through a lot of things in my own head then. It was like the first time I started rejecting all the old values and I was in with kids who weren't going through something like this. They seemed to be satisfied completely. I think that's the thing that really marks it -- I was dissatisfied with what I was doing and in ways I wasn't fulfilling myself. I didn't know -- I feel I do now -- what my weak points were. And I was very introverted. I would sit around for hours and think about myself and my problems. And a lot of the problems I had were problems with social relationships.

I. How about now? Are those things still a problem?

S. Yes. I'm going to therapy now. I still have tremendous problems, but I sort of know where I'm at. In high school I sort of didn't. I kept saying "All these kids are different. Wait until I get to college. I'll meet so many different kinds of people. I'll be able to find some I like." And then, when I got to college some of the same patterns continued.

I. How do you mean?

S. I still felt cut off to a certain extent and unable to

get close to people --very close. So when I saw that, I realized that there was something in me -- I couldn't blame everyone else.

I. What would you say worries you most about yourself?

S. That's kind of hard. There are a lot of things. There are certain patterns that I know I have to change. It's usually with my friends. I feel I want to get close to someone and something sort of prevents it. It takes a pretty long time for me to feel that I can trust a person with my thoughts, my emotions. But it's something that I want very badly and I think I'm working on it. Another thing that worries me is that at times it's hard for me to want certain things and go out and demand them, go out and try to get them. And it's hard for me to accept them once I have them.

I. Like what?

S. Well, it's nice being dependent. It's safe. It was safe for me being a Catholic. Now I can't take that. When I know what it does to my self I get very angry. Because I feel that myself is being stifled.

I. What do you feel your self is being stifled by?

S. Well, I don't assert myself enough. And I know that I have something to offer. Yet it's hard for me to assert myself. I sometimes prefer being passive. And yet when I am, I come to a point when I realize that I am being passive and I know that it's not because I really want to. I don't always want to be able to control things and be very self-assertive, but I want to be able to do it and sort of accept both sides. Now I'm very conscious in a situation of two alternatives. I can assert myself or I can sit there, feeling uptight. And I think the thing that's really changed my attitude is that if I act, if I do assert myself, that action will have consequence. As tiny as it may seem as trivial as it may seem, it will have consequence. I don't always do it, but I do it a lot more.

I. What does becoming independent mean to you? How would you define it?

S. I think it's feeling that you have control over a situation yourself --somehow feeling that you can effect a change --even in just you. It's very hard, especially in our society.

I. How does your view of becoming independent -- how does that include others? How would you feel your relationships would be different?

S. I can't separate it. What characterizes my life now is a struggle for autonomy. I have to realize myself, find myself,

realize my potential, and then get rid of all those fears and feelings of inferiority at times. Then I think I could relate to people honestly. An honest relationship is very unusual. In our relationships, even what's considered a good relationship, I don't think it is. I don't think people are being honest. I think they'll hold back things for the sake of security or fear of hurting the other person. I don't say that you should hurt them, but I don't think that very often the things we consider to hurt people really do -- they're things you have to do.

I. For example?

S. If you feel very honest with another person, telling them what you want and telling them honestly what you think of them.

I. What do you think holds you back sometimes from doing that?

S. I think it's especially because I don't know what I'm really feeling at times. I don't really know what I want. And it's very hard to understand another person while trying to understand yourself.

I. How do you view yourself as resolving some of your problems?

S. Right now there are a lot of changes going on inside me and I can feel them. In my whole life. Now I'm getting involved in Women's Liberation. I'm going there to make friends with the kind of people I like -- people who are honest and dedicated to something. I know the people I've found there -- they don't judge -- they don't call you "perverted" or "messed up" or "neurotic". I really think it's very hopeful. First of all because it's an attempt by me to control my life and to define or redefine myself. I feel everybody talks a lot about oppression -- and how they're being oppressed -- and I did, too, for a long time. But now I'm getting up and doing something about it. What I do might not have too great an effect because it's kind of hard to make too much of an effect in this society -- but I am making an attempt to control my life and for me to say what I'm going to be, how I'm going to define it and how I'm going to be seen. I know it's going to take a long time and I get depressed every now and then. I guess I get hopeless at times. But somehow I know I can keep going, that I can endure.

Variable 3. Tolerance of friction.

The following is an example of a HNA subject. The excerpts clearly illustrate the sort of difficulty this girl has with overt expressions of anger. This subject was given a rating of 0 on this variable.

WENDY (HNA)

I. How often is there arguing and fighting in your family?

S. Well, the only fighting that there has been has been between my mother and my sister. Because I don't fight.

I. You don't fight?

S. No. I can't take any kind of fighting. It makes me sick.

I. What do you mean, it makes you sick?

S. Very sick. The first time I heard my mother and father fight was right before they got separated legally. And I got sick. I didn't get my period for nine months.

I. For nine months?

S. For ten months really. Really completely. It really upsets me. I don't like any kind of fighting. I get very upset if I have to fight with somebody.

I. Can you give me an example of what happens to you inside?

S. Oh, my stomach constricts. It really gets all tight. And I really get lots of pains. I usually don't cry. I never cry in public. I never cry in front of my mother. There was a fight between my mother and sister, a really bad fight. And I'm the one who has to stop it and everything. And I can't take it. Like I get all upset, you know, inside. It upsets my whole body really. Because you know, for me not to menstruate for ten months ---

I. What about the fight with your parents was so upsetting?

S. They never -- I guess they never had a fight before.

I. Why do you say that you can't take any kind of fighting? In what other instances have you been involved -- with your mother, sister or friends?

S. I don't fight with my friends. I usually talk with them. Like I don't think I ever fought with any of my friends.

I. Even when you were little? You never got into fights when you were a child?

S. With my sister -- maybe. But that was like sisterly fights. I don't think I ever got upset. I mean, fights with my sister were stupid things --like getting a drink of water or something. Nothing serious. But when I was a little girl I don't think I ever fought with anybody. I guess I had one fight with one of my friends once which wasn't upsetting.

I. What was that about?

S. I used to get a ride to school sometimes with her and she didn't wait once. And she came up to apologize to me. I had to walk to school in the rain and I got really mad and we didn't talk to each other for like three weeks. But that was the only person I think that I ever really really didn't talk to for a long period of time because I was mad.

I. Did you ever have disagreements with your parents when you were little?

S. Yes, with my mother. The first time I disagreed I got scolded.

I. What was it about?

S. I had disagreed with her in front of one of her friends-- about something she said. When we got back to the house she said to me, "Whenever I say something, even if it's wrong, don't correct me. Don't ever make a liar out of me." That's what she told me. Then I had to learn that there are certain times when you lie and certain times when you don't lie. And that was the first time I disagreed. I didn't like that too much. I disagreed afterwards, too, but I got spanked for it. I got spanked a lot if I ever disagreed with her.

I. Did you ever hit your mother?

S. No! I'd never hit my mother. I mean, that's ridiculous!

I. When was the last time you had a fight or an argument with your mother?

S. A real fight, like a disagreement?

I. Yes, where you were really angry.

S. I don't know. We don't fight. On, one time --I guess this was the last time --it was about four months ago. My mother gave my sister a hem to sew and my sister was sewing something on the sewing machine. My sister sewed the hem wrong. And I said to my mother, "You knew there weren't any pins in it and she couldn't have done it right. So why did you give it to her?" And she started yelling at me,

"Don't you tell me what to do," and stuff like that. And I got upset with that as a matter of fact.

I. What if someone does something to make you angry, what do you do?

S. Not too many things make me angry. Like, ah, I sort of accept a lot of things. I don't do anything as a matter of fact. Like, nobody has really done anything to make me angry enough to have a fight with them. I usually don't get into situations where that happens. That doesn't usually happen. I don't know. Nobody really bothers me. Oh, somebody might make a joke that I might not like --you know, it might hit a wrong nerve. And I might just not say anything and just sit there and not talk to them. And they'll realize probably that they said something wrong and they wouldn't do it again. But I don't say anything usually. I don't. I just let it go.

I. Do you ever participate in arguments in classes?

S. Usually not. I usually have to think about something like that before I'd say anything. I don't like to just talk off the top of my head. It usually doesn't come out right. You know, you'd probably say something that you really don't mean.

I. When was the last time you've been really angry at someone?

S. I don't know. I don't get angry. People don't usually bother me. I mean --they bother me, but nothing. Like usually I take it and I don't know -- I don't really get angry. The little petty things sometimes are not worth getting angry about.

I. How would you say you generally feel about arguments and disagreements?

S. I feel uncomfortable about it. And I also feel a lot of them are avoidable. The basic argument might just be based on semantics. Just on, you know, the way something is said. A lot of arguments are just stupid.

Below is an example of a INA girl who was given a rating of 5 on this variable. This subject has a rather lengthy history of an ability to openly express her anger.

DORY (LNA)

I. Do you remember as a child disagreeing with your parents?

S. Oh, yes, a lot.

I. What happened?

S. I'd be doing something they didn't want me to do and they'd tell me to go to my bedroom. I'd have a tantrum and kick the door of my room. I'd really get mad. They'd send me to my bedroom and I took it out on my dolls. I argued with my dolls.

I. How?

S. I think I used to pretend I was their mother. I used to lock them up. I had this big double bed and I used about this much (gestures) and all my dolls used the rest of it. I sat them up and made them listen to me argue with them like my mother. My mother would usually last (being angry) for about a half hour and then would forget it. My brother and I were so absurd when we were angry. We pouted in a way that was just hysterical. It used to make her laugh.

I. Were you a child who expressed anger openly with other children?

S. Oh yeah.

I. Do you remember how?

S. Fights. After a while it got to be too unlady like so my mother insisted that Mark (brother) fight all my fights with the boys. She said, "You can't beat up boys when you are 9 and 10." I used to just stand there and slug it out, just like in the movies (laughs). I did stop fighting the boys but I went back to it one time. I really got mad at this guy --I was about 13 and he was about 13 and I just beat the hell out of him. I was kind of shocked that I was still doing it at 13. But I was so proud of myself.

I. What was the fight about?

S. We had this swing out in the yard from this huge oak tree which has since died and gone its way. But we could go back to the stone wall and just swing out--we could swing out to the orchard which was in the back and it was the greatest thing. Only it was in our yard and we were very possessive about it. And no one could use it unless they were our friends. This guy in the neighborhood came over and just started using it and I just beat the hell out of him, you

know, for daring to come into our yard. And the thing was he was sneaky. He went out in the back field and through our orchard and then used the swing, instead of crossing in front of the house to the back. I expressed my anger.

I. Did your parents quarrel in front of you?

S. Yes, sometimes. They were direct.

I. Do you remember an argument they had?

S. They had an argument once when I was 6 or 7. I don't know what it was about, but I remember my mother throwing a plate of food at my father and then my father found this so absurd he started laughing. But meanwhile my supper was all over him. I was very annoyed about that. But my parents found it very funny.

I. Were you scared at the time?

S. No. I was angry. I mean I was about to eat this great meal. My brother and I had been talking. We would carry on our own conversations while they carried on theirs. But then they interrupted our conversation and then my mother got angry and threw the plate.

I. Did you participate in any of their fights or mediate them?

S. No. They both told us to mind our own business.

I. What were your feelings after an argument with your mother?

S. That I was right probably and she was wrong.

I. Did you ever feel guilty about having a fight with your parents?

S. Oh, if I was the one who was being bitchy then I felt guilty. If my mother was the one being bitchy she used to apologize to me, just like I would apologize to her if I was the one. If the person was clearly in the wrong then you were expected to apologize. When no one was in the wrong then you were expected to recover within a few hours because you can't stay angry that long.

I. Who did you feel was generally in the wrong?

S. My brother and I were generally wrong, but we were also generally the last to apologize. We were just too stubborn. My parents realized, you know, that when you're an adult it doesn't take that long to realize you're wrong. They would apologize faster. It would just take them a few minutes to come in and say, "I'm sorry this happened. Forget about it."

I. Can you tell me about a recent argument you had with your mother?

S. Yes --over whether or not my brother should get married. I switched over before she did. She said they should get married. I said they should live with each other. We don't have arguments that much anymore.

I. More like discussions now?

S. Yes. It's the same thing with my father or my brother. You wouldn't call them fights. They're just discussions. The fights seemed to turn gradually into discussions, I think, as I grew up. As I grew up, there were just less fights.

I. You said that you were more comfortable with school once you moved into New York City (high school). Why was that?

S. My greatest relief was being able to tell someone exactly what I thought of them and not have to worry about everyone else hearing about it. If you told someone they were a pain in the neck in the town where I was before, they'd have all their friends mad at you. And then it was a class war. It was really unbelievable. You couldn't say anything without five or six people getting involved. Everyone was very polite and hypocritical to everyone else. When I got to the city the school was large and maybe it was my age, too. My greatest relief was to tell people to go to hell if I was mad and not have to worry about having to draw up my allies while they drew up theirs and to see who's gonna win this, you know. People used to tell me to go to hell, too. It was freer. It was good.

I. How do you feel about arguing with your friends and boy-friends?

S. All right. It happens all the time.

I. When was there a time recently when you felt quite angry at someone?

S. Well, one of these girls I used to know was getting married. I hadn't been friends with her in some time. Our friendship had faded. And I was asked to go to her wedding. My mother said "you should go". I said "No." See, I thought it was very hypocritical. Her mother had sort of thought of me as a third daughter. So I went. I stayed through the ceremony and toasted them and talked goodbye to the bride and bridegroom and the parents. I said goodbye to her mother and she implied that I had no right to leave so early. She was like trying to tell me what to do. It was more the way she said it than what she said, which for some reason really ticked me off. I said, "What do you mean? 'How do I dare leave now?'" And I said,

"I'm going." And I left. I remember being quite angry.

I. Do you participate in arguments in classes?

S. Yes, generally.

I. How do you feel about disagreements in general?

S. They don't make me feel uncomfortable. Sometimes I just get a little tired of them. Like --when people get together on the subject of race, they argue and it sometimes get tiresome. Especially when people talk about religion. It tires me. I feel that arguments over religion are the most tiresome things that can possibly go on. Now music or art or a good movie --I find that exciting. Politics tend to make people stay where they feel comfortable. They usually never venture into any nuances. If you haven't heard the argument before, it can be exciting. If you have, it can be tiresome.

Variable 4. Self-Image and Defensiveness.

What follows is an example of a HNA girl who received a rating of 0 on this variable. This subject's unwillingness to be direct and open is clearly illustrated, as is the indirect manner in which she expresses hostility toward the interviewer.

IRENE (HNA)

I. What things about yourself worry you the most?

S. Worry me? Worry me?

I. Yes.

S. Oh, I don't know. Lately I've been in a very --what worries me though -- I don't know. Like I used to be very worried about little things and everthing. But I've reached the point --well, I'm much calmer now than I used to be, much more relaxed, you know. I don't know --nothing---

I. Nothing major worries you?

S. At the moment? No. I don't think so. No. It's quite possible that something might be bothering me but I just ---

I. You don't know what it is?

S. No. I'm sort of just disregarding it, disregarding it. I don't know. I'm not upset about anything.

I. What things do you like about yourself?

S. About myself? (giggles) Are these questions interspersed for any particular reason?

I. No, they're just mixed up.

S. Oh. What do I like about myself? I think I'm very lucky. But that's not really liking something about myself.

I. What do you mean, "very lucky"?

S. I don't know. I just think I'm lucky (giggles).

I. In what way?

S. I don't know.

I. You mean in things that happen to you?

S. Yes. Things just turn out good -- you know, they always turn out all right.

I. How would you say you are different from your mother in terms of morals and values?

S. I suppose we always think in terms of like you're a carry over from her --

I. What do you mean?

S. Well, I guess you always picture your parents as conforming to ideals -- you know, as being good and righteous or something. (S. keeps playing around with the microphone with a spoon. She is eating yogurt. This makes some of the dialogue rather difficult to hear. While told by I. to please stop playing around with the microphone, S, for the main part, continues doing it.) And you have this strict code that they brought you up on. But you sort of realize --well, how do I differ from my mother -- I mean, really?

I. Don't put your spoon so close to the microphone, please. It will pick up the sound so that we won't record properly.

S. Oh. (giggles). I suppose that I sort of, you know, I don't really --well, maybe -- I don't know--maybe I feel a more relaxed attitude toward some things. Even something as silly as --well, my sister got a bikini and my mother goes "Oh, you shouldn't wear it." I mean I feel I wouldn't think twice about it. I mean, certain things are more accepted today.

I. What role does your mother feel friends play in a person's life?

S. What role does she think? Am I supposed to be projecting my own image?

I. Yes --what you think about her.

S. I mean, does my saying what she thinks --is that indicative of what I think?

I. Not necessarily.

S. Because I was just wondering. Ah --I really don't know.

I. What kind of people does your mother admire?

S. What kind of people does my mother admire? Ah--I don't

know. She's very sociable. She's not sociable in the sense of like going out to the movies every night or going to see plays. She does things but she just sort of picks up people along the way. You know.

I. What kinds of things do you talk to your mother about?

S. What do I talk to my mother about? (laughs) I don't know. Whatever I feel like talking about.

I. What kinds of things would you be worried about that you'd go to your mother about?

S. I don't know. I guess it also depends on who is at hand. I have a tendency to discuss things with my sister.

I. Your middle sister?

S. Yes. If I was upset about something. I don't know. What would I specifically talk with my mother about? I don't know. Anything I guess. I mean just depending on if I'm in the mood to talk to her about it.

I. What does the marriage relationship mean to you?

S. What does it mean to me? Well, I guess it's the most fulfilling of all relationships. It's you know, having like your husband who you could always talk to or who you could always do things with, share things with. It's --there are probably two levels --intellectual level and emotional level. Well, ideally, it should be the most fulfilling you know. I'm all for marriage.

I. Would you like to have children?

S. Yes.

I. How many?

S. It's really funny, because somebody was really seriously talking to me about this population explosion. I don't know. I suppose four sounds like a good number. I like kids. I don't know. I'll have to see what happens.

I. Have you ever disagreed with a teacher?

S. Yes.

I. Can you give me an example?

S. What exactly we were discussing?

I. What you said, what he said --

S. (drops spoon --very loud noise) Ooops! (laughs) No. I can't really remember having argued. They were just discussions about things going on in class. I don't know if you're referring to something like that or to like an intellectual -- I don't know.

I. How would you characterize your parents' quarreling?

S. Let me see, how I would describe it? Well, my father's very fidgety. You know, he'll sort of nudge my mother to get something done. I suppose it's low-keyed, I guess. I don't know. It's not a matter of you know like everybody going around screaming at each other, calling names or something, what I'm sure must go on in other people's homes.

Below is an example of a LNA girl who was given a rating of 5 of this variable. Her interaction with the interviewer was characterized by her genuineness.

PATRICIA (LNA)

I. You say you feel you've changed in the past couple years?

S. Yes. I've been thinking a lot more --about myself in relation to other people. And when you're alone, you know, you think a lot. You're not forced to, but sometimes you admit things. Admitting to yourself certain things is a big step. Like I was always told that I shouldn't be jealous. So I said, "Well, okay I'm not (jealous). You're not supposed to be so you're not." But then I was thinking about some things and like I thought, "What's wrong with it? So I'm jealous." To admit that to myself was a big thing. You see all kinds of feelings that you have when you think about it.

I. Like what other feelings?

S. Well, like the stuff they put across on media --they show these things that are supposed to be typical. You know, like 13 year olds dating and stuff like that. And I never did that. I barely go out now. But going out at 13 is supposed to be typical and it makes you feel atypical. But really when you think about it, what they're showing to be the norm is not. Like everyone is supposed to have these sexual feelings and everything. And the feeling just didn't come over me to want to be with boys when I was 13. It was just not the way things happened. And then when I would think about wanting to be with boys the opportunity wouldn't come up very often

and so then I would say I didn't care. And I'd feel better again. But the thing that I admitted to myself was that I was almost terrified to be with a guy. I wouldn't know what to do if anything happened. I didn't admit to myself that I was terrified until last year.

I. What led you to admit it?

S. I guess I was just being overall more truthful with myself. I took a good look and saw I was really scared.

I. Are you still scared?

S. Yes. But not as much. I think I'm beginning to feel a little more comfortable with myself. I'm beginning to like myself more.

I. What things about yourself worry you the most?

S. I'm never sure how someone feels about me. I guess I need to be loved or something. I'd like to be really sure how someone feels. So that I could feel that the little things they might say or do shouldn't mean that much to me, as they sometimes do. That bothers me. And I worry about my weight. I guess the thing now that really bothers me is that I've never had any intimate sexual contact with anybody and I don't know how I'll be able to react if it comes about. I really don't know how I feel about sex. It's scary because I don't know how I'm supposed to respond. Typically, everybody's supposed to know everything, And I know nothing.

I. Do you like people who are open?

S. I like them to be. But right at the beginning I can't be. I'm being very open in here but I also know it's anonymous. And it's good to say things like this. Because there is a big difference between thinking something and saying something, I think.

I. How do you mean?

S. It's a big step to think something, to admit it to yourself, but then to really say it to somebody is even a bigger step.

I. What do you feel is important to you when you're talking to a friend?

S. When I'm telling something to somebody I'd like them to listen. I don't think I babble, you know. I think when I say something I'd like somebody to pay attention to it. Because I'd pay attention to them. I like people to be sincere. I don't hate very many people. But there are a couple of

people I can think of who I really hate. And their insincerity is just phenomenal.

I. How do you feel in situations when you meet new people?

S. Usually uncomfortable. But it used to be much worse. Now I try to be more jovial and outgoing and that sort of eases the situation until you get to know the person and then feel a little more at ease. I do talk more. When I would first meet a person a couple of years ago I would sit almost frozen. Now it's a lot easier.

I. What do you think got you out of it?

S. I think it's the whole business with knowing myself better. Any they're not really that important --not all other people. If they are your type of person something will happen. And if not, it doesn't matter. There are some people who I want to like me and some people I don't care if they like me or not.

I. Everybody doesn't have to like you?

S. No. Not everybody.

I. What role do you think friends play in one's life?

S. They're very important. When I think about the few I have, it's really sad. Because friends are a way to do what I'm doing now. Of letting my feelings out --of laughing and crying. When you don't have something like that, it's frustrating.

I. Can you tell me a dream that you've had that you've thought about?

S. Well, this one was kind of embarrassing. I haven't told anybody about this, so consider yourself privileged (laughs).

I. I do.

S. Well, seeing as I've never really dated that much or had any sexual experience, I had this dream. I don't remember that much specifically about it except that I was in what I considered to be some sort of sexual act.

I. With a man in the dream?

S. Yes. I don't know what it was. But I just remember that I was breathing very heavily. I felt excited by it. It was funny about that, too. When I first thought about it, I said to myself, "Why are you dreaming something like that?" I didn't feel guilty about it though. I said, "I guess it's just something that happens." According to my Catholic

upbringing I'm not supposed to dream something like that. But I do. Everyone does. I realized that it's just normal.

I. What would you like to do after you get married, assuming someday you do get married?

S. I think I'd like to do work in whatever field I go into. Children --I'm not too sure about the way I feel about them. I don't know if I would have them. I would want to have kids, I think, but not too early.

I. What are you unsure about?

S. I don't know if I would have enough patience to deal with them. You have children and they sort of upset the whole order of things. It sounds like a very selfish thing to say, but I think there are so many unhappy children because their parents aren't ready for them. They have them and just let them grow up --let them exist. They let them live but they don't really love them that much.

Variable 5. Gratification in diversified interpersonal experience.

Below are excerpts from the interview of a HNA subject who was given a rating of 0 on this variable. This subject's relationships are characterized by their lack of openness, narrowness and extreme dependency.

NANCY (HNA)

I. Do you remember your first day at school?

S. No, not at all.

I. Well, tell me about elementary school. How did you like it?

S. I cried every other day. No, really, In second grade I cried because I couldn't fold a paper.

I. What was the incident, you you tell me more about it?

S. All I remember about it was that there were instructions to fold a paper and I know I didn't understand them and I started to cry. I didn't know how to do anything and I cried.

I. What happens when you cry (now)? What does your mother do?

S. Nothing.

I. She doesn't say anything?

S. No. Like I never talk to her a lot. I don't know. Everyone in my house is like that. We're all like emotionally involved but like we don't talk at all. Like I know I am very very close with my brother and I never never speak to him. Never.

I. You never share each other's worries?

S. Never. I don't know. Like everyone in our house has like barriers. They just never tell anyone what's bothering them and we never know.

I. Do you have any idea what the barriers mean or how they came about?

S. No. But everybody's got it. I know I never know what's going on with my mother. I have never seen her crying, except on her birthday. But I know if it was up to her she wouldn't have wanted me to see her crying. It's a type of thing that we all know we love each other. I really really love my mother and I know she does me, too, but we just don't say anything to each other. Like she was never the type to kiss me hello or kiss me goodbye. I mean even now if I went to kiss her I don't think she would want me to. It doesn't matter because I am a lot closer to her than a lot of people are to their mothers anyway.

I. How are you close to her if you can't talk to her?

S. Like it's just certain things I don't talk to her about. Maybe it's because I know that about certain things she would have to suffer along with me and I never wanted that. I just never wanted her to, you know, feel bad. But I spend more time with my mother than anyone.

I. Did you have any special friends in elementary school who you were especially close with?

S. Yes. A club. Six girls. We all used to be friends and we would go to parties.

I. Are you still friendly with them now?

S. No.

I. How did you like junior high school?

S. I loved it. We had the same kids in the class for three years. By the time we got to the ninth grade we were so close. Like if anyone got into trouble we were a class, like we were never just kids. Those were like really important years and I think we all have a sort of stability from the group because you knew that you were never alone. People were always behind you, always with you.

I. What sort of backgrounds did these kids come from?

S. All from the same background.

I. What was the background?

S. They were all Jewish. We all lived right in the same neighborhood. Academically, it was about the same. Most of them were studiers and most of them acted the same.

I. How did you like high school?

S. I hated it. It was just like a lot of people, and teachers. And like you weren't a class anymore, you were just people. I was without a group in high school and I never like to be without a group.

I. What kind of qualities do you look for in close friends?

S. I think a person who would care about me and not that only, that I would feel that I would do anything for them. Like my close friend--there is very little I wouldn't do for them. Most of them I have become very friendly with are all very emotional.

I. How do you mean?

S. They all take every type of emotion very seriously. Like if they're really happy, I know that I can be happy with them. If -- I know if my best friend will start to cry then I'll cry also. I'm like very emotionally tied with all my friends. They can't go through any type of emotion without having an effect on me.

I. Do you feel you can help your best friend when she has a problem?

S. Help? No. I become too emotionally involved. If she's depressed, I get very depressed.

I. What role do you think friends play in a person's life?

S. Pretty important, I think. Well, I know like me --when I first started school here I was really dying and now I know that I have my friends. I think that friends are like a basic security.

I. What does love mean to you?

S. One hundred per cent trust in friendship.

I. Are most of your friends now Jewish?

S. All of them are Jewish.

I. Do you date different guys or the same one?

S. I really don't go out that much.

I. Have you ever gone out?

S. Not really, no. It never really came.

I. How do you mean?

S. Well, I went out maybe once in the tenth grade but I never really liked someone who I wanted to go out with. I liked people and they didn't like me or people liked me and I didn't like them. But we never got together.

I. How would you feel about going out with guys who aren't Jewish?

S. I don't really care. The thing is, if I knew the boy wasn't Jewish I just wouldn't go out with him. It just isn't worth it to start. Because I know my cousin went out with a Christian boy and they were about to get married and when it came to the time she just couldn't do it. Their parents had a lot of hesitations, not because they didn't want her to marry him, but just that they were afraid of the problems. Now she is graduating from college and I know she is looking for someone all over again. My mother used to always talk about this. And I know that she worries all the time. And I just wouldn't want to start the same thing.

I. How quickly do you feel you form opinions about other people?

S. Not very quickly because I always like everybody.

I. How do you feel in situations where you are meeting people for the first time?

S. Generally I'm having trouble. Like if I am with a group of friends then I can be the outward one and talk to them. If I were alone I wouldn't be able to talk at all.

I. Why?

S. I don't know. Like I have to have security all the time and there are just some things I wouldn't do.

I. What does marriage mean to you?

S. I don't know. Well, the thing about marriage is I worry about convincing myself that I love somebody because you have to know that you're going to be stuck with this person for the rest of your life. Because it seems like getting a divorce would be like the hardest things for me. I don't see how I could change my life all over again.

I. You mean a divorce would mean a loss of your security?

S. Yes. I want to know that I love this person all the time. I'm afraid that even if I marry someone just for the security then I would be afraid to be divorced because I would lose the security.

I. What kinds of qualities would you consider important in a husband?

S. Intelligence -- for security.

I. Why?

S. Because if I know he is smart, smarter than me, then I have the feeling that he knows more than I do. I want to look up to him and realize that if I didn't know something then he would. I know I am not politically aware. And living in this world now --I would hope that he would be because I would be so scared just living on my little knowledge in the world. Just to know that he knows a lot more than I do. I'll have someone to turn to who's going to know more than I. I don't want to ever feel that I have the most power because I don't feel I have very much power.

The following is an example of a LNA subject who was given a rating of 5 on the interpersonal variable. Her relationships are characterized in particular by their openness, depth and variety.

KAREN (LNA)

I. Do you remember your first day at school?

S. Yes. In kindergarten. I wasn't afraid to go. I was close with my mother but I wasn't clinging. I went in. I was a little frightened at first. But some kids were screaming for their mothers. As soon as they walked out, I adjusted, I think. I liked playing with the other kids.

I. What specific things can you remember about your mother--things that you did together?

S. Well, she always talked to me --like a mother and like a friend, too. She never just talked to me like a baby. She would talk to me and ask me things --this was mostly when I

was older. And she would listen to me --to things I would say. We were very close. I feel she allowed me freedom without just trying to be my friend.

I. How do you mean?

S. You know --like some parents try to be very hip and swinging and they put on a big act and she's never done that. She's been my mother. She's always been there when I needed her --whatever it is. Even though sometimes I'll go to Bob (boyfriend) --I know she's there. I think that's important. It was important to me as I was growing up and it still is.

I. Did you have any special friends in elementary school --close friends --whom you remained friends with?

S. Yes. I have this girl who I'm still friendly with. She lives up the street from me. In each class I made a new group of special friends. This girl remained close though. She travels in different circles sometimes than I do. But we still talk to each other. We can still go to each other whenever we have a problem or something's bothering us.

I. How many close friends would you say you have now?

S. Four that are very close.

I. What qualities do you consider important to have in close friends?

S. First, they have to care about other people, not just themselves. Most of all, they should be understanding and open. Openness is very important --to be able to speak about anything --and the way you feel. If they are a good friend and I'm a good friend to them, they should be open. Because if you're close to each other you definitely have to have that, I think. If you're not close, then there won't be any openness. I couldn't talk to just anybody off the street and say, "Well, I have a problem, listen to me, help me." I want to go to somebody I care about.

I. Do you ever feel nervous meeting new people?

S. Oh, yes. You go into a place where you don't know anyone and you sort of feel alone and worried. But I get over it when I think they're not out to get me or anything. They're just people and they must feel the same way. And because of that, I'm just going to talk. If they don't want to talk to me, I'll talk to somebody else. And it works. I don't have that many problems about it --not since I decided that if I was going to be that worried and close myself in a corner I wasn't going to get anywhere. And I'd be pretty miserable, too.

I. How quickly do you feel you form opinions about other people with regard to liking them or not liking them?

S. Well, I form some impression right away. You can't meet someone without having some idea. But afterwards, when you know a person, it usually hopefully changes. Because an outside impression isn't always right. Somebody I might like at first, at getting to know them better, I won't like. And sometimes I see someone and I say, "Oh, I don't like her." --right away. And then I meet her and she might be in a class of mine and I'll get to know her and she's a nice girl.

I. What do you like about yourself?

S. Well, I feel I'm aware and I like that about myself. I can talk on most things. I like that. I can get along with all kinds of different people. I like talking to someone who has opinions on a lot of different things and who reads the paper, but I have friends, too, who when I start talking politics get very bored. I guess you'd call them apolitical. But I get along with them and like to talk to them about other things. I mean, it's very hard to find other people who will agree with everything you say. I like the fact that I feel open to other people. And that I can find something in someone that I can communicate with.

I. Were you dating other boys before your boyfriend?

S. Yes. I had gone out a lot, starting in the ninth grade. I always went out a lot --a few months with that one or this one --or a few at a time. Nothing serious. But it helped me. I learned a lot from guys I went out with and from friends I stayed with.

I. Can you give me an example of something more specific in terms of how you've grown from knowing different people?

S. I learned how to cope with different personalities. I think I've changed my opinion toward different people. I have this one friend -- I still speak to her. But she's very close-minded about a lot of things --politics and racial situations -- and I really like to talk about that. When I was younger I didn't think that much about these things and we used to get along just on a kind of surface thing -- we liked the same kind of music and going out with the same kinds of boys. But now I really figured that I can't do that much with her anymore.

I. Would you ever consider marrying anyone who wasn't Jewish?

S. I guess if I fell in love with someone who wasn't Jewish -- if it happened, it would happen. I always said that to my mother. I wasn't going out with the attitude "I want a non-Jewish boy, come here!" But if it happened and I fell in love with him, and he was the kind of person as Bob --whatever

religion he was, I would marry him anyway.

I. How do you feel about having dated one guy now for quite a while and that you're thinking of getting married? Do you have doubts about it?

S. Yes. I have really questioned it. I have thought about it. Especially last year when I knew I was getting serious. So I went out with other guys. I never told Bob we were going steady. I always said, "If I want to go out, I'm going to go out, and if you feel you want to go out, you go out." It was always open. Well, it (dating other guys) just wasn't the same. Other guys I went out with were well off and they were too impressed with themselves. Bob isn't. He's genuine. That's rare. And I knew it. We were able to talk so well. I feel I can say anything to him that's bothering me or bothering me about him. I think I want to get married and spend my life with him. We've been going out so long that we see each other in all different phases and different moods --like when he's in a terrible mood or I am, we help each other out of it. We don't think any less of each other for it.

I. What does love mean to you?

S. Love is something lasting. Love is happiness, sadness, it's everything. It's feeling mostly. Honest feeling. Not having to keep anything inside. It's physical. It's emotional. It's mental. Every part of you is love when you feel it, when it's real. It's a hard thing to describe. You say it and hope the other person understands it. But when it's real, they do understand it. When I tell Bob I love him it's not just like a four letter word that everyone uses right now.

I. You mean you feel "love" is a word that's being thrown around a lot?

S. Yes. Everyone says you should love everyone. That's impossible. You can't love everyone. You don't get along with everyone. Everyone doesn't care about you, or you, them. You can understand, you can like, you can get along with people, which is good. But you don't really love them. Maybe somebody does. But I can't.

Variable 6. Physical independence.

The following is an example of a HNA subject who was given a rating of 0 on this variable. In most ways she is still extremely physically dependent on her family and does not seem to be motivated to become more independent.

IRENE (HNA)

I. During your elementary school years did you enjoy being with your family more or your friends? Who did you spend the most time with?

S. My family. To a certain extent I relied upon them to do something, you know. I suppose I would have taken more initiative to say call up a friend or something, but since there was always something going on in the house, I didn't very often take the initiative. I suppose to a certain extent my family was security for me.

I. Who does the cooking in your house?

S. My mother.

I. Do you eat most of your meals at home?

S. Yes, on the average, yes.

I. Who does the washing and ironing?

S. Well, we have a maid. But my mother does most of it.

I. You don't do your own then?

S. No.

I. Whose opinion do you rely on in choosing your clothes?

S. When I choose my clothes? My own.

I. You go shopping by yourself?

S. No. Well, like dresses -- I go to a store in Brooklyn and I usually go along with my mother and sister.

I. Does your mother have similar taste to yours? Would you like something she would pick out for you?

S. Yes. I guess for the most part our tastes are the same.

I. Who takes care of cleaning your room? Do you have charge of that?

S. Well, I make my own bed usually. Though if I don't my mother will make it.

I. Can you describe an argument you've had with your mother?

S. An argument? I suppose generally they just tend to be about her not having done something that I wanted her to do.

I. Like washing your clothes?

S. Yes. Or not having fixed something for me. I might come home and I might be in a rotten mood, you know and just not like anything there is for supper, you know.

I. How do you feel about going places by yourself --like a movie?

S. I wouldn't go to a movie by myself.

I. Did you ever give any thought to going to an out of town college?

S. No. No.

I. You just didn't want to?

S. Well, I didn't really want to that much.

I. Why?

S. Well, I don't know. I was coming from a very small school. In my graduating class there were only about 57 kids. It was something different just the very fact of going to City. So for the moment that seemed enough. Plus the fact that my parents didn't want to send me out of town.

I. Why was that?

S. I suppose for religious reasons. And it's just that I myself didn't want to go that much.

I. Have you ever given any thought to having your own apartment and moving out?

S. Not really. I mean, well I could very well see that I'd like to go to Israel next year or something. But living in New York isn't the greatest place. And it's not just a matter of --well, like, maybe it is like going along with my parents and getting married.

I. Like what?

S. I don't know. I haven't really thought of moving out or something. I guess I would be married and then leave or something. But I don't know.

I. You wouldn't consider moving out before you married?

S. Not if I was in New York I wouldn't. Actually it depends on when I got married. I mean I could reach the point where I would want to be out on my own, where I wouldn't want to depend on my parents. But not at the moment. I like where I am.

I. Would you consider moving out after you graduated from college?

S. Well, I wouldn't, but --like I could very well see myself picking myself up and say living somewhere else. But it is just the fact of New York is really terrible. I can see myself living in an apartment with some girls and stuff, But I don't know. I suppose on the one hand it's convenient where I am now. It's also because I've never really thought in terms of like having a job and really having to support myself. There's never been a need for me to really be trained for something. Probably when I get out of college I can't do anything.

Below is an example of a LNA subject who was given a rating of 4 on this variable. In several ways this girl is in the process of weaning herself from her family in a physical sense.

HELENE (LNA)

I. How physically independent do you feel you are from your family?

S. I feel very independent in my family because all I do is like sleep there now. I've broken off a lot of ties --like money ties. They pay the rent and the food but I'm paying for the whole college bit. And for my clothes. I'm independent from them in my work. And I feel more independent in other ways from them. I think differently from them now. I'm not afraid to think differently. Really independent would be getting away from there, so I guess in ways I'm dependent on them still.

I. Have you ever given any thought to moving out and having your own apartment?

S. That would mean working a lot more and I don't like working

at the kind of jobs I get now --a salesgirl or something. I don't like the punch card thing and the boss always around. I don't know if I could work enough to move out. Or if I could, I would have to go to school at night if I wanted to stick with school. If I was going to leave here (home) the first thing that comes to my mind is being able to get a good job so I can take care of myself. I always wanted to go to college so I could get a job and learn how to take care of myself. I've thought of moving out and living with John (boyfriend) --things like that. I don't know how that would work out. To me, as soon as I'd start living with him it would be like being married. I was going to say we could live together and not get married, that kind of thing, and see how it works out. I don't know what would happen, but maybe we would be happy that way. I'd just live with him.

I. When did you start working?

S. I've been working all this school year, I started working in high school when I was 16. I worked for a summer. They fired me because I took 4 days off after working all summer. It was a terrible store. The meanest people you could think of worked in that store. And then I waited awhile and that November I walked all up and down Fifth Avenue going into stores looking for a job. I found a job in a shoe store.

I. Do you spend most of your spare time with John now?

S. Yes.

I. You say you have to cook the family a meal at night because your mother works at night?

S. Yes. And I don't like it. She says we need the extra money and that's why she's working nights and so I'll cook the dinner. But I'll complain. I wonder why she doesn't get a day-time job. I just get angry at her. I feel sorry for her but I also get angry at her. So four nights a week I have to go home from school and cook. And she tells me I don't do anything.

I. You feel you do enough?

S. Yes I do. I feel that my room is mine. I take care of it. And I don't want to cook for them. I don't feel I belong to them anymore. I don't feel I want to clean for them. I just don't feel it's my family. John feels more like my family. And I want to take care of things with him. I don't feel like taking care of them. I didn't have my brother and I don't want to take care of him. My father's not my husband, he's her husband and I don't want to take care of

him. I wouldn't keep my house the way she keeps hers --- I think it's a mess. I'm not saying my house is going to be spotless.

I. Do you feel you'll be close to your parents in about 15 years?

S. I feel kind of worried about it. Most of the time -- until I started feeling the way I do --my family was very close. My cousins and relatives always came for the holidays -- Christmas and Easter. And I don't feel like that anymore. I don't feel like going and getting together. I look to them like I'm totally outside. I don't really want the closeness right now. Maybe I will feel differently when I get older.

I. How do your parents react to your not wanting to be close?

S. Lots of times they hit me with I'm "neurotic". They say things like that. I go upstairs to my room a lot. They don't even ask me if I have a test anymore. They don't care about my school work. They'll ask me, "Why are you going to college?" Even my father who's educated will tell me, "You're not worried enough about babies or cooking." Both of them tell me this. They tell me I won't know how to take care of a house. I don't want to tell them that I'm not really worried about it with John. I've cooked his meals and I can do it fast, too. And at night they watch TV and I don't like to watch TV anymore. So I go upstairs. And they say, "You're neurotic. You don't talk to us anymore."

I. Do you feel close to your parents at all?

S. I guess I still feel close to them in ways. But when I'm away from them --like I'm with John and his parents are away --we make dinner, go shopping, do laundry together, go to the park. I don't miss my family a bit then. I feel very good.

I. Why did you want to go to college?

S. I didn't want to just work 9 to 5. I wanted time to do other things. Paint or write. I wanted a chance to have my own time. To use my own time. I think I would like to teach --English.

I. Did you ever give any thought to going to an out of town college?

S. I wouldn't have been able to get there money-wise. I sort of feel like I'm more independent at home. I can work. I can go out when I want to, things like that. I don't have to live in a dorm. If I went away to college I might be confined to one room with one roommate. I feel I can get around here, go to various different places.

The Fantasy Measures (TAT)

1. TAT Autonomy.

As a group, the TAT stories of LNA girls contained significantly more themes of a struggle for autonomy than did the stories of HNA girls, whose stories more typically reflected themes of submission to a given situation or an acceptance of a symbiotic solution.

What follows are examples of stories of HNA and LNA subjects which are representative of high and low autonomy.

Card 1 (boy with violin)

HNA (low autonomy)

His parents are giving him violin lessons. He seems to be --he seems to have been just told something by them about playing the violin and he seems to be thinking about it. He seems to be trying to figure out what he's been taught so he can play. But first he has to think about what he's been taught. Only then could he play it.

LNA (high autonomy)

His mother's making him take violin lessons. He doesn't want to take violin lessons. He's debating the course of action he should take --to play or be defiant. He's contemplating it quite deeply.

Card 2 (farm scene, girl with books in foreground)

HNA (low autonomy)

Should I just tell what I see? This lady on the right seems to be the mother of the lady on the left. She's pregnant --going to have another child. The man in the field seems to be directing a horse across it. The girl --school girl --is carrying books. She seems to be very sad for some reason. The lady on the right seems to be thinking about something meditative. Looking out over the world. I can't tell a story like this. Maybe the girl is sad because she'd like to be like the lady on the right. Like her mother --to be married and have kids and stuff. She'll get married soon. The pregnant lady will have a healthy child.

LNA (high autonomy)

First of all, this girl doesn't seem to fit in. Everybody seems to be at different places in their minds. This society is sort of hard working, the situation they're in. The girl in front is fantasizing, dreaming hard about leaving. The other woman is fantasizing but not in the same way. She looks content, sort of her mind is just drifting with no place to go, whereas the younger girl has sort of a goal.

Card 7GF (maternal figure with little girl)

HNA (low autonomy)

I don't think the child should be looking away from the mother unless she's looking away to fantasize on what the mother is reading to her. The mother is reading Grimms Fairy Tales and from the mother's part there seems to be so much love involved, and from the child's part, too, in a way. Just by holding the doll and playing house, trying to be like the mother in some ways. This is something a mother and daughter would do some afternoons, just take time to be alone together and communicate, which I think is important. Before this the mother was doing housework and the girl was just playing near her.

LNA (high autonomy)

Looks like the little girl is very bored with whatever her mother is telling her. She's reading her a story or the Bible or something. The little girl couldn't care less. She'd like to be a thousand miles away. She probably has religious parents. She wants to say, "Oh, mother, leave me alone! I don't want to listen to you." As soon as her mother's finished, she'll probably walk away. She looks like she'll probably go off for a walk --go someplace by herself. She looks like she wants to be alone.

Card 12F (old woman with younger woman)

The two figures --one is the mother-in-law of the other -- resembles her a little bit --but she's not her mother. She's making life very difficult for her daughter in law. I think the mother in law is very happy about it. Maybe she didn't want her son to marry or she just doesn't feel she likes her enough to get along with her. The mother in law seems tricky, very cranky. The daughter in law is very sad. She's thinking "What should I do about her? How can I make her like me and treat me a

little better?" I don't think she'll reach a solution because it's very hard to make someone like you who hates you. She'll just go on and on and keep trying to get along with her mother in law until she dies or goes into a nursing home or something. She can't do anything because you can't change people.

LNA (high autonomy)

It's a boy and his grandmother. The boy is grown up a bit and he's taking care of his appearance. Grooming himself well. Looks like he spent time combing his hair. He's talking about political ideas and social change. The grandmother is thinking, "What am I going to do with this kid?" She thinks he's funny, doesn't take him seriously. She thinks he's going to end up with conventional views once he passes through this stage. She's wrong. This kid is going to stick by his views.

2. TAT Openness.

In general, TAT stories of LNA girls were significantly more open and undefensive in style than were the stories of HNA girls.

What follows are examples of stories of HNA and LNA subjects which are representative of "low openness" and "high openness".

Card 1 (boy with violin)

HNA (low openness)

It's a little boy. He's sitting at the table in a chair. Do you want a big story? (Repeat instructions.) He looks pensive. Um --I don't know. Maybe he's interested in learning how to play, but I don't know.

LNA (high openness)

He looks like he has to take violin lessons and he doesn't want to and he's sitting there just sort of dreaming whether to pick it up and play. He probably will but he's just sort of putting it off for awhile. He looks kind of disgusted, too. He looks introverted and kind of

intelligent and he feels sort of slighted. He won't play for long. Eventually he will stop taking lessons. He wants to become interested in something for himself.

Card 3BM (figure slumped on floor)

HNA (low openness)

Hmmm--I'm taking an art class --let's see, what does it look like? I can't tell if it's a guy or a girl or --anyhow, it looks like it's seeking comfort, crying. I don't know. I don't know what this is in the corner here. I don't know.

LNA (high openness)

I see a girl who has tried or maybe is contemplating committing suicide. And there seems to be some kind of weapon --a gun, next to her. Maybe she was thinking suicide was the only way out for her but now she realizes she couldn't do anything like that. She's in a state of despair at the present moment because she doesn't know how to solve the problems she has. She seems to be saying, "Oh, what am I going to do?" She seems to be fairly young.

Card 12F (old woman with younger woman)

HNA (low openness)

I saw this card in the textbook. An older and younger woman. I don't know if they're related. I don't know how I'm supposed to build a story around this picture. I really don't. They're looking in different directions. (Shrugs shoulders and pushes card to one side.)

LNA (high openness)

I'm really not sure what I think about this one (pause). It's a daughter and her mother. I think the mother has a witch-like face. She might be trying to hold on to her daughter. The daughter's pretty old. I don't think she's married. Their story doesn't fit the faces exactly. If I were to follow this I would say that the daughter wants to be free of the mother but can't break away. The mother's face is strange --it has a smirk like look. The daughter has her eyes in a sideward glance. She wants the future for herself. The mother's eyes are looking in the opposite direction. She might be going back to her past when she was a little girl. The mother expects the daughter to stay be her and the daughter doesn't want to. That's it.

Card 14 (figure silhouetted at window)

HNA (low openness)

Hmmm --it doesn't make much sense. Usually if you're in a dark room with an open window the light rays will come in and light up the room. Hmmm--it doesn't hit me.

LNA (high openness)

He seems to be mulling over some kind of problem. Maybe he's in a whole house full of relatives he can't stand and he just has to go off by himself and get some fresh air. It's only a temporary thing. He's going to leave soon. He's just looking out at the sky for some inner peace because he feels confused about the day's events. And also he doesn't feel he knows who he is and what he's going to do. He'll probably go back downstairs pretty soon. He feels a little relieved having spent a little time alone.

3. TAT Expressions of Hostility

LNA girls were significantly more direct in expressing hostility on the TAT than were HNA girls, whose expressions of hostility tended to be either indirect (covert or intro-punitive) or absent from their records.

Below are examples of stories by LNA subjects which contain direct expressions of hostility, followed by examples of stories by HNA subjects where hostility is expressed either covertly or intro-punitively.

LNA subjects: Direct expressions of hostility

Card 18GF (two women on staircase)

A. I think this is a family picture. I think it's a daughter fighting with her mother. She's becoming very violent for some reason, and the mother can't do anything. She looks like she's quite a bit older. The daughter is almost crying but is very angry and her hands are grabbing at her mother.

B. To me it seems like this girl is strangling her mother. I'm going to make you think I hate my mother. She has an extremely bitter hatred. From the outline, I imagine her mouth to squirm in pain. The daughter has forced her mother against the bannister and is strangling her. It could also be that the daughter walked in and found the mother dead. But the position doesn't fit. If she found the mother dead, she'd be carressing her head and her facial expression would be different. The first story fits better because the tenseness in the girl's arm doesn't go along with carressing. I think it's more an act of bitterness against the mother.

C. This woman looks like she's choking the other one. They may have had a fight and the woman got angry. It moved her so that she had to take violence. Looks like she's choking her for something she said. The one doing it doesn't look like she really hates the other one -- she just looks like she was very angered by something that happened.

HNA subjects: covert expressions of hostility

Card 18GF (two women on staircase)

A. This is a woman and she's found her husband. I think he's dying and it's the last time she'll see him alive and she's trying to show him that she loved him. She's sorry that he's dying. That's it.

B. A picture of a woman with a sad remark on her face --she's the mother or sister of the other woman who's sick and nearly dying. She's wondering about all the happy times they've had together.

C. This lady here whose face we see looks very grief-stricken. Looks very sad. I guess the person she is holding has died or is sick --something like that. She looks very sad. The lady seems very sympathetic and is like saying, "Poor --whatever her name is --why did you fall sick? You had your whole life ahead of you." A person seems to be coming down the stairs because there's a shadow on the lady's face. Maybe going up the stairs because the shadow's going the other way. Her hand is misformed --crooked --I don't know why. The person sick seemed to have had a spell or a fit or something. From the look on the other person's face she won't get better, Maybe she'll get worse. Because if it was just an epileptic fit or something, she wouldn't look so sad, so horrified.

HNA subjects: intropunitive expressions of hostility

Card 3BM (figure slumped on floor)

A. She looks like just a very tired sufferer. I don't even know where she is, but it looks like she's looking for rest somewhere, the first opportunity for rest from what's on her mind. The object looks like a gun that dropped out of her hand. She may have been trying to escape from what was bothering her, and that may have been a better escape than laying down her head. I can't tell if she did kill herself or fell out before she did. I hope she just kind of fell out and is thinking about what she's going to do, but she may have killed herself.

B. The first thing I was going to say is this figure -- don't know whether it's a boy or a girl --it's either sleeping or crying, but I see a pistol on the floor. Maybe the person just killed herself --himself --either that or the person is just thinking about doing it and doesn't know whether to or not. Very depressed about his or her life. If the person --he or she--hasn't already killed his or her self, he or she won't. (Why depressed?) I have no idea. Maybe the person had trouble in his family --or financial problems. I really don't know. Maybe she had trouble with her husband. Maybe he beat her or something and she doesn't want to go on living. But I don't think she'll kill herself. I don't know that she won't. I hope she won't. Most women don't have enough courage to do that.
