

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

73-2830

BLUVOL, H el ene, 1936-
DIFFERENCES IN PATTERNS OF AUTONOMY IN
ACHIEVING AND UNDERACHIEVING ADOLESCENT BOYS.

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

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

  COPYRIGHT BY

H EL ENE BLUVOL

1972

**DIFFERENCES IN PATTERNS OF AUTONOMY
IN ACHIEVING AND UNDERACHIEVING ADOLESCENT BOYS**

by

Hélène Bluvol

**A dissertation submitted to the Graduate
Faculty in Clinical Psychology in partial
fulfillment of the requirements 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 Clinical Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

June 26, 1972
date

Herbert Kachin
Chairman of Examining Committee

6/26/72
date

Walter Weiss/tn
Executive Officer

Professor Max Hertzman

Professor Irving H. 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 the members of my committee, Professors Max Hertzman, Herb Nechin and Irving Paul for their cooperation in expediting this dissertation.

It is a great pleasure to express my appreciation to Professor Max Hertzman for the many ways he contributed to this study. He taught me to experience people directly; he generously gave his time, encouragement, and support; he helped to clarify some of the problems and shared with me the excitement of discovery. Just as important, to work closely with him has been a gratifying moving expansive experience.

My thanks also to Anne Roskam for rating the T.A.T. protocols; to Carol Yahr, my assistant who did the tedious pre-selection of subjects with intelligent efficiency and good humor; to Mrs. Trudy Feintuch, Psychiatric Social Worker who made it possible for me to get subjects; to Mrs. Elinor Tolbert, Chief Librarian and her staff for giving me space to test subjects.

The boys who participated in this study were most cooperative, interested and willing to involve themselves. Their curiosity, kindness and liveliness was heartening; my special thanks to them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Underachievement, An Aspect of the Struggle for Autonomy.....	1
A. Evolution of the Problem.....	1
B. Statement of the Problem.....	18
II. THEORY AND RELATED RESEARCH.....	24
Autonomy.....	24
Open Struggle for Autonomy.....	31
Abdication of Autonomy and Protection of Autonomy.....	34
Academic Achievement, Underachievement, Autonomy and Related Research.....	40
Autonomy, Conformity and Underachievement...	54
III. PROBLEM, HYPOTHESES AND TESTS USED.....	59
Problem and Hypotheses.....	59
Test Used.....	61
A. Rationale for a Study with the T.A.T..	61
B. The Crowne-Marlowe (C-M) Scale of Social Approval as Predictive of Conformity.....	64

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

Chapter	<u>Page</u>
IV. METHOD.....	69
Subjects.....	69
Procedure for Subject Selection.....	69
Administration of the T.A.T.....	72
Administration of the Crowne Marlowe Scale..	73
Measurement of Variables.....	74
A. Variables Derived from the T.A.T.....	74
B. Variables Derived from the Crowne Marlowe Scale.....	82
Treatment of Data.....	82
Reliability of Scoring.....	83
V. RESULTS.....	85
Patterns Contributing to a Differential Organization of Autonomy in the Two Achievement Groups.....	85
A. Autonomy.....	85
B. Protective Pattern.....	87
1. Isolation.....	87
2. Symbiosis and Isolation.....	91
3. Self Division.....	93
Correlational Analysis.....	97
Conformity.....	100
Relation of Conformity to Patterns of Autonomy.....	102
VI. AMPLIFICATION OF THE STATISTICAL RESULTS THROUGH THE PROTOCOLS.....	108
The Underachievers' Pattern of Autonomy.....	108
A. Outstanding Features of the Autonomy Pattern in Underachievers.....	108
B. Underachievers High in Autonomy With Respect to the Entire Population (N = 14).....	113
C. Underachievers Relatively Low in Autonomy with Respect to the Group..	115
The Achievers' Pattern of Autonomy.....	117

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

Chapter	<u>Page</u>
VII. DISCUSSION.....	124
Patterns of Autonomy.....	124
A. Summary of Quantitative and Quali- tative Results.....	124
B. Centrality of Autonomy to the Re- lative Success of Achievers and Underachievers.....	127
C. Critical Comparison of the Findings of this Study to Orientations in Previous Studies.....	131
Autonomy and the Need for Social Approval...	136
Suggestions for Further Research.....	142
Implications of Findings for the Therapy of Underachievers.....	143
APPENDICES.....	146
A. SCORING GUIDES.....	146
B. CROWNE MARLOWE QUESTIONNAIRE AND PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE.....	159
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	162

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Sample Composition: Grades and Ages.....	71
2. Reliability of Measurement.....	84
3. The Struggle for Autonomy.....	86
4. Goals Self-Instituted.....	86
5. Isolation.....	88
6. A Comparison of the Isolation of Achievers and Underachievers with Autonomy Levels Held Constant.....	88
7. The Struggle for Autonomy in Isolation: Mean Isolation, Cards 1 and 2 for Stories with Autonomy Scores from 1-3.....	90
8. Isolation Compared to Isolation with Respect to the Struggle for Autonomy: Card 1.....	90
9. Symbiosis.....	92
10. A Comparison of the Number of Boys with at Least One Symbiotic Story in Each Achieve- ment Group.....	92
11. Loss Theme.....	94
12. Self Division.....	94
13. Patterns of Autonomy.....	96
14. Signs of Underachievement.....	96
15. Intercorrelation of Autonomy, Isolation and Self Division.....	98

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd)

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
16. A Comparison of Within Groups Correlation Coefficients.....	99
17. Mean Crowne Marlowe Score.....	99
18. The Struggle for Autonomy of the Eight Highest and Eight Lowest Crowne Marlowe (C-M) Scorers in Each Achievement Group.....	101
19. A Comparison of the Eight Lowest C-M Under-achievers to the Eight Lowest and the Eight Highest C-M Achievers with Respect to Autonomy.....	101
20. Distribution of High and Low Need for Approval (HNA, LNA) Achievers and Underachievers with Respect to the Four Critical Scores.....	104
21. Patterning of Signs in High and Low Need for Approval (HNA, LNA) Achievers and Under-achievers.....	106

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Underachievement, An Aspect of the Struggle for Autonomy

A. Evolution of the Problem

For the past ten years I have been a therapist and tutor for bright adolescents who are failing or succeeding minimally in school. These girls and boys come primarily from financially secure or wealthy families and are enrolled in private schools. Their parents highly value school success and often little else. Some of these children, however, quietly gave up academic success a long time ago while a few actively rebelled against it as they entered adolescence. They all felt more or less consciously that scholastic achievement was not within their province; it didn't properly belong to them. Nevertheless, they all had to pay a penalty; they experienced themselves as dumb and unacceptable and they felt better when they managed a good grade.

The paradox of a child choosing not to relate to academic work or some facet of it and then feeling a failure not only in school but often in almost every other area was particularly impressed on me by Wendy, an unusual 13-year-old girl. She wrote vividly but only on themes which interested her. She

was especially adept at accurately recreating a scene in all its concreteness and aliveness. She was a powerful, sensitive sculptor, a painter and a violinist. While she was mediocre in most academic subjects, arithmetic was a disaster. She remembered that trouble had started after second grade. She felt "naturally dumb" with numbers and by the time she came to work with me, she hated and feared them. She felt humiliated amongst her peers for being "stupid." Even though she gained some satisfaction from her artistic work and got recognition for it, it came to mean little. In times of discouragement and hopelessness all her accomplishments turned to dust and she was simply the "naturally dumb" girl. It became clear to me, and then to her that she could not appreciate herself till she became competent with numbers and from then on her progress was rapid. As her panic diminished and I helped to refamiliarize her with arithmetic, we discovered she was not only not "naturally dumb" with numbers but she easily discovered and grasped numerical relationships. She then remembered that arithmetic had been easy for her before third grade and she had simply stopped learning at that time. The decision had been unconscious while consciously she experienced difficulty in learning and finally she convinced herself that she was incapable by nature to understand arithmetic. Neither Wendy nor I really understood what motivated this "refusal."

I was trained to look at the academic failure of these intelligent children as stemming from learning difficulties rooted in unconscious emotional conflicts; i.e., as a special expression of neurosis, and to understand these neuroses within the Freudian framework. Though the nature of our work--dealing with homework, teachers, schools, parents--made it plain to my colleagues and to me that the life situation influences the course of the learning disability in important ways, we focused primarily on the intrapsychic conflicts viewed in Freudian terms. The "wrongness" was within; the influence of the external world was minimized, at least in our theoretical discussions. The puzzlement was that often the way we worked with children did not seem to me to genuinely connect with our theoretical discussions. However, it was true that learning disabilities were rampant amongst our students. They couldn't concentrate, they couldn't think, they couldn't get themselves to study or to understand even when they wanted to do so.

It was easy to understand Robert in this light. He was a 16-year-old, outwardly extremely obedient, proper and on the side of every adult dictum. He was failing every single course in spite of a very superior I.Q. and even though he admired and wanted success. He believed adolescents had no right to their opinions and that the trouble between children and parents

was that "children didn't obey." I was appalled by this attitude especially when I realized how profound it seemed to be. We read a poem contrasting the aliveness of a young man at home in the woods with his dogs and with the expansiveness within himself to the deadness of his ambitious, money-seeking elders. Robert, spontaneously and with conviction judged him to be a lazy drifter who would never amount to anything. At times, he would attribute his own failing to his laziness so that his identification with adults was by no means what it appeared to be. It seemed then that what made the difference in our work was paying attention to a hidden or underplayed side of him. I began to see it when he related his successful efforts at watching more television than his weekly quota. He would announce he was going to do his homework, leave his father in front of the TV set and tip toe back into the room to be uncovered much later. He told this with infectious glee and enjoyment. True he enjoyed putting one over on his father, but I was more impressed by his sense of mischief and his sense of humor. From then on, for a long period of time, he spent at least 10 or 15 minutes each session recounting his exploits. His school work improved enough for him to pass all his courses but not much more until he experienced consciously his right to his own opinions and to his anger. Yet even then he was typically himself in confronting arbitrary authority. He had to

wear a tie to school dances. He wanted to wear a turtle neck and he did. When he was about to be ejected, he insisted he was following school regulations and disclosed the tie underneath his turtle neck. At this point, he experienced such regulations as a big farce.

I felt then that what had made treatment successful was my understanding and valuing the almost secret mischievous boy who was nothing like the unconscious caricature of a staid adult. Some of my colleagues were not satisfied with this explanation. After all, they said we're all sympathetic, understanding and accepting of our students and patients. What had I really done? At that point I could not take it any further although I insisted that my paying attention to his mischievous side rather than his obedient side offered us a way to work. His ambivalent attitude to independence, the wish and the fear to best his father, his fear of open rebellion, and aggressiveness were not the core of the problem although certainly related to it. As Robert was getting ready for college, another boy added to my confusion.

Jon, almost 16, was the opposite of Robert. He was in active rebellion against his parents, his teachers and society. He was angry, negative, worked sporadically, used drugs and sold drugs. Until he was almost 14, he described himself as an "unbelievable idiot." He was like a "little child"

with no opinions of his own, accepting his mother, his father and the "system." His observations of his parents and society were acute and his criticisms often just. Yet, at the same time, if a teacher scorned his long hair or his poor work, he made the implied indictment his own. He did not notice this process but became more angry, more negative, more contemptuous, more rebellious and his work became poorer. While the poor work was an expression of defiance and not caring, it seemed to me to further his dependency, to tie him up with everything he hated. Reflecting on this process merely led to angry denials and continued externalization of blame. His behavior had all the earmarks of a power struggle, of a struggle for independence and his very anger and passion made me feel it was a destructive struggle for his very soul. In a panic at the thought of once more failing 10th year math, Jon screamed that it would be my fault if he failed and if he passed then I was a good "shrink" and a good teacher. I told him if he intended to remain ragefully locked in with his mother he would fail and if he really wanted to find his own way he'd pass; and so he did, brilliantly.

I could not then reconcile his conscious struggle for autonomy to his unconscious usage of this struggle; this struggle in effect served to tie him further to his mother. I was disturbed because it seemed contradictory that obedient Robert was unconsciously saving part of himself through failure while Jon in conscious active rebellion remained locked into what he hated through failure.

At the same time a study by Hammer (1961) of adolescent artists had the same disturbing effect on me. Adolescents, whose work was judged to be original and creative by their teachers, showed themselves to be autonomous in many respects on projective tests and interviews. As a group they are inner directed; i.e., they do what matters to them even though it may go against what matters to their peers or to adults. They are open to the full gamut of their emotions and can tolerate contradictions. They are open to both the pleasant and unpleasant aspects of reality without defensiveness. As artists they are original and productive. They can tolerate frustrations, discouragements and overcome obstacles. In contrast, adolescent artists, judged merely facile, lacked depth of feelings as well as tolerance for intense and negative emotions. Their dependency needs were acute and they tended to be compliant and in need of peer and adult approval. The creative and original adolescents described themselves as observers on the side lines of life. Their contact with people was barren, distant and cold. While they are in touch with their emotions, value their individuality and nourish it through their art work, they are emotionally isolated from others. As I see it, their autonomy is achieved through isolation so that they must fear closeness because it may endanger their feeling of separateness. Some of Hammer's material is suggestive. One boy reacts to a

domineering parent with fear of slavishness. As a group, they feel more strongly rejected by their parents than the merely facile but react to it by cutting themselves off from their parents while the merely facile tend to submit to parental pressure. The merely facile are more emotionally responsive to others, but their contact is superficial in another way. They tend to feel empty and need the stimulation which contact provides as well as the approval. Indeed they differ as to autonomy. Yet it disturbed me to find the creative adolescents so isolated. I could not view their autonomy as genuine when it was remiss in so important an aspect or achieved at the cost of isolation.

An unusual boy, Tom added enormously to my understanding. At 18 he was still almost a year away from a high school diploma because of repeated failure. He was the youngest of four, the family's school failure and yet the mother's favorite. She described him as sweet and responsible. His father, hard-working and aloof was open in his intense disappointment with Tom's lack of success. Tom felt dumb. He had always done the minimum of work and as far back as 8 or 9 quietly resisted his teachers and various tutors. He'd gone to Catholic schools through the first year of high school and especially resented being disciplined through physical force or through humiliation. He started to reject his church when his priest tried to pay him

for his services as a choir boy at his grandmother's funeral.

At that point of his life, he was motivated to get help because he wanted a diploma and college to avoid the Vietnam war. Otherwise, he would have preferred to explore and experiment full time with photography, a serious and engrossing hobby. Yet he was pained by his "stupidity." He too, described himself as an observer rather than a participant in life, but he yearned to engage himself and couldn't. His reactions to his school work and his teachers were illuminating. He was failing Chemistry for the second time and asked questions which indicated his estrangement from the subject. For example, when chemists made hydrochloric acid: "where did they get the chlorine? the hydrogen? what did they look like? how did they know that combining them would produce hydrochloric acid?" Such questions made his teachers impatient and he understood that they wanted him to stop asking such "dumb" questions. He complied but couldn't make sense of chemistry and couldn't stand to study meaningless material. His questions meant to me that he was the kind of person who needed to be familiar or intimately connected with what he learned. I conveyed this to him together with my appreciation of his particular way of learning. I started to familiarize him with chemistry and he quickly took over on his own in all school subjects.

Part of Tom realized very early in our work that it was

not his stupidity which led to failure but nonsense learning and resentment. His resentment expressed itself in a specific fashion. For example, he'd written a composition sensitively describing his apprenticeship as a sailboat sailor, climaxed by his feelings of mastery, triumph and exhilaration on first sailing alone. His teacher criticized the ending stating that an adventure or a voyage would have been a more fitting climax. Tom was angry that a difference of opinion should lead to a lower grade, but he said nothing to his teacher. He couldn't talk to him. I had to point out that it went beyond a difference of opinion. In his story, given his description of what was important to him in sailing, a sea voyage would have been a false and artificial ending. He had been true to his own feelings with his ending and it came across vividly. He had done an excellent job in describing his increasing mastery, its importance to him as well as his increasing relatedness to the sailboat, and to the sea. He couldn't engage in a discussion with his teacher because he didn't appreciate himself and instead his resentment led him to withdraw and guard what was his own as if he was afraid to lose it. It was the same when it came to speaking out in class. He was afraid to be laughed at because he wasn't really appreciative of his own contributions and questions. In this context, he was easily able to notice and give up various self-protective attitudes

and behaviors as they applied to school work. For example, he was a poor speller and often got around it by using only words he knew he could spell. He had been convinced he was born that way but in the period of our work described above, he angrily stated he wasn't going "to lose his freedom" to spell as he wished. All I had to do was to point out he had the choice to his private spelling or to good written communication of his thoughts and feelings. It was for him a new way of perceiving the situation. He had always valued good writing and he improved his spelling rapidly. Nevertheless, he was astonished that the advice of teachers to make up a list of misspelled words, to study and to use them worked while it hadn't in the past. I had to remind him there was no real mystery or magic at work. He had decided he wanted to become a good speller and he let learning take place. He described his new way of studying. He would open himself up to the material and let it come in and "make friends." All these years of resisting learning had left untouched and undistorted his unusual capacity for receptive meaningful organic learning. He could do a paper by absorbing his material, working it out within himself and writing it out in one draft as a whole.

Tom was amazed for months that it was he doing good and excellent work, learning so easily and joyfully. At times when he became depressed and felt a failure once more and incapable

of understanding some specific material, he'd remind himself that all he had to do was to open up and it invariably worked. At first he was angry at his parents lack of appreciation for his newly rediscovered powers. They still reacted to him as if he were a "lazy" failure and nagged him to do his school work. His temptation was to stop working because it felt to him at times that he worked for them since he wanted their recognition. But, he also and primarily wanted it for himself; he enjoyed school subjects for their own sake; he was immensely satisfied and gratified by the receptive meaningful connectedness to his work and he liked his increasingly good grades. So it was not hard for Tom to give up expressing his anger and his separateness from his parents through failing. I think that his parents early lack of recognition of his new way of learning helped him. It gave him a little more space in which to become cognizant of his individuality and separateness and to come to appreciate it without being defensive or protective through withdrawal, passivity, anger, depression and guardedness.

Tom was unusual in still another way. As he laid down his armor at school and his success solidified he stopped being an observer altogether. Not only did his circle of friends widen through his increased ability to show himself as he was without inhibiting fear of ridicule or hurt but also his friendships deepened. His sensitivity in photographing odd aspects of

objects spread to showing his feelings for old houses and for people. He became open in his struggle with his parents and siblings without losing his specific sensitivity to his mother. He clearly saw her attempts to keep him her eternal baby and her peculiar dissociation. She "floated through the house like a ghost." He no longer had to protect himself by withdrawing but could assert or state his needs, his desires, his wants while remaining sweet and loving.

Working with Tom made clear to me that his early passive negativism and his later passive withdrawal served to preserve his sense of self, of separateness, of autonomy. This non-engagement did not pervade every part of his life. He could, for example, grapple and involve himself in learning to sail a boat and enrich his sense of self in the process of gaining mastery in its handling. The kind of schools he attended served to make school work alien to him. Their teaching methods, their discipline, their lack of comprehension of what is meaningful to a person like him, contributed to his cutting himself off and in the process saving that part of himself which needed meaningful receptive poetic connection. His parents and siblings likewise through their emphasis on good grades, on school achievement regardless of what crushing of his sensitivity and self would result reinforced his withdrawal and guardedness. How could he learn to appreciate himself under such circumstances?

But preserve it, he did, though at the cost of failure at school, painful feelings of inadequacy, and of too great an isolation in his personal life. His yearning for warmth, tenderness and engagement which undoubtedly blossomed in his close connection to his mother who loved him specially as her last baby had to be pushed aside but was also a potent motivation for change. Still the rapidity with which he gave up his armor, his observer's position is extraordinary in my experience.

Matthew, a 15-year-old I saw shortly after my work with Tom ended, further illustrates how school failure can serve to maintain or protect autonomy. Matthew started to do poorly at school around 4th grade. He was never outstanding in school like two of his brothers nor artistic like the third. However, his mother guiltily pointed out that he was especially adept socially with many friends and the most considerate and responsible of her sons. He was perhaps the closest to her but she was upset and guilty at her negative reactions to his lack of outstanding achievement. She complained that he did little work and hid his school difficulties and failures till it was too late to get him help and he didn't seem to care. As far as she was concerned only unloved children reacted this way and she was puzzled because she did love him. Both she and her husband were highly educated and very bright and most appreciative of intellectual or artistic achievement.

Matthew, when I saw him, was in danger of flunking out of school. He had failed algebra once and was in danger of failing English and Latin. He had tutors and even tried therapy. The tutoring didn't help and he left his psychiatrist after a half dozen sessions. He did want help. He was interested in a career in anthropology or history and he knew he'd have to overcome his writing handicap as well as pass all subjects. His written work was confused, disorganized and his grammar and spelling very poor. In contrast, he was highly articulate when he spoke. In addition he couldn't concentrate on school work, though he wanted to.

For these adolescents who cannot at the beginning bring up problems, starting with school work is ideal. As mentioned they are passive, withdrawn, guarded and aloof and only vaguely aware of what bothers them, if at all. Above all, they don't want to reveal themselves. So Matthew and I first worked on grammar at his request. He caught on so easily and applied his knowledge so effortlessly, I couldn't detect any learning disability. He was pleased and I was puzzled. I enjoyed his presence--he looked to me like a reserved but warm bear--and I liked his witty though cutting sense of humor. He struck me as a decent boy quietly and actively involved in the peace movement. He told me he couldn't work with a teacher he disliked. He couldn't stand teachers he experienced as arbitrary

in their discipline or who ridiculed or whose approach to material made no sense to him. He could work with more ease if he liked a teacher. However, though he liked his English teacher, he couldn't write. On the one hand he could not express his aggression or rage, on the other it seemed as if his work could either be a gift, or a withdrawal from his teachers. Could he only "learn for love" (Eckstein and Motto, 1969)? I'm tempted to say quite the contrary, but that's not correct. He didn't learn for hate either. The issue is more subtle. It was love and approval offered to him on the basis of self-betrayal which was unacceptable.

By the 6th grade Matthew was being considered for the accelerated program in a public junior high school. This was important to his mother and to him though in an ambivalent manner. He needed a minimum average of 85 to be accepted and he wasn't working much. His average all year remained a few points below 85. There was fierce competition among his peers. Those with high grades taunted him with the specter of non-acceptance. It hurt, but he worked no harder. He was accepted into this program and his chief tormentor who had a high average was not. He understood then that I.Q. must have been the determining factor. His was high, as well as those of the students accepted into the program. It reinforced his already formed notions that the school system was riddled with hypo-

crises, unfairness and absurdities. He found the competition for the program distasteful and his own acceptance ironic. Something in his tone as he reported on this made me say, you have too much pride and sensitivity to wrest your success from someone else's failure. He agreed vigorously adding in a pained voice, "but why must I always get the wrong end of the stick?" I pointed out that, of course, he would fail or do poorly as long as he equated good work with demeaning himself through the acceptance of a distasteful system. His mother also offered him love and recognition on the basis of school success. The latter touched a sensitive spot in him too. He couldn't understand why each time he brought home a bad report card his mother would exclaim, "but Matthew, I love you." I simply told him he knew very well what she meant and had been acting on it all these years. It felt to him that her love was in part a response to outstanding achievement regardless of what it would cost him and he had too much pride to accept it on such basis. This awareness became the turning point of treatment. Matthew came to terms with his own desire to learn and do well as separate from his mother's wishes for him and as separate from the competitiveness and absurdities of the school system and of some of his teachers. It was enormously helpful that he was now in a private school so unregimented and so open to a variety of point of views that he sometimes jokingly complained

of being deprived of the need to rebel. His sense of humor helped him cope with the inevitable meaningless teaching he sometimes encountered or with courses he had not much interest for. He was quite clear in his rejection of many of the values held by our society but no longer afraid he would betray himself if his interest and theirs happen to coincide at some point. He could then concentrate on homework for longer and longer periods of time. He could now understand explanations even from his hated math teacher or work out his own solutions. Very quickly the level of his writing came to match the level of his oral articulateness with minimal academic help from me. Unlike Tom, the improvement did not flow to other areas. His sense of humor also served to dilute his own intense feelings and while he had many friends, he was not really involved with any of them. He barely noticed his personal detachment. His school success had solidified and he was ready to end treatment. It was only as we were winding up treatment that I perceived the beginning signs of emotional thawing and I hoped life experience would encourage and sustain it.

B. Statement of the Problem

It is clear these adolescents will not work "for love" at the cost of self-betrayal. Most of them know only one way to avoid self-betrayal--through withdrawal, aloofness and school failure. Jon is the exception. He woke from an obedient child

state to full blown open rebellion which in secret kept him still an obedient child. While there is no doubt he was struggling for self-definition on his own terms, the form of the struggle was reversed. He fought openly and sabotaged himself in secret. The struggle was quite different in structure than the one I usually see. I do, on occasion, see mixtures of both with the passive, self-denigrating form predominating.

For most of the adolescents I see, school success is experienced, though seldom in a focused fashion, as the main avenue of loss of autonomy and it is invariably found together with isolation of the self. They may have few or many friends. However, there is no genuine contact. The other person is in a variety of ways kept at a distance. Achievement can and does become a self-betrayal because it is at some level felt as alien to the self. For Robert, success would have meant crushing the last bit of aliveness left in him; for Tom, to disconnect experience and feeling from knowing--he was utterly incapable of doing this; and for Matthew to become absurd and inhuman. Achievement would have meant the rejection of aspects of their own experience which were important to them: aliveness, connectedness, intensity of feeling and human values. In the very process of keeping alive these potentials, they become detached, passive, uninvolved and isolated. The hope remains

that somehow, autonomy will be achieved in the future. In the meantime, it is protected rather than expressed or lived out. Not being in the open, their selves do not get the chance to grow through contact and confrontation with reality. Laing (1967) expresses the dilemma succinctly, "...without the inner, the outer loses its meaning, and without the outer, the inner loses its substance (p. 33)."

School achievement can, on the other hand, be an outcome of at least two distinct processes. It can be a valid and genuine expression of one's wishes, interests and temperament and thus useful in both acquiring skills and self-definition. However, in our society and our schools with their emphasis and reward for acquiring skills out of context of the experiences from which they might stem, not only are boys like Tom bound to fail unless they have unusual parents but high achievers are bound to suffer from one sided development. But achievement can also represent an abdication of most of one's wishes, goals, interests and aspects of the self not implicated in skills, ambitiousness or success, i.e., a loss of autonomy. (Roskam, 1972)

I understood well enough that the underachiever's mode of struggling for autonomy was positive in keeping alive a potential for autonomous growth as well as an expression of their intense desire for autonomy, but at the same time led to self-constriction and isolation. They were, it seemed to me, better off than achievers who had renounced autonomy or who put all

their energies into competition and good grades. However, I could not come to grips with the differences between these two groups until Dr. Hertzman focused on and formulated the essential difference between the achievers' and underachievers' mode of struggling for autonomy. The first struggled out in the open while the second covertly held on to what they had with the hope that some time in the future it could be expressed. Both modes then had their potentials for positive growth and for pathology.

My study aims to contrast two distinct ways of struggling for autonomy in high achievers and underachievers. For those achievers who have not abdicated autonomy, the struggle is out in the open, current and continuous and is expressed in the context of interpersonal relationships. For underachievers, the struggle for autonomy is covert and consists currently of isolating themselves from people for fear that whatever autonomy they have will be taken away.

There is a plethora of studies of school achievers and underachievers which have been done piecemeal and, therefore, not surprisingly a host of contradictory results. Either underachievers show up more maladjusted than achievers or no differences are found. No attempt has been made to understand both the positive and negative aspects of such maladjustment as exist for either achievers or underachievers. There

has also been misleading results on the issue of conformity. Achievers are usually found to be more conforming than under-achievers. However, on the one hand studies are beginning to show that achievement can come via conformity or independence and on the other, in the writer's experience, conformity for the underachiever may serve to protect autonomy.

More recently there has been at least one attempt to deal with constellations of personality traits which might describe achievers and underachievers but again from a piecemeal approach. Kisch (1967) using over thirty-two personality traits as well as a host of other measures comes up with three distinct groups of underachievers described by different combinations of five of the thirty-two personality measures used. But, do these clusters of traits represent what is really essential either to the person or to the underachievement? Can achiever personality, social and emotional adjustment, social extraversion and impulse expression really differentiate groups of under-achievers? I think not. My own students have had a variety of personality traits in a variety of combinations and have been in many respects different from each other. What they all had in common was a specific psychic structure which could be and was expressed in a variety of behavioral ways. For example, some were very social, others not, but all found ways to remain personally isolated. While success in school meant a lot to

all of them some could say so openly while others insisted so much they didn't care, it was obvious they must care. So while Kisch may have found five personality traits which differentiate three groups of underachievers, he cannot say, nor does he have any idea that they may relate variously to an essential personality organization shared by the underachievers.

This study differs then in neither using a piecemeal trait approach nor in searching for patterns with a mathematical technique. Factor and cluster analysis, of course, can only help one find patterns amongst preselected measures and the constellations obtained may or may not match reality or what is.

Chapter II

THEORY AND RELATED RESEARCH

Autonomy

Bettelheim (1967) traces the beginnings of autonomy as far back as an infant's earliest experience with his mother especially around feeding. The mother's responsiveness to her baby's activity on his own behalf, her adaptations to him as well as his adaptations to her, can not only make "mutuality" more satisfactory for both, but also allow the infant to affect his environment on the basis of felt need. From the start then, both the baby's temperament and the quality of mothering are important determining parameters of autonomy. Erickson (1963, 1968) dates "the will to be one's self" to a later stage of development. It emerges out of the experiences of "holding on" and "letting go" in elimination. While elimination as a concrete physical experience of what is "me" and "not me" can serve the process of self delineation as well as increase the sense of mastery over one's body as muscles mature, the "battle for autonomy" precipitated at this stage is typical only of cultures insistent on orderliness, punctuality, and control (Erickson, 1963, 1968). Whether or not toilet training, in our middle class families, can further the sense of autonomy depends very

much on the mother's attitude. If training is based on the child's wishes, decisions, physical and emotional capacities and occurs in the context of a meaningful relationship, then autonomy is enhanced. If the child must conform to parental standards without regard to his needs or readiness, then a variety of developments more or less injurious to autonomy may be initiated. Bettelheim (1967) points out that not only autonomy over the body can be enhanced but autonomy in relationships as well, if a child freely chooses to please his mother and himself in accepting toilet training. If the emphasis is on pleasing his mother then autonomy suffers.

Apparently, the importance of feeding experiences and toilet training does not reside so much in the events themselves as in the extent to which an infant's temperament and developing personality is allowed to positively affect his parents' response to him. Even the advent of mobility which permits the child to actively reach out or to withdraw will not lead to autonomy if parents do not respond to the child as he is. It is at this stage, for example, that some children become autistic when their earlier experiences of a world destructive to the self is confirmed through their active attempt to satisfy their needs (Bettelheim, 1967). Whatever the developmental level reached, autonomy is best served by:

...the conviction: It's important to me to do this and that's why I'm doing it. Not because I'm told I should (or must), and not because (even worse) I must consider important what others want me to consider important. (Bettelheim, 1967, p. 48).

When this conviction emerges in the context of a positive and meaningful relationship with a child's parents, then autonomy and contact with others are not mutually opposed, but mutually enhancing.

One aspect of middle class upbringing can be potentially destructive of this kind of autonomy. As Keniston (1965) points out, American middle class pre-school children are intensely dependent upon their mother for all their needs and thus withdrawal of love can become a powerful training device if the mother is willing to "exploit" this dependency. Of course, this dependency need not be on one person to have the same destructive potential. For children raised in Kibbutzs, this dependency is deliberately displaced to the youth group in which they grow and also used to put pressure on non-conformers (Bettelheim, 1969). Erickson (1958) suggests that a mother is willing to exploit this dependency when she picks out one of her children to justify her through his achievements. However, this is only one expression of the need to control and dominate a child. Sampson (1968) analyzes women's craving for power as a reaction to gender inequality which craving then finds expression in their relations to their children.

Winterbottom (1956) unintentionally confirms Keninston's, Erickson's and Sampson's views. She contrasts the upbringing of ten-year-old middle class boys who are high and low in the need for achievement measured according to the method developed by McClelland. High need for achievement boys have mothers who early make demands for independence and mastery and reward their children's acquiescence primarily through expressions of physical affection. These mothers are willing to manipulate their children's need for their love to gain their own ends. Winterbottom made up a questionnaire of demands for mastery and independence and ascertained how positive responses to these demands were rewarded. Since she neither investigated whether these demands were consonant with the child's own wishes, nor the extent of the boys own independent strivings, the format of her study becomes self validating. She implicitly assumes that children have no autonomous strivings and that they must be trained through "love" to become competent and independent. Other theoreticians come up with a similar formulation on the premise that children have primarily undesirable or anti-social tendencies. For example, Mahler (1945), a Freudian theorist, compares the education and socialization of children to a "barter" in which children give up selfish, unacceptable or objectionable tendencies and behaviors in exchange for "love." Lynd (1956) points out that Freud, his

followers and some experimental learning psychologists have built their theories on such views of human nature. Their theories, moreover, is an account of "human growth as a compensation for deprivation." If a child's urges and drives are viewed primarily as undesirable or inconvenient, they are inhibited and the child learns to compensate for this in a variety of ways. There are alternative ways of understanding human growth which subsumes this one.

Maslow (1956) observes that personality is shaped by both defensive and growth forces. He views healthy infants as naturally or spontaneously curious, exploratory and as wanting to master the new and try out their powers. He states that we find out "what is right for us" through interaction with our environment. Such experiences are "self validating" through the delight and joy they provide. It is his view then that autonomy strivings and the growth of the self are the natural consequence of being alive. However, he too recognizes that an infant's helplessness makes him particularly vulnerable to loss of love and if a child is forced to choose between the safety afforded by the mother and delight in his own experiences, he will choose to give up autonomy. So it is the child who feels safe with his parents who dares to explore the unknown while at the same time satiation and boredom with the old makes him seek out more complex and novel experiences.

Berlyne (1966) in a paper reviewing the experimental work investigating exploration and curiosity in animals and human beings confirms some of Maslow's formulations. Berlyne offers substantial evidence that exploratory behavior is neither motivated by biological drives nor with events associated with them. It is an intrinsic given of animal and human nature. Testing of 3-9-month-old babies demonstrates that "novelty," "surprisingness," "irregularity of form" and "complexity" are all properties of the environment which primarily motivate infantile exploration. The degree of complexity which is sought out increases with age but lags behind increasing visual acuity. Similarly adults spend more time looking at the more complex of two patterns shown them. While exploration time decreases as complexity becomes extreme, optimum complexity varies widely amongst individuals and populations. Habituation experiments, stimulus deprivation studies, fear inducing situations all point to the same conclusions. An organism is more likely to seek out the new and strange when he is bored or sated or stimulus deprived even at the risk of biological danger or at the expense of drive satisfaction. Whether a novel and strange stimulus provokes approach or terror and flight depends on how disturbing the situation is, how agitated or relaxed the organism is and on his personality. Finally, if a subject is afraid he is more likely to turn to the old and familiar. White (1959)

summarizing earlier research on non-drive associated behavior, argues that while curiosity and exploration can serve to reduce the anxiety produced by conflicting behaviors which are due to lack of information, as Berlyne suggests, they do not originate in such conflicts. White, on the basis of experimental work, comes to the same conclusion as Maslow and Lynd who start from clinical experience and observations. There is an intrinsic need in human beings to interact effectively with their environment which is "directed, selective and persistent (p. 317)." Threats, deprivation, strong fears, create urgent crises in which drive reduction, homeostasis and defensive behavior become the dominant mode of functioning. Even the latter would seem more likely either in children or adults who have not struggled for autonomy. However, the main point as Maslow puts it is that "The laws for deficiency motivation..." are not the same as those for "growth" and by growth, he means autonomous development which is made possible through love, respect and safety.

There is indeed much basis for believing that children need not be subtly coerced or manipulated to be competent, independent, curious or self-regulating. Rather the evidence is pervasive that we attempt to train them to be what we want them to be through dependence on our approval or love and in the process contribute to the stunting or abrogation of autonomy or to the precipitation of fierce struggles for autonomy themselves

potentially injurious to self development.

The struggle for autonomy in such a context can have three broad outcomes. Given some favorable circumstances, an individual can struggle for autonomy in the open. Autonomy can be abdicated or these strivings can go underground in a self protective maneuver. These patterns become more marked or noticeable during adolescence when in our society there is a renewed struggle for independence. Early childhood experiences are critical. There will be no adolescent crisis if some autonomy has not been achieved earlier according to most theorists (e.g. Bettelheim, 1967 or Erickson, 1968).

Open Struggle for Autonomy

This is perhaps the best known and described of the three patterns. In adolescence its main feature is a move away from parents and towards establishing meaningful relationships with other adults and peers. For example, Moses (1968) found significantly more Rorschach responses with the themes of growth, separation and departure among girls rated high in autonomy on the basis of an interview than among girls rated low in autonomy. Erickson (1968) views this period as one in which childhood identifications are selectively repudiated and assimilated in a unique way and ending in "identity formation." In this process, inevitably, conflicts between the adolescent's goals or views and that of his parents emerge. The adolescent

will be successful to the extent that he can free himself from dependence on his parents. Thus these conflicts are usually conceptualized as centering around dependence and independence. Moses (1968) finds that both high and middle autonomy girls are aware of the conflict between independence and dependence. While the first can effectively cope with it, the others tend to forego independent actions and ideas and are troubled by this. For low autonomy girls this conflict is out of awareness. Subjectively, they experience no conflict. Their compliance with parental values and ideas is so thorough they feel as if these were their own. They rate themselves as highly independent on a questionnaire but obviously they fool themselves.

However, dependency problems themselves are a function of parental unresponsiveness to their children's early spontaneous self assertion. If an infant's autonomous strivings are ignored, "...both dependence and acting out problems around oral experience become the only avenue left open to him and hence indeed become of paramount importance (Bettelheim, 1967 p. 33)." Thus, significant dependency problems are symptomatic of an early environment unfavorable to the development of autonomy. How dependency needs and problems are met in adolescence thus becomes crucial to how much autonomy can be gained or regained. Paradoxically, rebelliousness and defiance, a

weapon available to an adolescent fighting such needs have been too closely equated with those needs. Rebelliousness has often been termed a reaction formation against dependency needs or both are viewed as two sides of the same coin. For example, Hirsh and Singer (1961) gave adolescent girls deliberately ambiguous stories depicting conflicts between authorities and young people. The girls could decide who was right or withhold their decision. Dependent girls sided with the authorities and rebellious girls with the youngsters. Are they really the same because they side blindly? Or does the side you're on matter? Rebelliousness is often the first and necessary step to overcome dependency and to recover freedom to struggle for autonomy. Jon, my student who entered into adolescence with such vigorous and intense rebellion against his parents and teachers is a good example (see pps. 5-6). The intensity of his struggle was a function of the strength of his prior state of obedience. But it was also an indication of how strongly autonomy was desired. Obviously this is not true for genuinely dependent adolescents. The outcome of such struggle is uncertain: resignation and becoming what the parents want is still a possibility. Dependency on parents itself can sometime mask a safeguarding of autonomy. Robert's caricature of an obedient child was the outward sign of such an underground process (see pps. 3-5). Thus the struggle for autonomy in its various

guises does not altogether coincide with the conflict between independence and dependence. Open rebellion and defiance like assertions of one's needs, wishes and goals are part of the struggle for autonomy which takes place in the context of inter-personal relationships.

Abdication of Autonomy and Protection of Autonomy

These two patterns need to be considered together because their outward manifestations are so often misleading as far as autonomy is concerned.

Keniston (1965) feels that the intense dependency focused on the mother is especially suitable for producing early "independence" and "autonomy" since the child learns to please a mother who stresses such goals. This is done through internalizing her demands as his own. Clearly this is not what the writer means by autonomy but rather it is an abdication of autonomy. Nevertheless such children often look "healthy." High need for achievement middle class boys who were early trained for independence and mastery seemed to their teachers more motivated for success in school work, more independent, more successful in social groups and more pleased when they succeeded (Winterbottom, 1956). However objective ratings of success in school work, sports, games and leadership were not significantly different from those for low need for achievement boys whose mothers did not early push them towards mastery

and independence.

The consequence of being forced to choose safety over autonomy according to Maslow (1956) is a loss of self together with the growth of a pseudo-self in which others become the "center of gravity." As a child lets others choose for him, he loses his capacity to differentiate between "...his own impulses, judgments and feelings...from the interiorized demands of others (p. 40)." The final consequence is a loss of the capacity to experience joy and delight in spontaneous actions.

Not all such persons have given up self development and autonomy. Laing (1965) devotes a whole book to describing the split in the self of schizoid and schizophrenic personalities into a "false self" presented to others which serves the purpose of protecting a core of "true" self. He describes these schizoid persons as at one and the same time profoundly desirous of closeness to people and of autonomy. Their sense of autonomy being precarious, closeness to others becomes immensely threatening and they thus protect themselves behind a "false self." While this split gradually impoverishes the "inner" self, the intent is to protect the possibility of genuine growth. Laing (1965, 1967) came to believe that we all to some extent develop "false selves" and that the "normal," "adjusted" person has often more profoundly given up the possibility of genuine growth and freedom than the schizoid person or the struggling and conflicted individual. He also views some forms of schizo-

phrenia as a naturally healing process through which genuine selfhood is regained. Similarly, Bettelheim (1967) strongly implies that one aspect of childhood autism is a desperate attempt to safeguard autonomy which at the same time results in the destruction of the self.

Gruen (1968) most clearly contrasts individuals who have abdicated autonomy to those, who unable to be openly autonomous, seek to keep the possibility of being autonomous alive. The first submit to parents so completely that they take the latter's wishes as their own and feel independent. Moreover as Gruen states:

On the surface such people 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' (p. 652).

The others, individuals who Gruen characterizes as schizoid or dissociated may often appear compliant on the surface. However this very compliance serves the purpose of keeping others at a distance from the "inner" self. These individuals as children were well aware at some level of being manipulated by their parents but divorced themselves from their acts which they felt were a consequence of coercion. It is this "...dissociation along the lines of "it's they who want it, I'm just their puppet...(p. 652)" which Gruen feels keeps a potential for autonomy alive since the alternative is genuine submission.

However, as Gruen points out, these people because they tend to be depersonalized, removed, uncommitted and lacking genuine identification appear to be more maladjusted than those who have abrogated autonomy. Both developments can be seen as pathological but only the latter offers the possibility of one day openly becoming one's own person. Personality theorists are becoming increasingly aware of the many facets or different levels of autonomy and how it can be preserved through some pathological developments and not others. Daco (1965), a Belgian psychoanalyst, understands the self debasement and submission of the moral masochist as both a profound desire to be in control and untouched and therefore independent. He submits to have peace and security but is deeply determined to do as he wishes. While in part independence and power are equated, Daco sees behind this distortion a maneuver to remain free through compliance. The masochist is saying, "I'll do whatever you wish, but you won't own me." (p. 423), (my translation).

Maslow's theory then is inadequate in failing to recognize two different personality developments as the outcome of having to choose safety. As he points out autonomy strivings can be given up altogether or as Laing, Gruen and Daco point out they can be driven underground. Of course both types of individuals have pseudo-selves in the sense that they have not become their

own person. However, the two can be distinguished. Those who protect or maintain autonomy suffer from a self division partly expressive of the desire for both autonomy and safety. For them autonomy and closeness to others are mutually impossible. Usually, the coercive and narcissistic quality of their mothering has led them to experience genuine contact with others as destructive to selfhood. Some individuals even under such circumstances are able to struggle for autonomy openly in many respects (e.g. Hammer's creative adolescent artists) but seemingly it must be done outside the context of interpersonal relationships. Intimacy and closeness would threaten what they have achieved.

The underachievement of adolescents who are not openly rebellious can be understood as an aspect of the struggle for autonomy which has gone underground. Some of these boys like Robert (pps. 3-5) use obedience and compliance as Gruen's schizoid or dissociated individuals do or as Daco's masochist does, others like Tom and Matthew (pps .8-14;pps. 14-18) use passive resistance rather than compliance. In either case, as described at length in the introduction for a variety of reasons, school success at an unconscious level is viewed as a self betrayal and is thus avoided. Like the individuals described by Laing, Gruen and Daco, these underachievers manage to emotionally, though not necessarily socially, isolate them-

selves from others and for the same reasons. Contact is experienced as destructive of the self. Their ambivalence about school success--they want it but can't achieve it--is the most prominent outward sign of their self division.

Academic Achievement, Underachievement, Autonomy and Related Research

The last decade has been especially full of ferment in education. A number of educators, sociologists and occasionally psychologists have been critical of our educational system--its aims, methods, values and the societal attitudes which have led to its creation. Friedenbergr (1965) studied the operations and social climate of nine schools serving varied populations across the U.S. with a questionnaire administered to over one hundred high school students in each school. This was followed by individual interviews with twenty five adolescents in each school. He objects far more to the contempt the school authorities have for the autonomy, inner direction and privacy of their students than to the method and content of teaching. This disrespect is successfully conveyed and accepted by most of the students who themselves judge "...personal autonomy, and self-direction...as self centered and self-indulgent-autistic rather than autonomous (p. 67)." Both students and the school authorities often take "expressions of subjective passion" as a sign of "immaturity," poor "socialization" or "mental illness" and "...as contributing to 'underachievement' by fritting away time and energy that could be put to better or at least more social use (p. 213)." Thus students who immerse themselves in some subjects or areas of their lives out of lively interest but not in others are also

termed "underachievers" although in the writer's experience their grade average is usually indicative of at least normal achievement. While Friedenbergr puts more emphasis on the negative attitudes of school authorities toward autonomy, teaching methods and content can themselves be indicative and an outcome of the same attitudes and lend themselves to further crushing of autonomy.

Holt (1964, 1967) points out the pervasive feeling among many educators that they know best what children should learn and that they can only learn it by being fed information and explanations. The consequence, as Holt sees it, is the coercion of children to learn through fear--not harshly but:

...subtly, smoothly, quietly by withholding the acceptance and approval which you and others have trained the children to depend on. (1964, p. 180.)

Children come to depend on teachers for "the right answer" because their natural style of learning has been bypassed and replaced by a "right" and "wrong" system. Holt (1967) vividly and convincingly describes a child's autonomous learning as he has come to know it in and out of the classroom. A child's natural curiosity, interest, daring and desire to deal effectively with his environment results in learning, skills and competence. It is the child's need and attempts to make sense of his world and of himself which is the natural motivation for learning. He brings to this task patience, openness, re-

ceptiveness and a tolerance for uncertainty. He's willing to involve all of himself in life. If he is allowed to direct his learning, he learns far more rapidly and permanently than we have been led to expect. However, his own sense of weakness and just developing competence overwhelm him at times. He will then seek temporary refuge with an adult. Thus strengthened he can sally forth once more. Teachers' and parents' sensitivity and respect for this flow are crucial to promote learning and self development. Note how similar this educator's observations and conceptualizations are to Maslow's, White's and Berlyne's. Henry (1963), from his classroom observations, concluded that schools contribute to making children absurd by cutting them off from their own experiences and that schools succeeded in pushing children to be successful by making them afraid of failure. But some students resent this both from their own sake and that of others and stop competing (see for ex. Matthew pps.14-18) or feel they continually have to choose between their self respect and pleasing and opt for self respect and therefore failure or underachievement.

Bettelheim (1969b) who otherwise stresses the importance of autonomy in development makes an about face when it comes to formal education. He asserts that "...much of learning is not just a pleasurable experience but hard work (p. 241)."

Learning must therefore be based in part on the "reality principle." Thus,

We learn best when the ego is functioning well, that is, when it is able to serve id, superego, and the demands of reality all at once. Whenever it does not, there is conflict. And such conflict, where not resolved as in sublimation, etc. detracts from the ability to learn or make it completely impossible (p. 241).

This opposition of the pleasure principle to the reality principle is an artifact. Learning is not experienced as unpleasant meaningless "hard work" but rather as intensely pleasurable "hard work" when it is an outgrowth of interest, curiosity and self direction. The pleasure in autonomous learning in turn motivates new exploration and learning. As Gruen and Hertzman (1973) make clear, "... These autonomous processes rather than leading to self gratifying self absorption lead... (to) participation in life."

However, Bettelheim's conceptualization is representative of Freudian theory for both normal learning and learning disabilities. Learning difficulties are either attributed to intrapsychic conflict or to some defect in the structures of the ego. Since learning is unpleasant, children must be induced to accept it. How is this done? Eckstein (1969) describes the process as he sees it:

The children quickly realize they must earn the love, praise and the rewards of the teacher. It is because of this desire of the child to be accepted, to be recognized, to be rewarded, to be marked as a good student that he is willing to work (p. 96).

So according to Eckstein, first the child learns "in order to get love." This is followed by a transitory period in which the student gradually identifies with his teacher's attitude towards learning so that he too may get to "love learning" for its own sake. He has internalized his teacher's attitudes and is thus said to be "inner directed." If you teach children to learn or grow based on approval, then that will often be what you do find, as well as children who frantically grope for the "right answer" and fail. This, however, should not be confused with a natural inevitable process nor with genuine and autonomous learning. If love is mainly offered in the form of approval for achievement, grades, status or accomplishments then many will have no recourse but to accept it on such basis. Constriction of the environment must inevitably lead to both a narrowing of the range of expression of human feelings, behavior and to specific reactions against this constriction. This can perhaps be clarified by an example taken from animal research. Kavanaugh (1967), a zoologist feeling that research based on tame and homegeneous (through inbreeding) rodent samples had led to distorted and trivialized results has himself used captured wild mice or the first laboratory born generation with extraordinary results. These animals when confined spend a great deal of time on behavior

aimed at controlling their environment. Moreover they solve mazes far more complicated than any heretofore used experimentally and engage in a variety of activities though not deprived of water and food. Not only do these mice counteract any non-volitional activity, but some individual differences emerge. While some mice continue the same activity when it is spontaneously initiated, others do not as long as the compulsion is in effect. Compare this to the results obtained when domestic inbred laboratory animals are the subjects. The bulk of those results have demonstrated that animals are motivated to learn only through extrinsic motivation. The effect of compulsion has not been directly studied. However, experiments using deprived animals have coercion built into them. The animals must perform to eat and drink and they do perform though not as well as they could. However, as with human learning, this sheds no light on naturally occurring, spontaneous learning or non-coercive learning.

The defects of our educational system have been largely ignored by researchers seeking to investigate the cause of underachievement. Rather they most often start from the premise that academic success is a desirable and valuable personal and social goal. Whether this success is an outcome of autonomous striving or a submission is seldom investigated directly though there are suggestive results. Underachievement is also

studied apart from the social structures in which it emerges and ordinarily its causes are sought exclusively in the personality of the underachiever, especially in some deficiency of the personality. It is not surprising, therefore, to find a host of contradictory results.

Some researchers have attempted to establish that underachievers are more maladjusted than achievers using a variety of instruments and populations. Either no results are found or contradictions emerge which cannot all be attributed to the heterogeneity of instruments or populations since often the same instrument is used on similar populations. Neither can they be attributed to invalid instruments since a number of them have been well validated.

Margulies (1942) in a carefully designed study, using color and shading shock on the Rorschach as signs of emotional disturbance found both unsuccessful high school boys and girls more emotionally disturbed than their successful counterparts though there was a wide overlap between groups. Monroe (1945) using other Rorschach signs of personality disturbance found the same to be true for college students. However, Cronbach (1950) and Horral (1957) who scored Rorschachs of high and low achieving college students according to Monroe's method found no difference in the incidence of emotional disturbances.

The use of the MMPI has added even more confusion for some

studies show that college underachievers have better adjusted responses (Owens, 1949), others that none of the scales differentiates between achievers and underachievers (Anderson et al 1963, Folman, 1965) while still another (Gough, 1949) that MMPI items indicative of "moderate tension, insecurity and a somewhat suspicious attitude towards others" correlate positively with achievement.

Other personality scales have been used with similar contradictory results. Oakland (1969) finds that underachievement in college boys correlates positively with impulsiveness and the avoidance of unpleasant tasks as measured by the Edwards Personality Inventory. Using the Cattell Personality Questionnaire, Bachhold (1969) finds that fifth grade low achieving boys are less emotionally stable than their successful counterparts. However, college boys who are most poorly adjusted according to the Bell Adjustment Inventory receive the highest grades (Steinzor, 1944). Corlis (1963) investigating neurotic disturbances through interviews, Wilson et al (1967), a group of psychoanalysts evaluating the psychodynamics of fourteen male students on academic probation and Kisch (1967) with a variety of personality scales find no differences with respect to emotional disturbances among college boys with high and low grades. We have to agree with them that there is no unique or specific relationship between maladjustment and achievement.

Researchers who have tried to specify the emotional or psychological problems most frequently found among underachievers have consistently come up with the same finding.

Bricklin and Bricklin (1967) compared the Rorschachs of forty underachieving youngsters, twenty five "exceptionally well achieving" students and twenty five children with "other types of emotional conflicts." They ranged in age from eight to sixteen. Their main conclusion is that "...most under-achievers are characterized by passive aggressive orientations (p. xxii)." This can be seen on their Rorschachs by a high incidence of human aggressive details together with a low aggressive score in larger movement responses. Both the underachievers and the other conflicts group produce a much larger number of aggressive movement responses than the achievers but only the underachiever predominantly confines himself to small details. In addition significantly more under-achievers produce "aggression directed at organisms in the past" responses than either of the two other groups. Bricklin and Bricklin interpret this as fear of anger in the present. At the same time, achievers have significantly more assertive movement responses than do both other groups. This passive-aggressive orientation has also been found by Kimball (1952, 1953) among highly intelligent failing high school boys both through case studies and with a sentence completion test; by

Morrison (1969) in pre-adolescent underachieving boys by comparing expressions of hostility on the T.A.T. with teachers ratings of passive aggression; by Corlis (1963) among most of the 16 lowest achieving college freshman he interviewed.

Bricklin and Bricklin conclude that since the underachiever cannot express resentment directly, he does so through poor school work to hurt "parental pride." While revenge may be a motive, it is not the essential meaning of this orientation. If this aspect of many underachiever's personality is studied in isolation from other aspects of their personality or in isolation from social structures then its meaning becomes obscured. The findings of two other studies, are suggestive.

In Margulies' (1942) comparison of the Rorschach records of high school boys, only one determinant, integrated shading and form responses (Fc) significantly differentiates between her groups. The successful boys have a significantly greater number of Fc in their records than do the unsuccessful boys. Margulies interprets this as the successful boy's willingness to "sacrifice part of his personality" in order to become more responsive and considerate to the environment. Interestingly, the successful girls have a significantly greater number of Fc than do the successful boys. In the same vein, the significantly greater number of animal responses of the unsuccessful boys is interpreted as a greater rigidity and stereotypy of

thinking which may serve to protect these boys from reacting to their environment.

Boyer et al's (1967) work with Apache Indians whose way of life was disrupted makes the relationship between protection of self, non-learning and non-adaptation to a threatening environment clearer. While the Mescalero and Chiricahua Apaches share about the "same social structure" and "socialization patterns," the Chiricahuas experiences as prisoners of war for twenty seven years (till 1913) has led to an altogether different adaptation to reservation life. The Chiricahuas "old age" personality as assessed with the Rorschach differs from that of the Mescaleros if they have spent at least five years of their childhood in a prison camp. "They adjusted somewhat better to living like whites (p. 23)." However they pay a high personal cost. Their inner lives are "less rich" and they have "less personal security" than the other Apaches. Though the Mescaleros have a far richer inner life, they "...refrain from exposing themselves to the outer world (p. 26)." Boyer et al do not make clear whether or not the Mescaleros' protectiveness towards their inner lives is a typical Apache trait or a reaction to reservation life.

Boyer et al classified all children who were promoted from kindergarten as "learners" and all others as non-learners. The Rorschach was administered and assessed by Bruno Klopfer.

There were no intellectual differences between the two groups either on the Rorschach or an I.Q. test. As in Margulies' study, the non-learners are differentiated from the learners by both significantly fewer Fc and more animal responses. The authors state that these differences have "...no direct connection with the intellectual aspects (p. 24)." This is in spite of the fact that through further analysis of the Rorschach they do find that the difference between these two groups resides in "their attitude towards the outside world." Of thirty learners, only four respond in the "Mescalero Way," i.e., with a stress on inner life which must be protected. While still retaining the stress on inner life, some learners have developed a "...capacity to cope with external demands, often in a matter of fact way, reminiscent of the old age Chiricahuas (p. 26)." All children who respond this way are learners though not all learners fit into this "Converted Mescalero" pattern. Boyer et al implied that it is the shift to an "...attitude which permitted both inner and outer directed capacities...(p. 30)" which permits learning to take place. However the authors do not integrate their results because they fail to recognize the connection between the "Mescalero" pattern, the fewer Fc responses of the non-learners and the capacity to deal with new outer directed capacities. After all, the Apaches former main occupation of hunting and food

gathering are outer directed capacities at which they were quite good. It is not so much a question of outer directed activity as a new alien activity introduced by white overseers. Boyer et al interpret the few Fc responses in the records of the non-learners as reflecting a decreased capacity to "accept their affectional needs." While this is accurate, it also reflects a refusal to "sacrifice a part of the personality" (Margulies 1942). It is this refusal to "sacrifice a part of the personality" which is more explicitly expressed via the "Mescalero Way." The growth of a "Converted Mescalero" pattern points to a solution. It is possible to be "what one is" and cope with reality. The Chiricahua pattern seems to simply be an abdication. Boyer et al speculate that the personality changes of the Chiricahuas were an outcome of identification with their "captors" in prison camp, and that seems to be very much like "identification with the aggressor." In a different culture, under circumstances different from ours, the mechanisms seem to be similar. In a threatening environment, one can protect ~~one's~~ self through isolation, give up, or be autonomous and still cope with the world outside one's self. Moreover, the relationships of these tendencies to learning or achieving seem similar to those I have observed in my clinical work. Only one of fifteen children with a "Mescalero" pattern on the Rorschach is a learner. Fifteen of the twenty-one with a Chiricahua

pattern are learners. The kind of adjustment reflected in this pattern often produces learners but not always. Again, all those with a "Converted Mescalero" pattern are learners. So that learning is possible via independence or conformity.

The passive-aggressive orientation of many underachievers noted by many researchers, while it does express resentment and can and is used vengefully also reflects a resistance to interaction with people and with learning. Its purpose in my experience is to keep a threatening world at a distance to safeguard autonomy.

The results of these studies both directly and indirectly confirm some of the writer's clinical findings. Underachievers or non-learners are found to be reluctant to make contact and accommodate to their environment. However, this facet of their personality has not been understood as originating in a deeper motivation, as an aspect of a struggle for autonomy which takes place chiefly out of awareness.

Researchers have also focused on the causes for achievement. In the main, one consistent finding has emerged, the association of achievement and conformity. This is misleading with respect to the degree of autonomy of both achievers and underachievers.

Autonomy, Conformity and Underachievement

The nature of the struggle for autonomy--open or covert--radically alters the meaning of some aspects of personality and therefore their relationships to achievement. Conformity is especially vulnerable to this influence. It can either mask a covert struggle for autonomy or simply indicate a lack of autonomy. Thus far the research has a bearing on only the latter aspect of conformity.

In the main, investigators have linked achievement and conformity on an empirical basis. Gough (1949) finds that the second largest cluster of items on the MMPI which correlates with the achievement of high school boys are those indicative of "extreme conformity to manifest social norms and submission to parental standards (p. 70)." However, his empirically constructed scale consisting of 34 items among which the latter cluster is included correlates .43 with grade point average so that these characteristics apply only to some achievers. Oakland (1969) investigating high school boys but with the Edwards Personality Scale finds that overachievement correlates significantly with conformity and cooperation. These two scales are descriptive of a person who "fits in," "respects tradition" and "accepts the groups standards." But again the correlation is low (.27) despite its significance. Drews and Teaham (1957) this time investigating the attitude

of the mothers of Junior High school students at two ability levels--average and very superior--found that the gifted high achiever has a "...rigidly defined place within the home which he is expected to keep with docile acceptance (p. 33)." The mothers of the gifted achievers scored significantly higher on a "Dominating" and "Ignoring" scale. When conformity is measured according to whether Q sorts of personality characteristics conform to group norms, achieving college boys do not differ from low achieving boys (Erb, 1961). At the college level, Stix (1966) found a positive relationship between overachievement and defensiveness; the latter measures repression and denial. High scores on defensiveness also correlated positively with compliance, need for structure and respect for culturally "right rules." On the other hand, underachievement correlated with resistance to social pressure, assertiveness, pleasure in exploring and experimenting as well as with zest for a free and unstructured life. Stix does not question the meaning of his results but views the relationship between defensiveness and achievement as positive and necessary.

There is evidence from several sources that this relationship is not so. Domino (1968) finds that college success can be achieved either via independence or via conformity; that the two are not mutually exclusive. Jackson and Getzel (1962)

in a study of intelligence and creativity of sixth to twelfth graders make that distinction even clearer. They term I.Q. cognition, convergent thinking or conforming to the known and divergent or creative thinking, constructively unconforming. Students who had the highest I.Q. but the lowest creativity score were compared to those who had the highest creativity score but the lowest I.Q. The average I.Q. for the school being 132, none had a low I.Q., but the groups did differ by 23 I.Q. points. Both groups score as well on achievement tests and are equally superior to the rest of the school. While high I.Q. and high creativity are not mutually exclusive, the correlation between I.Q. and creativity is low and Jackson and Getzel make the point that these high creative students "...would have been classified 'overachievers' because they are not in the top I.Q. group rather than gifted." Their cognitive style is as conducive to achievement as that of the high I.Q. students, However, both groups feel quite differently about achievement. While both agree as to what traits ($r = 1.00$) will lead to success in adult life and as to what traits are preferred by teachers, they disagree on self-preference. The high I.Q. students' self preference is highly correlated to those traits predictive of adult success (r is .81) while the converse is true of the highly creative (r is .10) and their career choice confirms this. High I.Q. students'

career choices are classified as "success oriented" by Jackson and Getzel in terms of status and money while those of the highly creative are not. The high I.Q. achievers are preferred by their teachers and Jackson and Getzel suggest this preference is on the basis of mutually shared values. In their verbal fantasy, the highly creative show themselves to be more independent, free and separate individuals than the high I.Q. students. The home life of the latter reveals more conformity to conventional standards, greater child centeredness, greater implicit pressure for the child to do well. Their mothers are more vigilant and critical towards them, while the mothers of the highly creative are more willing to "let the child go his own way." There is less stress on school achievement and more on autonomy. It seems that high achievers may well differ in the extent to which they are autonomous and conforming.

Only one study thus far bears on the relationship of conformity to autonomy and only in regard to high achievement. Roskam (1972) has shown that conformity measured as the need for social approval can discriminate between autonomous and non-autonomous high achieving girls. The conformity of a high achiever does point to lack of autonomy. Conformity in underachievers ought to have a different meaning since underachievement can be understood as an aspect of the covert

struggle for autonomy. In this context conformity rather than indicating a lack of autonomy could serve as a protective facade.

Chapter III

PROBLEM, HYPOTHESES AND TESTS USED

Problem and Hypotheses

The main contention of this study is that achievers and underachievers do not differ in degree of autonomy, but in patterns of autonomy. The variables chosen for the study are those which together are crucial in contributing to a differential organization of autonomy in the two achievement groups. The hypotheses will therefore be stated as they relate to the unfolding of these patterns of autonomy.

1. Achievers and underachievers will not differ in the degree to which they struggle for autonomy.

However, there are qualitative differences in this struggle which are reflected in the underachievers' need to set up their own goals. Therefore,

2. Underachievers will more frequently than achievers experience their goals as self-instituted.

The underachievers protect their autonomy through isolation and a lack of symbiotic relatedness which serve to remove the threat of the other. Self-division serves the same purpose by keeping the need to be autonomous separate from the need to be loved and appreciated. Specifically the hypotheses with

respect to the protective pattern are:

3. Underachievers will be more isolated than achievers.
4. When there is a struggle for autonomy, underachievers will experience it more frequently in isolation than achievers.
5. Underachievers will have fewer symbiotic stories and more "loss" stories than achievers.
6. Underachievers will be more self-divided than achievers.

Since the association of achievement and conformity in past studies has been low or non-existent, and reflects the fact that achievement can occur via conformity or independence, and since underachievers can be expected to vary in conformity:

7. Achievers and underachievers will not differ in conformity measured as the need for social approval.

However, since conformity in underachievers should be more likely to hide and protect a core of autonomous strivings and in achievers to point to a lack of autonomy, a comparison of the eight lowest and eight highest Crowne-Marlowe scorers of each achievement group will show that:

8. Conforming and unconforming underachievers do not differ with respect to autonomy.

while

9. Conforming achievers are less autonomous than unconforming achievers.

Tests Used

Two devices for obtaining data and some relevant literature will be discussed here.

A. Rationale for a Study with the T.A.T

The main purpose of this study is to test the hypothesis that non-involvement of self with others occurs together with an underlying struggle for autonomy and most typically constitutes the underachievers' "protective autonomy" pattern. In contrast, for those achievers who do struggle for autonomy, this struggle should be found side by side with active interpersonal involvement and constitutes their "open struggle for autonomy" pattern.

The chief difficulty in such a study is to obtain data clearly indicative of the "protective autonomy" pattern. Exploratory therapeutic interviews often yield little information beyond a diagnosis of "passive aggressive" personality or "too defended," "guarded" or "denying" to profit from therapy as evidenced by the reports of psychologists and psychiatrists referring children to my colleagues or myself for educational therapy. In my own work it often takes twenty or thirty sessions to either begin to uncover the pattern or obtain some good suggestions of it. It is often obscured by a power struggle with authorities or a rapid positive response to treatment side by side with keeping the therapist at a dis-

tance. For some the non-contact, the disconnectedness either personal or academic is either never healed or at a snail's pace. So, one can only guess at the underlying motivation. Since it is impractical (though ideal) within the framework of a dissertation to use such lengthy educational therapeutic sessions, the writer turned to the Thematic Apperception Test.

Amongst projective tests, the T.A.T. has the advantage of the use of "...certain classical human situations" (Murray, 1946) as stimuli for the expression of some aspects of personality. It is the data on those aspects of personality bearing on the self in interpersonal or intrapersonal situations most readily yielded by the T.A.T. which is needed for this study. Moreover, like all projective tests, the T.A.T. is expected to make deeper motivation more accessible and to be less threatening than a therapeutic interview.

Certain limitations of the T.A.T. or fantasy material need to be considered. Projective tests give us a limited and sometimes distorted picture of motivation because "... the prime condition of the expression of human motivation is in relation to other people (Hertzman, 1955, p. 13)."¹ The question remains of how the tendencies revealed in the T.A.T.

¹See this paper for a thorough and lucid analysis of the limitations of projective tests in giving a picture of the whole person.

are expressed in life. This writer does not seek to predict life behavior but rather to delineate a psychic constellation or structure. Nevertheless, there are certain parallels between behavior feelings and thoughts reported in an interview and T.A.T. fantasies. Roskam (1972) finds that both interviews and T.A.Ts highly differentiate autonomous from non-autonomous high achieving girls. Moreover, the inference of life relationships from the relationships portrayed in the T.A.T. is seldom done on a one to one basis. Henry (1956) gives us a good example which is most appropriate for this study. He does a "blind" analysis of the T.A.T. record of a fourteen-year-old white middle class boy of superior intelligence who is also an underachiever (Chapter 8). While this boy portrays himself in his stories as interpersonally isolated and is thought to lack "real deep emotional involvement," Henry perceives him as a socially well liked and accepted boy because his record also shows him to have a "... warm acceptant attitude that would be sought by others (p. 163)" as well as a spontaneous impulsive and non-judgmental quality. The sociometric data indeed confirms Henry's interpretation. This boy was frequently chosen as a friend by his peers.

As can be seen in the example above, characteristics revealed on the T.A.T. need to be examined in relationship to

each other to make a judgment about anyone of them and their bearing to a life situation. The meaning of anyone trait changes according to the constellation in which it is found. Moreover, the relationship between a self-perception revealed on the T.A.T. and life can be expressed variously depending on the threat this perception poses. For example, Crowne and Marlowe (1967) find that boys high in the need for approval expect rejection on the T.A.T. but not in reality. On the contrary, they underestimate the extent to which they are disliked by their peers. In this case, while the rejection is genuine, it is consciously perceived as its opposite while unconsciously it is more accurately noted. While these results were the accidental by-products of a study on the need for affiliation, they were not surprising in the light of the personality profile of these boys obtained through research on approval dependent individuals. There can be a fruitful interaction between knowledge of individuals in life, clinical practice and through the T.A.T. as long as the latter is not used in isolation. Therefore, with the limitations of the T.A.T. in mind, it seems to be the most suitable of the instruments available for this study.

B. The Crowne-Marlowe (C-M) Scale of Social Approval as Predictive of Conformity

Crowne and Marlowe (1967) have devised a social desir-

ability scale free of pathological content. A high scorer is in effect describing himself in culturally highly desirable terms though it is very unlikely that the person behaves as he describes himself. The authors infer that such "ideal" description of the self or response style is evolved to ensure the approval of others. Crowne and Marlowe (1967) and their students have proceeded, mainly through experimentation, to demonstrate that approval motivated responses to their scale are predictive of similar behaviors in other situations. The scale has been especially successful in predicting varying facets of conformity though it has also predicted other behaviors usually associated with conformity and reflecting an apparent lack of autonomy: compliance and suggestibility.

The social desirability scale discriminated conformers from non-conformers more clearly than a well validated conformity scale (Baron cited in Crowne and Marlowe, 1967). It seems to this writer that Baron's conformity scale is biased for highly approval motivated individuals, by the need to respond in culturally "right" terms so that the Crowne Marlowe scale is a far better instrument to measure conformity and has the advantage of having other connections to autonomy.

The approval dependent individual as he emerges in these studies is apparently lacking in autonomy. Crowne and Marlowe (1967) note that they appear more "adjusted" because they

...exemplify many of the values of American middle class structure...say the right thing about themselves, appear to hold 'proper' attitudes...do not show hostility... (p. 204).

However, as the authors point out this "adjustment" is at a high personal cost. It serves the purpose of avoiding threats to self esteem and social rejection while protecting a "...defensively enhanced self picture." Is the cost abdication of autonomy or covert autonomy? Underachievers come from families who would most eagerly and enthusiastically give them approval for school achievement. If they reject this important avenue of approval satisfaction then what can a high score on the C-M scale mean for them? As discussed earlier, to seek security through conformity or compliance, in my experience, (see also Gruen, 1968, Daco, 1965 and Laing, 1965) may serve to hide a self which by its very secretiveness cannot be touched or threatened. Underachievers may use a variety of maneuvers to achieve this distance from others, among them conformity or compliance (see Robert pps. 3-5). Those who use passive resistance for example would be less likely to score high on the C-M scale. Therefore for underachievers it is more likely that a high need for approval score would stem from a need to protect autonomy while for an achiever it would seem more likely to indicate a lack of autonomy.

This scale by its very nature would be insensitive to

different levels of autonomy. This is just as true for low need for approval individuals as it is for high need for approval individuals. One of the lowest needs for approval boys in this study would be a puzzle without reference to the varied facets of autonomy. His T.A.T. record reflects both a very low drive for autonomy and self betrayal. He functions very well at school and enjoys it. His teachers find him interesting, friendly and sometimes creative and original. He has many friends and absorbing hobbies and appears open. For example, before he took the T.A.T. he asked me to change one of his "socially desirable" answers on the C-M scale to a "less desirable" one. He would have liked to do the first but realized in the interim he didn't in reality and wanted me to know. However, the T.A.T. also reveals another important facet of his personality which bears on his low need for approval. He is symbiotically related to his mother and tends to view women as symbiotic partners. For him, the consequences are two-fold. There is a profound rage at the symbiotic partner which must remain dissociated because he feels utterly unable to function without this symbiosis. On the other hand, as long as he is symbiotically related, he functions well both in life and as portrayed on the T.A.T. As long as he has his symbiosis, he has no need for approval. The need for approval in his case, has little relevance to the economy of his

personality. In effect, the Crowne Marlowe score can give both a false positive and a false negative in regard to autonomy. This false negative is more likely to be true of under-achievers.

Chapter IV

METHOD

Subjects

The sample consisted of forty white middle class boys of superior intelligence between the ages of fifteen and seventeen who attend a private high school with high academic standards. They were matched on I.Q., twenty were assigned to an achieving group if their grade average for the past year was B+ or above and twenty to an underachieving group if their grade average was B- or below. B- seems to be a high cut-off point for the underachieving group. However, on the basis of the writer's experience with students, teachers, the guidance counsellor and the administration of this school, a B- for a student of superior ability is considered a below capacity grade average. Moreover, the students usually consider themselves to be underachievers as well. At the same time, no student in that school had more than an A- average reflecting in part the emphasis on high academic standards.

Procedure for Subject Selection

Student Otis I.Q.'s obtained in ninth and tenth grade were on record in this school. An assistant to the writer

first selected all boys in tenth, eleventh and twelfth grade with an I.Q. of 120 or above. By checking with the guidance counsellor, she eliminated all non-white boys from the sample and recorded the names of the remaining boys. She then computed the grade point average of each boy from the school records assigning a weight of ten to one for grades from A+ to D. The weight range is wide because the school uses three levels for each grade; e.g. B-, B and B+. She assigned a code number to each boy and kept the key. The writer then matched for I.Q. and chose the boys for each group so as to maximize the grade point average difference between the groups. The writer then submitted the code numbers of the chosen subjects to her assistant in exchange for a randomized list of names. This somewhat complicated arrangement was necessary to insure the experimenter would not be aware of the subjects grade point average so as not to bias either the administration of the T.A.T. or its scoring.

Since it was expected that some subjects would not want to participate in the study, a wider pool of subjects than necessary to complete the sample was chosen to allow for replacements. As can be seen in Table 1, achievers and under-achievers are well matched on both I.Q.'s and ages. On grades, the achievers are significantly better than the underachievers. Furthermore they differ by well over one full grade: the achiev-

Table 1
 Sample Composition: I.Q.'s,
 Grades and Ages

	Means	S.D.	t	p
<u>I.Q.'s</u>				
Achievers	131.40	5.93	.861	<.4
Underachievers	130.00	4.92		
<u>Ages (in months)</u>				
Achievers	195.15	8.65	.880	<.4
Underachievers	194.90	9.30		
<u>Grades</u>				
Achievers	7.05	.52	12.547	<.001
Underachievers	4.39	.77		

ers getting an average of B+ and the underachievers of C/C+.

All the boys were unpaid volunteers at the school's request. They were contacted through the daily school newspaper. They were told that the investigator was doing psychological research for her doctoral dissertation; that she was interested in getting their reactions to a series of eight cards depicting people in different situations; that in addition they would be required to fill out two brief questionnaires.

Written parental permission was obtained since the boys are minors.

Administration of the T.A.T.

Eight cards of the T.A.T., 1, 2, 3BM, 7BM, 14, 6BM, 4 and 12M were administered individually to each boy at the school. The order of presentation of the cards makes little difference. Most of the subjects were given the cards in the above order of presentation. In two instances when there was a high degree of blockage, the cards were deferred to a later point in the sequence.

The instructions to the subjects were as usual to make up a story which includes what's happening, what led up to it, how it ends and what the people are thinking and feeling. An inquiry was conducted when necessary to elicit the above information.

Administration of the Crowne-Marlowe Scale

In Crowne and Marlowe's (1967) experience, it does not matter whether the scale is given before or after an experiment or study. It was, therefore, given on the basis of convenience together with a brief personal data sheet (see Appendix B). The latter was used to make sure that the socioeconomic level of the subjects as defined by Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) was about the same for all subjects. The socioeconomic level at this school is fairly homogeneous and the personal data sheet was used as a double check. It was found that both groups couldn't be more homogeneous socioeconomically had they been picked solely on the basis of socioeconomic level. All their parents are living. There's one divorce and one pending separation in each group. All but three sets of parents in each group are born in the United States and all the boys are born in this country. With the exception of one achiever, and one underachiever whose parents earn between \$10,000 and \$15,000, all the other parents earn above \$15,000 per year. Among the achievers: thirteen fathers have graduate degrees, four have college degrees, one is partly college educated and two have high school degrees. Among the underachievers: 12 fathers have graduate degrees, 5 have college degrees, one is partly college educated and two have high school degrees. The proportion of fathers having the following

occupations are about the same in each group: professionals, owners of their own businesses or executives in a business concern. In other words the boys do come from middle and upper middle class families.

Measurement of Variables

To delineate the "open autonomy" pattern of the achievers and the "protected autonomy" pattern of the underachievers, measures indicative of related aspects of autonomy, related aspects of isolation and of self division were obtained on the basis of selected T.A.T. cards. Isolation and self-division together constitute the protective pattern which contributes to a differential organization of autonomy in the two achievement groups. In addition, conformity measured as the need for social approval was evaluated both as an aspect of the lack of autonomy and as a protective maneuver. Detailed specific scoring criteria are presented in Appendix A.

A. Variables Derived from the T.A.T.

1. Autonomy

a. Separateness and the Struggle for Autonomy

Two central aspects of autonomy or the struggle for autonomy were measured on the basis of the T.A.T. stories. Each boy's ability to differentiate himself from others as a separate individual on the basis of different needs, values,

emotions, attitudes, abilities and goals as well as the extent of the struggle to maintain such separation or achieve his goals were used as indicators of autonomy. While these two aspects are not unrelated, the ability to see one's self as different from others does not necessarily result in a struggle. A struggle, on the other hand, both implies that some separation has been achieved and may further the process of individuation or stunt it. Moreover, different cards tend to stimulate both aspects differentially. For both reasons then, both aspects need to be taken into account to arrive at a score. For adolescents this score is more likely to reflect a struggle for autonomy than autonomy.

Five T.A.T. cards, 1, 2, 4, 6BM and 7BM which most obviously stimulate stories expressive of autonomy or the lack of it were chosen for this study on the basis of clinical experience. Their effectiveness in eliciting such stories is in part built into the structure of the card. This is substantiated by the frequency of such plots in response to these cards as reported by Henry (1956). Moreover, Hertzman (in Witkin et al 1954) points out that while some T.A.T. cards may be equally stimulating with respect to a variable, they may discriminate variously among groups of subjects. Thus, Ornitz (1963) found that the cards used in this study were highly differentiating between preadolescent and adoles-

cents with respect to autonomy.

b. Goals Self-Instituted¹

Goals self-instituted which reflects intrinsic interest in one's goals and is thus related to autonomy was measured on the basis of stories to Card 1. This card depicts a boy and a violin. It is the only card on the T.A.T. presenting a concrete goal to a hero. This goal is nearly always seen by subjects either as imposed by "outside cultural agents" or as self-instituted (Henry, 1956). Card 1 is therefore ideally suited to the measurement of intrinsic interest in a goal. In this writer's experience, underachievers will not struggle for a goal unless it is of intrinsic interest or unless they feel it properly belongs to them.

2. Isolation

Two measures of isolation were derived, pure isolation from Cards 1, 14, 3BM, 6BM and 12M and the struggle for autonomy in isolation from Cards 1 and 2.

a. Pure Isolation

(1) Cards with only one figure: 1, 14, and 3BM.

Cards with a single figure allow for a straightforward measure of isolation depending on whether another figure is introduced and the introduced person's importance to

¹This measure has been borrowed from Ornitz (1963)

the plot.¹ Since only one of the five cards used to rate autonomy had a lone figure, two more, 14 and 3BM, were included which also have some relevance to autonomy though less obviously so than those chosen for this study. However, Card 3BM may tap another aspect of isolation. It is a card constructed to elicit a subject's reaction to "depression" and "pain" and therefore it "...arouses associations of loss, guilt, attack and aggression." (Henry, 1956, p. 244.) Therefore the stories to this card were scored either for the loss of significant person which results in isolation or on the introduction of another person when the theme of loss is absent.

(2) Cards with more than one figure: 6BM and 12M

Cards 2, 6BM, and 4 which elicit autonomy, present different problems for the measurement of isolation.

Card 2 (farm scene)

Three people are depicted as separate large details. The fragmented structure of the card encourages subjects to deal with its separate elements and according to Henry (1956), these elements are more frequently identified separately than as a whole. In other words, it stimulates lack of interaction. Thus it would be least useful in discriminating between the two achieving groups and was not scored for isolation.

¹My thanks to Dr. Hertzman for suggesting this measure.

Cards 4, 7BM and 6BM

These three cards each introduce two people so arranged that an adequate explanation of the relationship of the two figures is stimulated for nearly all subjects. This makes scoring for isolation more difficult and more subjective except for Card 6BM. According to Henry (1956), the young man on this card is frequently perceived as the son of the older woman. Clinical experience shows that emotional distance, i.e., isolation can be expressed not only by a lack of interaction but also by not perceiving the woman as the young man's mother. Thus isolation can easily be measured on the basis of Card 6BM.

Card 12M

The writer felt that 12M because it deals with "the relation of the potentially passive and dependent to some superior uncontrollable force (Henry, 1956, p. 254)," would be more likely to stimulate a lack of interaction than any other card for the underachievers since there is a potential threat to autonomy. In this instance isolation can more directly be understood as protecting autonomy.

b. The Struggle for Autonomy in Isolation

On the one hand, isolation is sometimes associated with themes other than autonomy and on the other, people are sometimes introduced or mentioned who have no bearing on the

struggle for autonomy. Therefore, the struggle for autonomy in isolation was assessed by (1) only taking into account stories which had an autonomy rating and (2) disregarding interactions which were not related to the struggle for autonomy. This struggle for autonomy in isolation score is then a more direct measure of the association of autonomy and isolation.

This second assessment of isolation with respect to autonomy is only possible for cards rated for both isolation and autonomy (1 and 6BM) and which lend themselves to a direct judgment of the relation of interaction to the struggle for autonomy. Again Card 1 which stimulates the struggle for autonomy is highly suitable. However, stories to Card 6BM can be scored on either the degree of separateness or the struggle for autonomy depending on which theme is present. It is therefore not suitable for measuring the struggle for autonomy in isolation for all subjects. Since it would be preferable to have at least one other card on which to base this score, the other cards used for autonomy (2, 4, 7BM) were reevaluated. As mentioned previously, 4 and 7BM stimulate an adequate explanation of the relationship between the two people they depict and therefore most usually interaction. Card 2 which usually stimulates isolation due to its fragmented structure while it may not differentiate between

achievers and underachievers on pure isolation can be analyzed with respect to this second measure in two ways. Subjects may focus on only one figure struggling for autonomy or subjects may focus on other figures on the card who have no bearing or peripheral bearing on the heroine's struggle for autonomy. Thus, Cards 1 and 2 were used to obtain this score.

3. Symbiosis and Loss of a Significant Person

Two measures were used to evaluate the fear of close interdependent relationships.

Stories to all cards were rated for symbiotic relatedness, the interconnectedness of two people who need each other to function and survive. Symbiotic stories were not expected to appear frequently in a population of non-institutionalized middle class boys. However, its appearance at least once on a record indicates in part a subject's capacity and need for extremely close, intensely interdependent relationships. In the writer's clinical experience, some underachievers remain isolated in part because they yearn for symbiotic closeness and fear for their autonomy. Therefore, a lack of symbiotic relatedness in this population indicates an excessive fear of interdependent relationships and is an indication of "protected autonomy." Symbiosis can also in part point to both an abdication of autonomy and prevent autonomy from developing. Thus, a lack of symbiosis may also be seen as a

drive to be autonomous at the same time that it points to an over-reaction to close relationships.

The underachievers may be more likely to express their yearning for such closeness and at the same time counter their fears through imagining the loss of a significant person on the T.A.T. Card 3BM which is especially constructed to tap such themes, as elaborated previously, was used to get a second measure of the protection of autonomy through lack of unrealized symbiotic relatedness. Again, while other cards may at times tap the same theme, 3BM is much more likely to do so, and one story is enough to establish the existence of such process.

It is now possible to evaluate the association between autonomy and isolation in three ways: (1) through the greater isolation and lack of symbiotic relatedness of the under-achievers, (2) through the degree of association of isolation and autonomy, the correlation coefficient and (3) more directly through isolation assessed only with respect to the struggle for autonomy.

4. Self Division

Since according to Laing (1965), Gruen (1968) and Daco (1965) the protection of autonomy leads to a split in the self at some level of awareness, underachievers should also be more prone to it than achievers. Self division serves to protect

autonomy by keeping the need to be autonomous separate from the need to be loved and appreciated. These two needs which are experienced as mutually contradictory can be kept separated in a variety of ways and at different levels of awareness.

All cards were scored for self division. Self division is reflected in: contradictory trends in the personality, conflicts which reveal opposite trends in the personality, and pronounced ambivalence.

B. Variables Derived from the Crowne-Marlowe Scale

Conformity was measured as the need for social approval on the basis of the Crowne-Marlowe Scale (See Appendix B).

To evaluate conformity as a protective maneuver, the eight highest and the eight lowest need for approval boys in each achievement group were compared. Thus marginal scorers --those slightly above or below the combined groups mean-- could be eliminated without discarding too many subjects.

Treatment of Data

The relevant cards were rated for autonomy and isolation. In the case of self division, in addition to rating each card, the entire protocol was scanned to evaluate one of the criteria: transposition of self division within one character in one

story to several in another story.

Reliability of Scoring

Twenty or half of the protocols were chosen to be rated by another experienced clinician on the basis of the rating guides (see Appendix A) in order to evaluate the reliability of the writer's scoring. Ten of the protocols were obtained from achievers and ten from underachievers. They were randomized and of course the rater was unaware of their classification. Protocols of the remaining subjects were used to illustrate the rating guides. As can be seen from Table 2, the two raters are in very close agreement. The writer's ratings of all the protocols used in the statistical treatment of the data can be considered highly reliable.

Table 2
Reliability of Measurement

N = 20 subjects	Cards	r	N (No. of stories) rated
Autonomy	1, 2, 4, 6BM, 7BM	.95	100
Isolation	1, 14, 3BM, 6BM, 12M	.91	100
Self-Division	1, 2, 3BM, 4, 6BM 7BM, 14	.97	160
Loss Theme	3BM	.95	20
Symbiosis	1, 2, 3BM, 4, 6BM 7BM, 12M, 14	.92	160
Struggle for auton- omy in isolation	1, 2	.95	40
Goals Self in- stituted	1	1.00*	20

*There was 100 percent agreement between both raters and there-
fore r was not computed.

Chapter V

RESULTS

Patterns contributing to a differential organization of autonomy in the two achievement groups will be presented first. In addition, the importance of these patterns of autonomy will be elaborated by using critical protective scores as signs of underachievement. A correlational analysis of autonomy and protective maneuvers will be presented in the second section to further evaluate these patterns of autonomy. Finally, conformity, measured as the need for social approval, will be evaluated both as an aspect of lack of autonomy and as a protective maneuver.

Patterns Contributing to a Differential Organization of Autonomy in the Two Achievement Groups

A. Autonomy

While autonomy was measured as both separateness and the struggle to maintain such separateness, the resulting score is more a measure of the struggle for autonomy than autonomy. These data are presented in Table 3. The underachievers tend to struggle for autonomy to a greater extent than do the achievers. However, this difference does not reach an acceptable level of significance and therefore, we cannot reject the hypothesis

Table 3
The Struggle for Autonomy

	Mean*	S.D.	t ¹	p ²
Achievers	1.43	.60	1.637	<.2 but closer to
Underachievers	1.77	.69		.1

*mean is based on subjects mean rather than total for five cards so as to exclude unratable stories. The scores can range from 0-3.

Table 4
Card 1: Goals Self-Instituted

	Yes	No	Unratable
Achievers	3	15	2
Underachievers	11	8	1
Corrected	$\chi^2=5.065$ p < .05		Leaving out the unratables $\chi^2=6.800$ < .005

¹All "t" tests are uncorrelated tests since exact matching of I.Q.s was not possible.

²Whenever the variances are heterogeneous, 19 degrees of freedom are used for p. Two tailed tests are used either when no differences were postulated or when there was no a priori directional hypotheses.

that both groups struggle equally.

If we look at another aspect of autonomy, self-motivation, as can be seen in Table 4, this time the underachievers are significantly more autonomous than the achievers. Since the comparison of Yes to No is the crucial one and since there were only three Unratables out of forty, the Unratables were left out in a second analysis. When only the Yes to No ratio is considered, the difference in self-motivation of the two groups is significant at better than the .005 level. Note that autonomy ratings and goals self-instituted ratings were independent of each other. Whether self motivated or not, the autonomy rating was based both on the extent of the boy's struggle to achieve his own ends and on the outcome of this struggle.

B. Protective Pattern

1. Isolation: The isolation data are presented in Table 5. Underachievers are significantly more isolated than achievers. This difference is significant at better than the .001 level. Moreover, the underachievers on the average score above the mean of the isolation range while the achievers score below the mean.

It could be argued that the mean isolation difference is confounded by differences in autonomy in the two achievement groups. First, the difference in autonomy between achievers and underachievers is almost significant at the .1 level.

Table 5
Isolation

	Mean*	S.D.	t	p
Achievers	3.50	1.40	4.194	< .001
Underachievers	6.00	2.19		

*based on total score per boy. Scores can range from 0-10

Table 6

A Comparison of the Isolation of Achievers and Underachievers with Autonomy Levels Held Constant

		t	p
r_{IA}^*	.23	1.467	< .2
r_{GA}	-.25	1.637	< .2
r_{GI}	-.56	4.194	< .001
$r_{GI.A}$	-.54	3.850	< .001

*I = Isolation, A = Autonomy, and G = Group.

Secondly, the difference between the autonomy-isolation correlation coefficients is significant at the .06 level (see Table 16). Therefore, the variation in autonomy within each group was controlled or partialled out as follows (as per Cohen, 1968). The achievers were coded 2 and the underachievers 1 and the correlations between isolation, autonomy, and group (1 and 2 codes) were computed. It was then a simple matter to eliminate the influence of autonomy from isolation and group by computing a partial correlation coefficient.¹ These data are presented in Table 6. The r_{GA} "t" and the r_{GI} "t" equal, respectively, the between group autonomy "t" and the between group isolation "t" (see Table 3 and Table 5). Similarly, the $r_{GI.A}$ "t" would equal the "t" between Isolation means adjusted through covariance (Cohen, 1968). The "t" of the new isolation mean difference barely changes. Therefore, the underachievers' isolation is clearly greater than the achievers' isolation at better than the .001 level.

On the one hand isolation is sometimes associated with themes other than autonomy or with lack of autonomy and on the other hand, people are sometimes introduced or mentioned in a

¹My thanks to Larry Jordan of the CUNY computer clinic for suggesting this direct simple and elegant method for equating autonomy levels as an alternative to the more cumbersome, less directly apprehensible method of covariance.

Table 7

The Struggle for Autonomy in Isolation Mean Isolation, Cards 1 and 2 for Stories With Autonomy Scores from 1-3

	N	Mean*	S.D.	t	p
Achievers	18	.39	.75	2.671	< .01
Underachievers	19	.97	.52		

*this is a subject mean rather than a total mean.

Table 8

Isolation Compared to Isolation With Respect to the Struggle for Autonomy:
Card 1

	Mean Isolation	Mean Isolation with Respect to the Struggle for Autonomy
Achievers	.15	.30
Underachievers	.75	1.10

T.A.T. story who have no bearing on the struggle for autonomy. Therefore, pure isolation was assessed by (1) only taking into account stories which were rated for autonomy and (2) disregarding interactions which did not affect the struggle for autonomy. Only Card 1 and Card 2 lend themselves to such analysis. This new measure, "the struggle for autonomy in isolation" is then a more direct measure of the association between isolation and autonomy and is presented in Table 7. The underachievers remain significantly more isolated than the achievers and significantly more often experience the struggle for autonomy in isolation. The first becomes clearer when both the isolation and the "struggle for autonomy in isolation" scores to Card 1 are compared. (This is not possible for stories to Card 2 which were rated only for autonomy and for the "struggle for autonomy in isolation.") As can be seen in Table 8, both groups increase their isolation when only the struggle for autonomy is taken into account. However, both the initial isolation and the increase are slight for the achievers.

2. Symbiosis and Isolation

The data on symbiosis are presented in Table 9 and 10. Underachievers are significantly less symbiotically related to others than the achievers. Symbiosis is an infrequent phenomenon as can be expected in groups of normal subjects. This is reflected in the low means within each group. More-

Table 9

Symbiosis

	Mean*	S.D.	Variance F ratio	p	t	p
Achievers	1.05	1.47	5.97	.01	2.340	<.025
Underachievers	.20	.60				

*This is based on total score per boy. Each story rated yes received a score of 2, uncertain 1 and no 0 and the total per person obtained. Scores can range from 0-16.

Table 10

A Comparison of the Number of Boys With
at Least One Symbiotic Story in Each
Achievement Group

	No. of boys rated 1 or 2 in at least one story	No. of boys with no symbiotic rating
Achievers	9	11
Underachievers	2	18
$\chi^2 = 6.21$		p <.01

over, it varies enormously within the underachieving group; the standard deviation is three times the mean. If we now analyze the data starting with the individual rather than group averages, it can be seen in Table 10 that more achievers have at least one symbiotic story and that this difference is significant at better than the .01 level. Both the under-achievers' lower score and the lower number of boys with symbiotic stories can be understood in two related ways. These scores directly reflect the greater isolation of the under-achievers or an excessive fear of interdependent relationships and they are an indirect indication of their struggle to be more autonomous.

The loss of a significant person score was used because it was felt that it reflected the opposite of symbiosis or an excessive fear of closeness. As can be seen in Table 11, although underachievers tend to respond more often with a loss theme to Card 3BM than do the achievers, this difference is not significant.

3. Self Division

The data on self-division are presented in Table 12. The underachievers are much more self-divided than the achievers and this difference is significant at better than the .001 level. Moreover, the underachievers score at about the mean of the range while the achievers score considerable below the

Table 11
Loss Theme

	Yes	No	Uncertain
Achievers	7	12	1
Underachievers	12	8	0

$\chi^2 = 1.292$ n.s. (corrected)

Table 12
Self Division

	Mean*	S.D.	t	p
Achievers	5.15	2.57	4.922	<.001
Underachievers	10.55	4.03		

*based on total per subject. Scores can range from 0-21.

mean. Since the difference between the autonomy-self division correlation coefficients of the two achievement groups is significant (see Table 16), it is not necessary to equate levels of autonomy in testing for the difference of the self division means.

The major findings are summarized in Table 13. While the underachievers tend to struggle for autonomy to a greater extent than the achievers, this difference does not reach an acceptable level of significance. However, there is a qualitative difference. Significantly more underachievers than achievers need to set up their own goals. Underachievers protect their autonomy through isolation, a lack of interdependent relationships and self division. We can therefore conclude that the patterns of autonomy are different in the two achievement groups.

A further analysis of between group differences underlines the nature of these patterns of autonomy. These data are presented in Table 14. When a critical isolation and self division score at or above the group means (5 and 8, respectively) are used as signs of underachievement, the difference in the distribution of signs is highly significant. Moreover, isolation and self division are powerful variables in discriminating achievers from underachievers. Eleven achievers and twelve underachievers can be correctly identified through the absence

Table 13
Patterns of Autonomy

Means or Yes rating	Achievers	Underachievers	t or χ^2
Autonomy	1.43	1.77	n.s.
Goals Self- instituted	3	11	s.
Isolation	3.50	6.00	s.
Symbiosis	1.05	.20	s.
Self Division	5.15	10.55	s.

Table 14
Signs of Underachievement

	Two Signs	One Sign	None
Achievers	0	9	11
Underachievers	12	6	2

$\chi^2 = 18.831$
p < .001

or presence of two signs. On this basis, twenty three subjects out of forty can be correctly identified. Moreover, since only three achievers have the self division sign, seventeen achievers and fifteen underachievers could be correctly identified with self division alone. On this basis, thirty two out of forty subjects can be correctly identified. However, both signs enter into the definition of the patterns and should therefore be retained.

Correlational Analysis

The intercorrelations of autonomy and the protective maneuvers are presented in Table 15. While autonomy, isolation and self division are inversely correlated for achievers and positively correlated for underachievers, only the autonomy self-division correlation coefficient of the underachievers is significantly different from zero. For the two groups combined, both self division and isolation and autonomy and self division correlate positively and significantly different from zero. The former is still true with the influence of autonomy partialled out.

There is a strong tendency for achievers and underachievers to correlate inversely on autonomy and isolation. The difference between the correlation coefficients is significant at better than the .066 level. The inverse relationships of autonomy and self-division is significant at better than the

Table 15
Intercorrelations of Autonomy,
Isolation and Self Division

	Autonomy	Isolation	
<u>Achievers</u>			
Isolation	-.21		
Self-Division	-.12	-.08	
<u>Underachievers</u>			
Isolation	.29		
Self-Division	.45**	.23	
<u>Total</u>			
			$r_{ISD.A}$
Isolation	.23		
Self-Division	.34*	.44***	.39***
*significant at better than the .05 level			
**significant at better than the .025 level			
***significant at better than the .01 level			

Table 16

A Comparison of Within Groups
Correlation Coefficients

	r	z'	z	p
<u>Autonomy-Isolation</u>				
Achievers	-.21	-.21	1.490	<.066
Underachievers	.29	.30		
<u>Autonomy-Self Division</u>				
Achievers	-.12	-.12	1.790	<.04
Underachievers	.45	.49		

Table 17

Mean Crowne Marlowe Score

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Achievers	11.65	5.45	.395	<.70
Underachievers	10.95	5.49		

.04 level.

In the light of the above differences between within groups correlations, the total and positive r_{ASD} and r_{SDI} (see Table 15) are probably spurious or due to combining groups with unlike isolation and self-division means.

Conformity

Conformity measured as the need for social approval on the basis of the Crowne Marlowe questionnaire was evaluated as an aspect of lack of autonomy. As can be seen in Table 17 achievers and underachievers do not significantly differ in conformity.

The eight lowest and eight highest Crowne Marlowe scorers of each achievement group were chosen to evaluate conformity as a protective facade rather than dichotomizing at the mean so that marginal scores--scores slightly above or below the combined group mean--could be eliminated without eliminating too many subjects. The results are unexpected and are presented in Table 18. Unconforming achievers are no more autonomous than conforming achievers. However, non-conforming underachievers are significantly more autonomous than conforming underachievers. The opposite had been hypothesized. Since the non-conforming underachievers have a higher autonomy score than all the other sub-groups, the significance of these differences was tested and is presented in Table 19. Indeed, non-conforming under-

Table 18

The Struggle for Autonomy of the Eight Highest and Eight Lowest Crowne Marlowe (C-M) Scorers in Each Achievement Group

	Mean Autonomy	S.D.	t	p
<u>Achievers</u>				
Low C-M	1.53	.54	.532	<.35
High C-M	1.34	.72		
<u>Underachievers</u>				
Low C-M	2.17	.44	2.358	<.025
High C-M	1.46	.66		

Table 19

A Comparison of the Eight Lowest C-M Underachievers to the Eight Lowest and the Eight Highest CM Achievers with Respect to Autonomy

	Mean Autonomy	S.D.	t	p
<u>Low C-M</u>				
Achievers	1.53	.54	2.443	<.05
Underachievers	2.17	.44		
Achievers High C-M	1.34	.72	3.154	<.001
Underachievers Low C-M	2.17	.44		

achievers are significantly more autonomous than non-conforming achievers, conforming achievers and underachievers. The last three are about equally autonomous and in comparison, the non-conforming underachievers are outstandingly autonomous. This suggests that the need for social approval has a variety of relationships to autonomy not only within groups as had been hypothesized but also between groups.

Relation of Conformity to Patterns of Autonomy

To explore the relationships between conformity measured as the need for social approval and autonomy, major variables entering into the definition of patterns of autonomy were used as follows:

1. Self Division. A critical score of 8 or above was used as a sign of the underachieving pattern. This variable, a measure of the opposition of the need to be autonomous and the need to be accepted ought to be the most relevant to a further analysis of the relationships between autonomy and the need for social approval. Either one or the other side of the personality may assume more prominence while co-existing with its equally strong opposite. In addition, this co-existence may be at different levels of awareness. So that not only can conformity serve to protect underlying striving for autonomy

as had been hypothesized but other relationships are possible as well. Conformity and non-conformity associated with self division has a different meaning than relatively unconflicted conformity or non-conformity. Thus self-division points to the side of the personality which is not reflected on the Crowne Marlowe questionnaire.

2. Isolation. A critical score of 5 or above was used as a sign of the underachieving pattern. Isolation can act in only one way, by removing the threat of the other. Thus it ought to have less power to discriminate between high and low need for approval.

3. Goals Self-Instituted. The underachievers significantly more often than achievers need to set up their own goals. Thus goals self-instituted will be used as a sign of the underachieving pattern.

4. The Struggle for Autonomy. The mean of the combined achievement groups, 1.60, was used as a critical score. Moreover, subjects with this critical score were identified as high in autonomy. Since the two groups are not statistically different in this respect, this score is applicable to both autonomy patterns. The use of a combined group mean appropriately reflects the tendency of the underachievers to be more autonomous.

The distribution of individuals who fall above and below

Table 20

Distribution of High and Low Need for Approval
(HNA, LNA) Achievers and Underachievers with
Respect to the Four Critical Scores

	HNA		LNA		χ^2*	P
	High	Low	High	Low		
<u>Self Division</u>						
Achievers	0	8	3	5	7.82	<.05
Underachievers	4	4	8	0		
<u>Isolation</u>						
Achievers	2	6	2	6	5.09	<.20
Underachievers	5	3	7	1		
<u>Goals Self-Instituted</u>						
Achievers	1	7	1	7	3.66	<.30
Underachievers	5	3	4	4		
<u>Autonomy</u>						
Achievers	4	4	6	2	.57	<.95
Underachievers	3	5	8	0		

*All χ^2 are corrected.

each critical score with respect to conformity is presented in Table 20. Table 21 presents the patterning of signs with respect to conformity. The results for self division and the patterning of signs are the only significant ones.

The distribution of highly self-divided individuals within each Crowne Marlowe sub-group is significantly different for the two achievement groups. All the non-conforming under-achievers are highly self-divided while only fifty percent of the conforming underachievers are highly self-divided. No conforming achiever is highly self divided while all the self-divided achievers are to be found in the low need for approval group. However, they comprise only thirty-seven-and-a-half percent of that group. Self division is associated with both non-conformity and conformity for the underachievers, though to a lesser extent in the second sub-group. For the achievers, conformity is never associated with self-division while it is sometimes associated with non-conformity. So that for the underachievers, conformity or the lack of it can be understood as reflecting only one side of the personality.

There is a tendency for low need for approval underachievers to be more isolated than high need for approval underachievers. This tendency is not found among the achievers. Otherwise, the need for approval has little relationship to the other signs.

Table 21

Patterning of Signs in High and Low Need for Approval (HNA, LNA) Achievers and Underachievers

No. of individuals with signs	HNA Signs			LNA Signs		
	0-1	2	3-4	0-1	2	3-4
Achievers	7	0	1	4	4	0
Underachievers	1	4	3	0	1	7
Corrected $\chi^2 = 13.82$ $p < .02$						

Thus the significant patterning of signs reflects the significant effects of self-division and the lesser effects of isolation.

Chapter VI

AMPLIFICATION OF THE STATISTICAL RESULTS THROUGH THE PROTOCOLS

The Underachievers' Pattern of Autonomy

The qualitative features will be discussed with respect to those that cut across the degree of autonomy manifested and with respect to the degree of autonomy.

A. Outstanding Features of the Autonomy Pattern in Underachievers

The underachievers need to set up their own goals or feel an intrinsic interest in what they do. See for example, Mark's¹ response to Card I:

Looks like we have someone who is interested in learning to play the violin. He is considered too young to take it up but because he is so interested he will probably take it up by himself. Uh, he will also probably make things a little difficult. He'll have some difficulties with his contemporaries because his intellectual interests would be considered unusual. He's thinking right now of music he's heard and how much he wants to play it for himself and how he is sure other people play. How it always interested him.

Moreover, when they cannot set up their own goals, they can be especially clear in differentiating between their own motivation or needs and those of others. See for example, Alex's story for Card I:

¹The boys' names have been changed to preserve their anonymity.

Well I think the situation is, is a young boy who has perhaps been urged by his parents to in this case play the violin and I think it's a very usual occurrence, not especially with the violin but may be with the piano or sometimes any kind of lessons. Usually I find it occurring in middle class type families. It's never happened to me, myself but to many good friends. The parents want the child to be a perfect, idealistic model and the child doesn't really want to be this. In this case, in this child, he really doesn't have any self motivation to play the violin and he's sort of at the point... where he wonders whether he should do what he himself wants to because he's too young to be completely independent from his parents. (?) In this case, it looks like he's about ten years old. It can't resolve itself immediately because he's still under the authority of his parents and I think that later on, in about five or six years, later he would be likely to rebel against his parents and their wishes to control him.

Among the boys in this group, the struggle for an autonomous self takes place in isolation because other people are experienced as a threat. This threat, while it is expressed variously, can be generalized as a threat to their autonomy. The threat is of course not solely from without. Their own desire to please, to be accepted, to be loved has to be fought because it leads to becoming who the other person wants. See a story by Greg and by Larry as well as another story by Alex:

Greg (6BM):

She knew whenever I was troubled. I could never keep anything from her and whenever I told her whatever I'd done, in little things she would get this quizzical little smile on her face which reproved me gently but did not carry my offense out of proportion. When it was something serious, like the time I took money from her, she would get a sad, disappointed look. That's the one that hurt the worse and she knew it...and I would

feel that I would rather not have done anything or would do anything just to get that look off her face. Inevitably, I got older (in a rushed fatalistic angry tone) but nothing really changed. I became what she created. Now let us both live with it and get that damn look off your face.

Larry (I):

I would say that the picture is of a young boy probably about six years of age and he's looking at a violin dejectedly. It seems that something has happened to this violin or something has happened to the young man and that would seem to be more likely the case as there is nothing apparently wrong with the violin. He might have received a thrashing from his parents for not having practiced sufficiently and perhaps he's looking at the violin as a source of his troubles. I just noticed that there is a sheet of paper under the violin and on second thought it is a new acquisition of the boy and again he's looking at it dejectedly, very depressed at the prospect he will have to learn to please his parents and let's see, in the first case he will probably reject altogether what is going on, this business of learning how to play the violin and end up not playing at all, but in the second he is at the point where he is considering all this and has not yet reached that point.

Alex (12M)

Well this boy appears to be, the boy lying in the bed appears to be very sick. Actually it looks like...a cabin of a ship. This boy has taken sick. See he's a stowaway on a ship. He's in this man's cabin. He'd taken sick and passed out in a life boat where he was hiding and this sort of senile old man picked him out of the life boat and took him to his cabin. I guess this man is very religious whereas the boy is not. The boy hasn't seen the man because he's been asleep the whole time. The man is showing, is giving to the boy some kind of religious mystic power which he feels he has and which he feels will help cure him. The boy will be cured not as a result of this mysticism but because all he's suffering from is sea sickness. O.K. the boy will feel thankful to the man--let's see--without feeling an extreme amount of gratitude but the man will feel that the boy should be forever indebted to him

because he saved his life. Uh, the man will threaten the boy if he doesn't remain with him as his companion and also as his servant. The boy will go on living in this prison for quite a time, doing as the man pleased until the time where he will become so fed up with it that he'll feel he'd be better off in chains than with this man. So he turns himself in.

While Alex in this story and the rest of his record places no open stress on his own desire to please, he clearly experiences "love" as a form of control and manipulation and rejects it. It is this control and manipulation which the underachievers reject over and over again and with it the possibility of gratifying personal relationships. The issue is often cast in the form of slavery versus freedom and this freedom is most often interior rather than physical freedom. This sometimes leaves them with absolutely nothing. See for example two stories by Sam and Allan.

Sam (3BM)

Let's call him Joe. Joe was always very self-willed and he always did what he thought was best or what he wanted to do. In school, his teachers did not like this, neither did his parents. At home whenever he was a bad boy he was sent to sit in a corner of the room facing the walls. This brought out great hatred in him. Now he still sits in the corner but this time, he's in prison uh for murdering someone he disliked.

Allan (7BM)

This looks like father and son talking very seriously. Looks like a kid. The kid has some sort of trouble. Probably he's in his 30's, probably very bored, not involved in anything, depressed. His father also looks sort of depressed as though he's sad with his son. His son hasn't accomplished

anything and they're trying to get the son going; some sort of job or business, anything he'd be interested in or enjoy doing and he does eventually find a job, but he's not happy with it and he quits and becomes a drunk and finds himself in a Bowery type situation, a loser and his father forgets about him and he's forgotten and nothing becomes of him.

Allan is at the extreme of the group in always ending up with nothing or as he often puts it, "unknown." It is only when he can keep himself ignorant of the other's wishes for him and the other and himself of his "compliance" that he can act for himself at all. See for example his story to 12M:

This is, Jesus!, an old man and his son. The son is sleeping after working very hard. Some sort of work, probably around the house for his father. They're very poor. The father worked since he was 10. The son too from about the same time. He's now about 17. The son is sleeping and the father is standing over him like praying that his son won't have to live the way he did and that his grandchildren will live much better and not be held down by poverty and sickness and anything like that. So eventually the father dies and doesn't know what happens to the kid, but the kid does become relatively successful, has a small business, marries. His children are able to get a good education. They don't live in poverty and so the father's wish, although the son didn't know about it, comes true even though the father doesn't know about it. (Italics mine)

Becoming nothing is seen as preferable to giving in to another person, or to the possibility of merging with them. In that sense, becoming nothing serves to protect autonomy.

A few boys can picture themselves as simply autonomous, rather than struggling for autonomy and through an aloneness

which has more the flavor of separateness than isolation. Mark's response to Card I given on the first page of this section is a good one. However, the rest of their records also reveals that isolation or an observer's role has been developed to keep them out of people's reach though they yearn to be engaged.

For example:

Chris (14):

Someone who hasn't had much to do and is just loafing around and decided he will look outside and at the sun for beauty, nature. Some lover of God and he would like to be outside but he is going to remain cooped up. (?) because he doesn't want to make the effort to go out and he just wants to observe rather than be in it.

B. Underachievers High in Autonomy With Respect to the Entire Population (N = 14)

Five of the underachievers who are high in autonomy are primarily and intensely searching for an honest self definition on their own terms. See the following two stories in response to card 14.

Greg:

Most men live in a world of shadows, two dimensional worlds, not even the full living color of their T.V. set, but a simple black and white. Certainly, that's how most men see me. If people would bother to look around a person and through him as opposed to only at an image, there would be a lot more reality in what is real. As he looks out a window...he is seen as merely a shape in a world of darkness...but as a man of a bit more insight than his fellows, he struggles toward a light by which he can see himself in his full rounded form. I cannot tell you whether he goes forward and stands erect in a vision of light or

is pulled back to become merely another part of darkness. Yet in his attempt lies whatever noble there is in humanity.

Larry:

A young man, muscular and uncreased looking at the sky, a bright sky from his dark room. In this room in the past several months, he's thought many disturbing things. He has realized that he's not different from everyone else as he thought he was; that his supposedly unique qualities were shared by innumerable people. He convinced himself that he could not believe in himself as one would a God and had turned to other equally introspective modes of thinking. At first decrying the futility of man and then later on turning to more rational, less hysterical thoughts. All this thinking began to drive him a little bit crazy, not the crazy of a neurotic, but merely a little fed up with the wheels that unceaselessly turned within his brain night and day always clashing at some point and always asking questions. He began to think that it was his constant thinking and reasoning with himself and wondering which anguished him so much. Many questions were posed. Answers given only the same day to be thrown out by another thought. All that he'd been thinking before were merely straws in the wind. He became mightily tired of all this and realized that his only peace would come not in suicide but in not thinking. But the former plagued him for many days. He would look to his window and see himself plunging down and thinking yes, death would stop him from thinking but it would also stop him from arriving at any sort of truth about himself or the world that he observed. So now, after months of toil, he sat on his window ledge, resting from his mental labors and looking out over the town. The sun was neither bright nor was it cloudy. It was a blah sort of day but there were many things to see and he became mesmerized by them as he so often had before in these moments of reverie. During these times, the wheels went slower and more lackadaisically, apathetically. He would think his thoughts. He would not be so concerned with the cares of himself or human beings, but merely answer questions like: why was the roof green on the building across the street. Often in these wanderings he sought out the

patches of green a few miles away at the edge of town. It was a large town. The atmosphere was quite oppressive and it was in these living spots that he sought refuge. This day though was a little different. He had tormented himself all the day and was now staring fixedly at a bit of yellow over there and this tiny drop fascinated him, transfixed him until at once he thought he knew what the answer was, what he really enjoyed and that was these living objects that had never before spoken to him but now seemed to possess a brightness of their own. It seemed more alive than himself and he swore that it was from these living things that he would learn and listen to. Were they from that body that the others called God? He didn't choose to answer that question, too exhilarated by his discovery. But soon enough he would have to grapple with it and once again the wheels would turn in his head.

Larry's struggle is exceptionally fierce and it is impressive and moving that at the age of seventeen from the depth of despair, suffering and emptiness he has begun to engage himself in life and to find the basis for a valid self.

Among these five boys, two processes are at work. The struggle for autonomy takes place in isolation because solitude is necessary to their inward struggle. In addition, interpersonal contact is potentially destructive of the ongoing attempt to create a self on their own terms.

C. Underachievers Relatively Low in Autonomy with Respect to the Group

The processes underlying underachievement are not different for the six underachievers who are low in autonomy. However,

five of these boys protect autonomy more strongly than the high autonomy underachievers. This is done in two ways. The personality becomes more constricted. See for example:

Steve: (Card I)

It looks like a boy studying a book. Do you want more? (Yes, explain.) He looks interested in it. He looks like he's reading because there's not much else to do, not like he's been made to do it. (?) I suppose he will probably lose interest in it and turn to something else.

Or, the compliant side of the personality is most prominent together with outbursts of a secret autonomous self which is either rejected or unheeded. See for example:

Tony (Card 7BM)

It's a picture of an angry young boy talking to his father and the father is looking ahead of him and realizes that's the way he was when he was his age. I just had another idea...it's a very spoiled boy and the father is looking down on him as if to say: Is this really my son and how could I have let him get this spoiled?...The father explains to him that he tried to be a good father to him; to give him everything he wanted and he really can't stand to see him be this way but he realizes it's his fault for letting it get that far, being this spoilt. (?) He's not really concerned about anybody else in the family. He just wants things for himself and the father explains to him that when he's on his own, if he acts that way, people will not be attracted to him.... Just then the father, he's a pretty old guy, gets a heart attack and he's taken to the hospital and while he's very near death, he's in critical condition, the boy stays with his mother. He comforts her and his father pulls through and both of them gather round the bedside and there's a marked change in him, the boy. And he begs for forgiveness from his father and says how horrible he's been to the family, the boy. And the story ends when all three of them are hugging each other around the bed.

Autonomy strivings are apparent in the records of the three constricted boys. One makes the point in his stories that his activities are usually not a product of outer compulsion. Yet, he is not aware that his more usual apathy and his intense isolation are a reaction to the fear of giving in. The other two could be mistaken for non-autonomous achievers were it not for a strong indicator of underachievement which appears only once in each boy's record. In their own way, each boy while lacking in separateness on the surface, successfully holds merger or symbiosis in abeyance on another level.

Constriction to a greater degree than isolation safeguards autonomy by cutting off feelings which might endanger it. This constriction is often accompanied by isolation but not by self division. Compliance, an apparent lack of autonomy is accompanied by deep self-division. This self division is the consequence of hiding and underplaying autonomy while presenting a compliant facade to one's self and the world.

The Achievers' Pattern of Autonomy

The achievers are more homogeneous with respect to their pattern of autonomy than the underachievers with respect to theirs. Thus the qualitative features of the achievers' autonomy pattern will be discussed without regard to the degree of autonomy manifested.

The achievers' struggle for autonomy is most typically

expressed via conflicts with other people. Moreover, none of the achievers are involved in an inward struggle to create a self on their own terms. Three of the achievers perceive their lives as meaningless at times, but no struggle to change inwardly is initiated either because they feel it is not possible or because they feel overwhelmed from within. For the high autonomy achievers, this struggle is more often successful than for the low autonomy achievers. See for example:

Gary (II)

Alright, these are three members of a rural family. Two sisters and a brother. Excuse me let's say these two are married, I see she's pregnant. We'll say the girl and the man on the left are both related, in the same family. All three of them were raised in the country but the girl on the left is now planning to leave the country and to go to the city to teach. The family wants her to stay in the country and she's torn between the two choices she has to make but she will leave the country.

Jerry (I)

The door slam shut tight. All of a sudden it was very quiet or at least quiet compared to the steady flow of words I had just heard. So here I was now alone with the violin and in one hour they'd let me out. I had my music and it was practice time. I just looked at it and all I could remember were my dear mother's words: we're only doing this for your own good. Why your uncle even said you had great musical ability. This is a great joy we're giving you. You should be thankful. I was determined not to play it. Somehow the more she told me I enjoyed it, the more adamant my refusal to play it was and in the past few weeks I had come to hate the violin but now is my turn to act. I took the violin and smashed it, not viciously but smashed it so it would never be able to be played again and I felt sorry for it but this is the way it had to be. Now she,

they can never force anything on me again. I was free and it all seemed so simple.

In contrast to:

Phil (II)

This vignette, this place in the late 18th century in Ohio. Now this takes place on a farm in America and this is a relatively new settlement in this community. First of all there's a family who occupies the house in this picture and they moved there from New York City. The girl who is holding the books is really very young. They were very poor in New York City and came to take their fortune and so the daughter is grown up and every one in the valley community where there's virtually no educational opportunity for her and everyone. So she's illiterate and ignorant but then in her 18th year, they start a schoolhouse in the valley and all the male children who are much younger than she, attend the school but also some of the adult males go too; like her brother in the background, he goes at night. He's about twenty-years-old. But they won't let girls or women go to this school which is sort of ironic since the school mistress is a woman. So she tells the school mistress that she wants to go to school but since the community would object, the school mistress says she can't do it but she says she would secretly and privately give her lessons, reading and lend her the books she has in this picture now. And this kept up for a while. She learned to read fairly well but her family and the whole community objected so she eventually was forced to give it up and she married some guy from a neighboring farm when she was 19, had 3 children and died of childbirth with the fourth at the age of 26.

Wayne (7BM)

Paul Robeson the Third looked down with sympathetic eyes at the young man who had just come to realize that his daughter (Robeson's) Cynthia was not his as he has supposed, for at this moment, an immaculately dressed and imposing stranger had entered to sweep Cynthia off for the evening, shortly after the young man had arrived to call on her without having forewarned her of his intentions. The young

man had met Cynthia several weeks before when they were both engaged in a voter registration project on Chicago's South Side. Cynthia had found the young man congenial and pleasant but had not entertained the same romantic illusions that he had developed about her. Now back in her own element Cynthia had dropped all thought of the young man who stood now disillusioned and considered that he had been a fool to act as he did. Cynthia's father...older and understanding felt sorry for the young man, although his emotion was encouraged by the fact that he was sure Cynthia would never have taken to this person. At this point the young man left feeling that he had been embarrassed in trying to ignore societal guide lines and after he had resumed his job as a stockroom director in a mail order firm, he soon married one of the secretaries there and lived as happily ever after as he felt he could reasonably have expected to.

Moreover, the high autonomy achievers when they give in are more likely to hold on to their own motivation and to reject control in their own mind. Holding on to autonomy in this fashion makes them similar to underachievers as well as in the consequent self-division. For example:

Leo (Card I)

I think he's feeling that he doesn't want to practice the violin. I think he's debating whether or not he should do it. He has had some directive from an authority figure to practice but still he's indecisive and I think the outcome will be that he will practice but not due to his own motivation (?) because of the weight of the command...He must, no should practice.

In contrast among the low autonomy achievers who give in, the giving in, sometimes reaches the outer limit of submission and becomes self betrayal as well as a radical giving up of the possibility of an autonomous self. See for example:

Elie (Card I)

It's a young boy and a violin and I think he's thinking about music and the violin. I think there is some sheet music under it. Seems he should be or has been and will be probably practicing the instrument. His parents are very musically oriented and pushed him and now he likes it. It's probably what's going on here. He doesn't really want to play. If he wanted to he would pick it up and start playing (?) I think that as any young boy, he will probably continue and get rather proficient. I can't say he'll become a violinist but he will enjoy it. People can enjoy music.

In addition, among achievers, lack of autonomy is more frequently expressed than for the underachievers either through symbiotic relationships or through overdependent ones. See for example:

Cliff (7BM)

Two men differing in age by maybe 20 or 30 years. The young man is being scrutinized as if he is an insubordinate (sic). He may be employed by the elder. He's an employee or at least he's doing some tasks for him and the elder seems to be gratified or pleased with what the younger is doing while the younger man has more the attitude of confidence but a touch of nervousness. He is esteemed however by the elder and goes on to be a good worker.

Therefore, interaction can be associated with both a struggle for autonomy, successful or not and with a lack of autonomy, though there is a small tendency for it to be more often associated with the first. This is reflected in the low and nonsignificant inverse correlation between isolation and autonomy (Table 14, p. 96). The correlation between inter-

action and autonomy is therefore lowered both by the achievers who struggle for autonomy in conflict with other people and fail and by those who lack autonomy because they are related to people on a symbiotic or overdependent basis. So while it is true that achievers are more likely to struggle for autonomy within the context of people or in the open, it is also true that lack of autonomy, though to a lesser extent, can be found in the same context.

For achievers in general, on Card 1, the boy's goals are significantly less often self-instituted than for the underachievers (Table 5, p. 88). This reflects the fact that though achievement seems to have nothing to do with intrinsic interest, they are more frequently concerned with achievement and success or acceptance than are the underachievers. See for example:

Wayne (I)

He just had recently taken up playing the violin, i.e., approximately two months ago and at this point he'd come from a lesson where he'd played a piece, he was supposed to have prepared very badly and now back at home he felt discouraged and embarrassed and he sat at a small table looking down at his violin lying on a sheaf of music. Being a conscientious boy and determined to achieve in most things that he undertook, he worked hard in the interim week and surprised his teacher with his increased skill at their next meeting (laughs). (?) It was suggested to him by his parents.

Moreover, two of the three achievers who see the boys goals as self instituted, shift the focus of the story from pursuing their goals for their own sake to succeeding in order to please.

See for example:

James:

Well, looks like the boy had a lesson on his violin and his teacher was very unsatisfied with him and he had a bad lesson and the teacher told him to go home and practice and he sat down at his desk with his violin and his music and he was discouraged and he sat and he thought and he was very sad and finally he decided that he'd better try again and maybe he'd do better next time. (?) I guess he always wanted a musical instrument and the violin seemed the most interesting, except he had his doubts during his practicing.

The underachievers, as previously mentioned, are more concerned with remaining free sometimes to the point of failure or they can imagine themselves as successful when the object of success is of intrinsic interest. See for example:

Chris:

The boy likes music and would like to be a musician and is thinking of the day when he'll be able to play and he will be able to play very well.

Chapter VII

DISCUSSION

Patterns of Autonomy

A. Summary of Quantitative and Qualitative Results

Underachievers tend to struggle for autonomy to a greater degree than achievers, but this difference does not reach an acceptable level of significance (Table 3, p. 86). However, the underachievers' struggle for autonomy is qualitatively different from the achievers' struggle. The underachievers have a greater need to set up their own goals (Table 4, p. 86) while the achievers more typically struggle against goals imposed on them. This need of the underachievers, together with their tendency to struggle more than the achievers, indicates their intense wish to be autonomous. Moreover, the groups differ as to the context in which the struggle for autonomy takes place. For the achievers, autonomy is generally found side by side with active interpersonal involvement and with relatively little self-division. For the underachievers, autonomy is more often associated with isolation and self division (Table 13, p. 96). Therefore, achievers and underachievers differ radically in their patterns of

autonomy. While the indices of the struggle for autonomy are not statistically different for the two achievement groups, qualitative differences in these indices and the context in which they are found changes their meaning.

1. The Underachieving Pattern of Autonomy

Underachievers need to institute their own goals or feel an intrinsic interest in what they do.

They maintain a core of separate autonomous self through isolation and through the rejection of control and manipulation either behaviorally or in their own mind. This sometimes leads to an impoverishment of the self or to becoming nothing. The latter further serves to protect autonomy. The fierceness of some of these struggles for autonomy seems to stem from the perceived differences between themselves and others. Since they are different, they cannot get the love, the acceptance for which they yearn without becoming other than they are. It is not surprising then, that the underachievers almost never picture themselves as symbiotically related (Table 9 and 10, p. 92).

The constant shift between the desire to be loved and the desire to be autonomous, to be a slave or free, to reject control in the mind while going along with it, leads to a profound split in the personality or to self division.

There are a few differences between high autonomy under-

achievers and low autonomy underachievers.

Five out of the fourteen high autonomy underachievers are primarily and intensely searching for an honest self-definition on their own terms. For them the struggle for autonomy takes place in isolation for two reasons. Solitude is necessary to their inward struggle and interpersonal contact can be destructive of the ongoing attempt to create a self on their own terms. This inward struggle is a potentially self healing phenomenon. It can serve to reengage the person in life and create the basis for a rich and valid self (see Larry, p.114).

Five of the six underachievers who are low in autonomy further protect autonomy in two ways. The personality becomes constricted thus safeguarding autonomy by cutting off feelings which might endanger it. This constriction is often accompanied by isolation but not self division. Or, the compliant side of the personality is most prominent together with outbursts of a secret autonomous self which is either consciously unheeded or rejected. Compliance is associated with self division. This self division protects autonomy by allowing these boys to present a compliant facade to themselves and the world while hiding or underplaying autonomous strivings.

2. The Achieving Pattern of Autonomy

The achievers do not struggle inwardly to create a self on their own terms. Their struggle for autonomy is most typically expressed via conflicts with other people. High autonomy achievers are more often successful in this struggle than low autonomy achievers. Moreover, high autonomy achievers when they submit, hold on to their own motivation while low autonomy achievers are not aware of their submission. They substitute their parents goals for their own and feel independent. Lack of autonomy is more frequently than for under-achievers expressed through symbiotic or overdependent relationships. This also indicates that achievers are less fearful of close relationships. Finally, although achievement in general often seems to have nothing to do with intrinsic interest, achievers are frequently concerned with performance and success.

B. Centrality of Autonomy to the Relative Success of Achievers and Underachievers

Clearly, autonomy is the central factor in understanding the relative success of achievers and underachievers.

Underachievers cannot achieve unless the object of success is of intrinsic interest. School achievement is by and large imposed from the outside, without regard to a child's natural curiosity, his need to learn and his need to engage

in life (Holt, 1964, 1967). Most often children are subtly coerced to learn through the fear of the withdrawal of love (Holt, 1964). In fact, Freudian theorists feel that learning can only come through the need to be loved (e.g., Eckstein, 1969 or Mahler, 1945). The evidence is that children need not be motivated to learn through love (e.g., Maslow, 1956; White, 1959; Berlyne, 1966 or Holt, 1967). Underachievement indeed stems in great part from the failure to accept learning in exchange for love. Underachievers deeply wish to be autonomous, to set up their own goals. To protect autonomy, to remain free of manipulation--achievement in exchange for love is one such manipulation--they remove themselves from learning and people by isolating themselves emotionally. They continue to yearn for love and approval but cannot accept it at the cost of genuine submission or abdication of autonomy. In the sense that underachievement in turn keeps the potential for a genuine self alive, it is an outcome of a healthy drive for the survival of the self. However, the development of the self becomes stunted through isolation and deeply split due to the opposition of autonomy and love. For some underachievers, the protection of autonomy can become a self healing phenomenon. Having put themselves in the position of being left to their own resources, they assume the task of struggling for a self on their own terms and from within.

The process is ongoing and provides the basis for the development of a valid self which can reengage these boys in life and whose strength can eventually withstand the vicissitudes of a world they perceive as manipulative, coercive and destructive.

In contrast, success which stems from a drive for achievement which is alien to the individual, and it is alien to the majority of achievers in this study, can and does lead to an abdication of autonomy. While non-autonomous achievers function well in school and even outstandingly, they have to a large degree given up having a self of their own making. The autonomous achievers have struggled and do struggle for autonomy with success. They do this without relinquishing gratifying interpersonal contact and with relatively little self division. Yet, it must be noted that none of the achievers struggle inwardly. Three of them, at least once on their records, perceive a life of achievement and work to which they have no deep connection as empty and meaningless. They each give up the attempt to create a more meaningful life for themselves either because they feel trapped or overwhelmed from within. This attempt would require the same inner struggle some of the underachievers engage in. Two of these achievers otherwise express strong behavioral autonomy while the last more usually seeks safety in others. At least for

these two achievers, their behavioral autonomy can be seen as rather vulnerable.

In a paper soon to be published, Gruen and Hertzman (1973) develop the thesis that "...autonomy is the central unifying factor in the integration of the individual and that failures in autonomy are the central factors for understanding pathology." The results of this study confirms their contention. The relative success of achievers and underachievers is centrally connected with autonomy and its vicissitudes.

Underachievement is an aspect of the struggle for autonomy which has been driven underground. The same hiding of autonomy strivings through isolation, splitting of the self, and compliance has been described by Laing (1965) for schizoid and schizophrenic individuals, by Daco (1965) for masochistic ones and by Gruen (1968) for disassociated and schizoid patients who divorce themselves from acts which are the consequence of coercion. The split in the self of schizoid and schizophrenic individuals described by Laing is more pervasive and encompassing than for the underachievers. Moreover, only a few underachievers have developed the compliant side of their personality to the degree necessary to protect autonomy.

Achievement may be connected with genuine autonomy or it may represent an abdication of autonomy (see also Roskam, 1972). Here we must contrast the protected autonomy of the

underachievers which keeps them both safe and free from manipulation to that of the achievers who have abdicated autonomy. We have to agree with Gruen and Hertzman (1973) that both patterns of autonomy represent "failures in autonomy." The first are boys "...whose development has been dominated by fear of life rather than by the capacity to engage it." Gruen (1968) points out that this development while it is pathological keeps the potential for a genuine self alive. The hope is of "...someday having a self of one's own making (p. 652)." The second are boys who have profoundly given up the possibility of a genuine self.

C. Critical Comparison of the Findings of this Study to Orientations in Previous Studies

To ignore autonomy and its central connection to achievement and underachievement is to end up with the partial or contradictory results which have obscured this area for years.

Halpern (1964) out of his therapeutic experience with underachievers comes close to the writer's view of underachievement. He does conclude that a "work inhibition" is a "...distortion of a healthy and vital process, the child's individuation of his unique ego (p. 187)." However, he fails to recognize both the structure of the underachieving autonomy pattern and its centrality to the development of the self and the underachievement.

The orientations of most other studies have been fairly similar to each other and strongly influenced by Freud and his followers.

Underachievement has been investigated out of the context of the social structures in which it exists. Primarily, the defects of our educational system are largely ignored (see FriedenberG, 1963 and Holt, 1964 for two complementary incisive analyses of these defects), as well as the effects of our technological society which focuses on and rewards achievement and little else (see Keniston, 1965). The value of achievement is so taken for granted, that this premise of most of these studies is usually not stated openly. School success is viewed as a desirable valuable personal and social goal without regard to its possible cost to the individual. Thus underachievement is viewed as a failure to adjust to reality and its causes are sought almost exclusively in the personality of the underachiever, especially in some deficiency of the personality. Here the influence of Freud and his followers has been enormous. As Lynd (1956), Maslow (1956) and Gruen and Hertzman (1973) point out, Freud's view of human nature and the growth of the self is essentially negative. This view together with the unquestioning acceptance of the "given reality" has put "...the onus for illness on the individual" (Gruen and Hertzman, 1973). Moreover, it leads to

a false pitting of the pleasure principle to the reality principle. Autonomous learning is both pleasurable and compatible with life in its widest sense.

While not explicitly Freudian in orientation, many investigators have sought to establish that underachievers are more emotionally disturbed or maladjusted. The results are contradictory. Sometimes, the underachievers are found to be better adjusted (e.g., Owens, 1949). Sometimes the achievers are found to be more emotionally stable (e.g., Margulies, 1942) and sometimes no differences are found with respect to adjustment (e.g., Cronbach, 1959). While it is true that instruments to test adjustment, definitions and sample population vary, the results are the same when studies using the same instruments, the same definitions and similar populations are compared (e.g., with the Rorschach see Monroe, 1945 and Cronbach, 1950). From the vantage point of Freudian theory, we must conclude with Kisch (1967) that there is no unique relationship between maladjustment and achievement. But, with autonomy as our unifying concept, this study shows that both the achievers' and underachievers' pattern of autonomy have their potential for pathology and that this pathology is centrally related to "failures in autonomy."

More important yet, the focus on adjustment has obscured some suggestive and so far consistent results. Both Margulies

(1942) and Boyer et al (1967) find that unsuccessful students and non-learners are less accepting of their need for love and less willing to "sacrifice a part of the personality" to accommodate to their environment. At the same time, both studies indicate that underachievers protect themselves against responsiveness to their environment. These results are treated as aspects of the issue of adjustment and therefore the significance of these aspects of the protected autonomy pattern to an understanding of underachievement is not perceived.

Again, trying to locate the causes of underachievement in some specific deficiencies of the personality, Kimball (1952, 1953), Corlis (1963), Halpern (1964), Bricklin and Bricklin (1967), Wilson et al (1967) and Morrison (1969) have found that a passive aggressive orientation was frequent among underachievers. This is the only consistent finding with respect to psychological problems shared by underachievers because it is centrally related to their struggle for autonomy. This personal orientation reflects a resistance to interaction and thus serves to protect autonomy (see for example Tom, pps.8-14). However, these researchers except for Halpern (1964) have interpreted this finding solely as a revenge against parents. While revenge is a motive, the connection of this passive aggressive orientation to a central aspect of the self was in part obscured by the exclusive focus on intra-

psychic conflict. For example, Bricklin and Bricklin (1967) conclude that underachievers fail to make a relatively "conflict free identification" with achievement oriented parents or to "internalize parental values." By taking for granted the value of achievement, and placing the onus on the underachiever for failing to internalize his parents' values, autonomy is totally disregarded and thus also both its importance to the underachiever and the underachievement. Further, Halpern (1964) in part attributes underachievement to the "permissive society" which encourages pleasure principle learning. This is a false pitting of the pleasure principle against the reality principle and an outcome of failing to analyze the effects of achievement divorced from intrinsic interest. On the contrary, it can be said that the "Achieving Society" has a large share in precipitating the underachievers fierce struggles for autonomy, by divorcing intrinsic interest from achievement. (See Academic Achievement, Underachievement Autonomy and Related Research, pps. 40-53 for the relevant documentation and the elaboration of this point.)

The causes for achievement have largely been studied on an empirical basis. In the main one consistent finding has emerged, the association of achievement and conformity (see for example, Oakland, 1969). These results were left unquestioned for a long time because of the focus on achievement as

a valuable goal. A few investigators have begun to suggest that achievement may come via independence or conformity (see Domino 1968, Getzel and Jackson, 1962). Roskam (1972) has shown that achievement is centrally related to autonomy. It may be an outcome of genuine autonomous strivings or represent an abdication of autonomy.

Autonomy and the Need for Social Approval

When conformity is measured as the need for social approval, achievers and underachievers do not significantly differ in the extent to which they conform (Table 17, p. 99). This is in agreement with the finding that when conformity is measured according to whether Q sorts of personality characteristics conform to groups norms, "achieving" college boys do not differ from "low achieving" boys (Erb, 1961).

Contrary to what was hypothesized, on the one hand, the eight achievers who are highest in the need for approval are not significantly less autonomous than the eight achievers who are lowest in the need for approval. On the other hand, the eight lowest need for approval underachievers are significantly more autonomous than the eight highest need for approval underachievers. However, the non-conforming underachievers are also more autonomous than both achieving groups (Tables 18 and 19, pp. 101). These findings reflect the variable relationship of the need for social approval to autonomy both

within and between groups. Self division is a measure of the opposition between the need to be autonomous and the need to be loved. Its prominence among the underachievers ought to be relevant to further defining the relationships between autonomy and the need for social approval. The distribution of self division is significantly different in both groups (Table 20, p. 104).

All non-conforming underachievers are highly self divided. Their T.A.T. stories clearly and often show either the opposition of slavery to freedom, of autonomous strivings to the desire to please, or of the wish to be acceptable to autonomous actions. The low need for approval as measured on the Crowne Marlowe (C-M) questionnaire directly reflects their choice to be free and autonomous.

The high need for approval underachievers are evenly divided between high and low self division. Two of the highly divided underachievers are also highly autonomous. For them, the need for approval is simply a facade. For low autonomy underachievers who are highly self divided, both the low autonomy and the high need for approval are facades which function to protect a more secret striving for autonomy. Three of the underachievers who are low in self division are also low in autonomy. It is not surprising that these three are also the most constricted or isolated and least aware of

an underlying conflict for autonomy. The last who is high in autonomy, is also high in the need for approval on the T.A.T. This need for approval is split off from awareness and reflected in the C-M score.

All the achievers who are highly divided are low in the need for approval. Two are high in autonomy and like the non-conforming underachievers are divided over wanting to please or be autonomous. While they obviously more often choose to be autonomous, they choose achievement in their T.A.T. stories while remaining divided about their choice. The last is not autonomous because he too often chooses to give in to other people's wishes while he remains divided about his choices. For the three non-divided high autonomy achievers, the C-M score reflects a relatively non-conflicted autonomy. But, for the two non-divided, low autonomy achievers, the low need for social approval is invalidated by a profound lack of inner autonomy.

All the conforming achievers are relatively little self divided. The five who score above the autonomy mean do so because the need for approval as reflected on the T.A.T. is split off from awareness. However, this need for approval is acted on when responding to the C-M questionnaire. In their case the scale again taps only one aspect of the autonomy-need for approval dichotomy. The three boys who score below

the autonomy mean are either intensely enmeshed in other people, cowed and crushed or both and except for one are not aware of it.

There are indeed a variety of relationships between the C-M measure of the need for social approval and autonomy. Within the achieving group, the C-M scale is only sensitive to either relatively non-conflicted autonomy or lack of autonomy. It fails to differentiate between low need for approval boys who are profoundly lacking in inner autonomy and high need for approval boys who are striving for autonomy but whose split off need for approval is acted out. This difference is of prime importance in gauging the potential for the development of an autonomous self, and it might lead to enhanced prediction of the behavior of subjects based on the C-M scale.

Within the underachieving group, the C-M scale is only sensitive to one end of the "protected autonomy" continuum. It would indeed be surprising if it failed to reflect, the strong commitment to autonomy of the low need for approval boys. However, these autonomy strivings coexist with rejected but still very much alive wishes to be close to others and appreciated. It is their isolation which protects them from this continuing temptation which is potentially threatening to autonomy. If that side of their personality is

ignored as it must be if one is to use the need for social approval as an indicator of autonomy, then the underachieving autonomy pattern is overlooked and an artifact is created: Low need for approval is associated with autonomy and high need for approval with lack of autonomy. In actuality, autonomy strivings can be seen as varyingly protected. Isolation is sufficient for some. A facade of conformity must be added to or substituted for the isolation for others. For some, both an apparent lack of autonomy and conformity are needed to protect still more secret strivings for autonomy. And finally a profound splitting off of autonomous strivings serves as the ultimate protection though it may also be reinforced with isolation. Self division is no longer experienced or expressed.

Critical isolation and autonomy scores as well as goals self-instituted were also used as signs of the underachieving pattern of autonomy. (The rationale for this is given in the Results Section p.102). None of these variables taken alone is a significant function of conformity (Table 20,p. 104). However, the patterning of the four signs of underachievement with respect to conformity is significantly different for the two achievement groups (Table 21, p. 106). This result in the main reflects the significant effects of self division and the lesser effects of isolation. There is a tendency for

low need for approval underachiever to be more isolated than high need for approval underachievers, but not for the achievers.

Certainly a study with a much larger number of subjects is necessary to confirm and elucidate the varying relationships of the need for social approval to autonomy for achievers and underachievers. A study in which only extremely high or low need for approval boys were chosen might differentiate between high and low autonomy boys in the achieving group. Roskam (1972) showed this was true for high achieving college girls.

Note that the low need for approval girls in Roskam's study are comparable to the low need for approval boys in this study with respect to the Crowne-Marlowe score. However, the high need for approval girls had a C-M score of 19 or above while the scores of the high need for approval boys in this study range from 12-24. Moreover only three achievers and two underachievers scored 19 or above. In other words, the two subject samples are not comparable with respect to high need for approval. Moreover, there are undoubtedly sex differences. For example, Erb (1961) found that achieving and underachieving boys did not differ in conformity, but achieving girls were more conforming than underachieving girls. There-

fore, even with achieving boys picked on the basis of extreme C-M scores, there still might be no difference with respect to autonomy. High need for approval achievers may express the greater cultural emphasis on non-conformity for boys either on the C-M scale or on the T.A.T. In effect the T.A.T. reflects both autonomy and the need for approval when they are present while the C-M scale only taps one of these aspects of the personality. As for the underachievers, extremely high need for approval scores are likely to eliminate the more self divided boys and leave just those with the most hidden protective autonomy patterns.

Suggestions for Further Research

While in this study, the writer sought to delineate a psychic structure rather than predict behavior, it is perhaps possible to gain an understanding of the relationship between this structure and behavior. The guardedness defensiveness and secretiveness of many underachievers which precluded a study using interviews can perhaps now be overcome using the results of this study. Underachievers might be screened with the T.A.T. It is likely that underachievers who are open on the T.A.T. would give useful interviews. However, the limitations are obvious. Such sample would misrepresent the autonomy of the population of underachievers in a positive direction and since it is inner autonomy which is

important to them behavior alone may not touch on the heart of the matter. Nevertheless and with these limitations in mind, it is a necessary and worthwhile study to undertake.

The finding that some underachievers inwardly struggle for a self of their own making raises new questions to be researched. The relation of the protective autonomy pattern to this inward struggle needs to be delineated. It is not clear whether the other underachievers will eventually need to engage in the same inward struggle to create a self of their own or whether they are already involved in such a struggle, although it is not expressed on the T.A.T. In learning therapy, for example, once the self division is in the open, it becomes clear that an underground self definition had been ongoing. This finding needs to be explored in a non-therapy involved population.

Implications of Findings for the Therapy of Underachievers

The therapy of underachievers has been found to be difficult and often non-productive (Bricklin and Bricklin, 1967). Those features which make for a difficult therapy are those that are centrally related to the protection of autonomy. The underachiever is found to be passive, passive aggressive, not able or unwilling to put himself into treatment and not able to talk about himself in depth. These "negative" features reflect the protective isolation of the

underachievers. Their relationship to autonomy must be understood to reach the underachievers. If they are understood and interpreted solely as reflecting the underachievers resistance to facing his emotional problems, then the core of the problem is missed and the resistance to treatment is often increased.

In the writer's experience, learning therapy is ideally suited to those who have some self-motivation to do better in school. The school work itself often offers a way to breach the isolation and the resistance to interaction as long as the therapist is sensitive to the underachievers strivings for autonomy and the way in which they express themselves in the learning.

The varying strength of the protectiveness of autonomy revealed in this study or the varying openness of the mutual contradiction between autonomy and love makes for different therapeutic problems. Those underachievers who are most in touch with this opposition would probably most rapidly stop protecting autonomy and reengage themselves in life. Those underachievers whose autonomy is most secretive and in addition need to appear obedient and conforming would probably need more time to become openly autonomous and to be reached. The most difficult to reach, if they ever seek therapy would be the constricted underachievers. On the surface, they appear

friendly, outgoing, undivided and like conforming achievers.
For them, too, the T.A.T. does reflect autonomy strivings
and a protection of autonomy but at a still deeper level.

APPENDIX A
SCORING GUIDES

Autonomy Scale

Two main aspects of autonomy are being evaluated for each boy through their T.A.T. fantasies: the boy's ability to differentiate himself from others as a separate person with different needs, values, emotions, attitudes, abilities and goals as well as the extent of the struggle to maintain such a separation or become his own person. These two aspects of autonomy are obviously related, however the ability to see one's self as separate and be separate need not result in a struggle. On the other hand, while a struggle often implies that some separation has been made, this is not always the case. It is sometimes not clear whether a conflict is between two persons with different needs or whether the struggle is an expression of negativism. However, since the latter is developmentally a forerunner of separation, no assumption need be made about the struggle.

The stories are to be rated on a scale of 0-3 as follows:

- 0- The hero (heroine) of the story is symbiotically related. He expresses no wishes, needs of his own or abrogates them in favor of another and may even become like the other contrary to some initially self-directed impulse. Stories reflect no self differentiation or others are the source of wisdom, strength, support without which the hero cannot function.

- 1- mild struggle for autonomy
Unelaborated mild hints of separateness or desire for something of his own. Can become his own person only with parental agreement.
- 2- moderate struggle for autonomy
An intense and elaborate struggle which ends in temporarily going along with the other when the boy clearly expresses that it is not due to his own motivation. Separateness is clear but not acted on when action seems necessary. This must be elaborated in contrast to a 1 rating. In general this score is for moderately intense and/or elaborated struggles or struggles with some mild elements of dependency or intense struggle which result in self direction being temporarily checked.
- 3- Intense and elaborated struggles which are successful and for clear elaborated expressions of separateness with or without a struggle. Stories directly expressive of autonomy or autonomous functioning.

UR--unratable

This score is necessary for impressionistic or descriptive stories or for plots which obviously don't deal with autonomy.

Autonomy

Scoring Criteria for Cards I, II, 4, 6BM and 7BM

Card I -- boy with the violin

0 ratings

The boy is forced to study the violin, accepts it without a struggle and may even get to like it.

The boy plays only to please parents or some authority. The stress is often on how well he is doing to please.

Parent's goal and child's not differentiated.

The boy fits into the situation: playing the violin without wishes of his own stated and without critical self appraisal.

1-ratings

Unelaborated self evaluation especially of motivation which is then dismissed.

mild dislike or interest of task

2-ratings

The boy expresses his own wishes, likes dislikes and a lack of compulsion but interest is weak no matter the activity.

Doesn't want to practice or play the violin and after some struggle does but is clear it's not due to his own motivation. The struggle should be intense.

The boy has doubts, clearly appraises these though he may not act on them, i.e., critical self appraisal re motivation. It must be elaborated or score as above : 1.

3-ratings

Under forced condition the boy refuses, does something else, breaks the violin, i.e., any act which takes him away from the violin.

Playing the violin is clearly the boy's own goal for which he struggles without following in the footsteps of someone he admires.

Note: that he gets the idea to play through exposure to someone else is not following in the footsteps of someone else especially if S states and describes his own motivation.

Card II - Farm scene

0 ratings

The girl is part of the existing situation, a static situation, part of the family with no expression of separateness.

Yearning for and/or accepting of a happy symbiosis. It may be stated in symbolic terms, e.g. : a happy paradise.

The wish to stay with the family is congruent with the parent's wishes.

1-ratings

Girl views herself as different from the family but does not struggle to act on it, e.g., unelaborated dream, wish, thought.

Other mild hints of separateness which are not elaborated.

2-3 ratings: depending on intensity and elaboration

The girl is depicted as separate: she has her own values goals, wishes and leaves to act on them--she may or may not be in conflict with others.

In conflict with one or more persons and works at resolving conflicts in her favor. If girl is unsuccessful score 2.

Note: if girl needs outside support score 2, if she needs parent's agreement score 1.

Card 6BM--Older woman, younger man.

A- For themes which deal with some aspects of the "mother-son" or older woman younger man relationship other than leaving the mother or home.

0 ratings

Theme is concern for mother's feelings with no signs of self directed strivings or of the young man's own needs, feelings, etc.

1-ratings

Mild signs of separateness as people, e.g., they really are very much alike but live separately or don't interact.

Act of rebellion which is intensely regretted--mother figure may be supportive.

2-3 ratings

S expresses a clear separateness of feelings, attitudes, wishes, goals there may or may not be conflict.

Card 6BM (cont'd)

The older woman and the young man don't see eye to eye.
The young man stands by his own ideas or acts on them.

B- For themes of leaving the older woman.

0 rating

The young man remains with the woman despite his own wishes or they happily live together.

1-2 ratings

Separation is portrayed as forced by circumstances after a long closeness between them rather than as the young man's active intention.

Note: score depending on the context and how much of the young man's need is expressed.

Young man leaves or has left to make a life of his own but has a tendency to come back or take in the mother.

3-ratings

Leaving the mother is self-directed: for his own good, to make a life of his own, to act on his plans, goals, needs. Guilt, sorrow, unhappiness may be present as long as the former is clearly present.

Card 4 -- woman who appears to be restraining a man.

0- the man doesn't leave the woman or express any desire to leave her.

1- the man expresses a desire to leave but is constrained by the woman or leaves and states he'll be back despite his own wishes.

2- the man leaves mainly to commit some destructive or aggressive act.

3- it is clear the man leaves to do something of importance to him. There may be a peripheral aggressive theme or both themes may be of equal importance.

Note: If you are not sure score 2. If the man's leaving is not elaborated as to motivation score 2 also.

7BM- Older man and younger man

0-ratings

The older man gives advice to the younger man who accepts; the older man is influential and able to refuse or grant requests.

The two men are seen as plotting or engaging in something together; there is no independence of action for either.

The young man is in trouble and is getting help from the other man.

1-ratings

The young man sees both as different but needs the permission of the older man to act on it.

The young man can be taught by the older man without feeling the older man is the source of all wisdom.

2-3 ratings: depending on elaboration, intensity and/or how much dependency is mixed with independence.

The young man is rejecting the advice of the older man either openly or in his own mind.

The young man turns to the older man for reassurance but makes it clear he can or has acted on his own. If the latter is not clear score 0.

The young man sees himself as the equal of the older man and succeeding without his help.

The young man sees the older man as a harmful influence, threat or stumbling block or detriment to his future.

The two men are seen as equals with different opinions, feelings, attitudes or wishes.

Additional Autonomy Scale

Card I only

Rate whether the boy's goals are self-instituted as follows:

Yes: It is the boy's own decision to play the violin

No: Playing the violin is some other person's idea

Unratable: Where it is not clear or stated how he came to play the violin.

Note: a few subjects misperceive the violin: use the same rating guide as above for the stimulus introduced by the boy.

Isolation Scale

Rated for stories to Card I, 14, 3BM, 6BM and 12M

This deals with the extent to which each boy portrays his T.A.T. hero(s) as isolated or alone on the one hand and the degree of interpersonal interaction expressed in his stories on the other hand. This is to be rated on a scale of 0-2 with 0 representing interaction, 1 mild interaction and 2 isolation.

Cards I and 14--scoring criteria : lone figures

- 2 no people introduced
- 1 people introduced peripherally, i.e., they are not major characters in the plot.
- 0 people introduced centrally: they are principal characters in the story together with the hero.

Card 3BM

For many subjects the negatively toned character of the card taps the theme of the "loss" of a significant person. A central character is introduced which highlights the painful aloneness of the hero. Therefore, the scoring system for lone figures has been modified accordingly.

- 2 Intense Isolation due to the loss of a significant relationship: intense sorrow, loneliness, disappointment. It may be expressed symbolically, e.g., the loss of oral supplies.
- 2 No people introduced

1 Isolation due to loss of significant person or persons may be temporarily breached by these people, not by S though he may want it, i.e., a magical good ending.

1 Mixture of tendency to isolation and closeness: The loss of a significant person does not result in total isolation: other people are there to ease the pain.

1 people introduced peripherally

0 people introduced centrally in the absence of a "loss" theme

6BM

2 The older woman is not the younger man's mother.

2 The older woman is the younger man's mother but there is an absolute lack of interaction between them.

1 The older woman is the younger man's mother but interaction leads to withdrawal from contact.

1 When there are two stories equally elaborated in which the older woman is the mother in one and not in the other.

0 The older woman is the younger man's mother: do not score the younger man's leaving home to make a life of his own as withdrawal from contact.

If the subject changes from mother to someone else score according to which story is elaborated.

12M

2 Nothing occurs between the two figures, each is in his own world.

1-ratings

Standing figure acts to rescue the dying reclining figure who dies or probably dies: the wish for closeness has been considered and rejected.

Some positive act towards the reclining figure who is unaware.

Ambivalence in dominating the reclining figure. This may be mixed with theme there's nothing going on.

Indirect resistance of reclining person to domination. If direct score 0.

0-ratings

Strong interaction between the two figures. This may be symbiotic.

Standing figure takes care of the reclining figure who lets him do it.

Upright figure dominates reclining one or feels he will.

Standing figure acts to rescue or wishes to rescue the dying reclining figure who recovers: The possibility of isolation has been considered and rejected.

STRUGGLE FOR AUTONOMY IN ISOLATION SCALE

This is to be rated on stories to Card I and II on a scale of 0-2. It refers to a struggle for autonomy or autonomy which takes place outside the context of people. Note: You are rating for isolation (2-0) only those stories which have an autonomy rating (1-3).

Card I - rating guide

When there is a struggle for autonomy (scores of 1-3 on the autonomy scale)

2-ratings

No people introduced

People introduced which have no bearing on the struggle for autonomy.

1- People introduced which have a peripheral affect, positive or negative on the struggle for autonomy.

0- People introduced which are actively involved in the autonomy plot.

UR-unratable

Card II - rating guide

When there is a struggle for autonomy (scores of 1-3 on the autonomy scale)

2-ratings

The struggle is within the character's own mind: the other two figures in the card are ignored. S may contrast himself to others but without interaction.

Autonomy without conflict with other people and without inner struggle.

1-rating

The struggle is within the character's own mind but a subsidiary person is introduced in regard to the struggle or as part of the struggle.

0-rating

The struggle for autonomy is expressed through a conflict with other people; usually the parents or the older woman. It may be within S's mind.

UR-unratable

Symbiosis

This deals with stories expressive of relationships between people who are so intertwined with each other that neither is capable of existing without the other. It is sometimes expressed as the hero's closeness, admiration and dependency on another figure as his sole source of strength, wisdom and sustenance. Do not score if the story is just overdependent. It may also be reflected in the hero's yearning for and acceptance of a very early symbiotic relationship which may be expressed in symbolic terms. Finally, it

may show up as a need to remain in the bosom of the family without any conflicted feelings.

Note: the tone and flavor of such stories is unique.

Rate each story in the entire record which is expressive of symbiosis: as yes; if you are not sure score: U.

Rejection of Symbiosis

This is an attempt to evaluate isolation as a reaction against a yearned for and rejected symbiosis. It deals with the loss of a significant person. While it may appear anywhere in the record of a subject, the bulk of such stories are given to 3BM and only infrequently to other cards and will therefore be scored only for 3BM.

Score YES if the theme is present whether utter isolation or temporary isolation is indicated.

Note: Isolation without loss of a significant person is not scored Yes.

NO: the rest

U : uncertain

Self-Division Scale

This refers to contradictory or opposite trends in the subject's personality. He has quite different and opposite views of himself. It is reflected in T.A.T. stories through conflicts of goals, wishes, ways of life, actions and out-

comes within a fantasy character. It does not refer to conflict between people when the hero is not conflicted within himself.

All cards are to be rated for self division as follows:

0- no self division

Conflict with people which implies no self conflict: no guilt, no depression, no upsetness.

No conflict with people accompanied by no conflict within the self.

1- mild self division

Conflict with people between two different ways of life wishes goals, etc. resolved in favor of self with mild doubt, guilt.

Differences with people accompanied by mild inner division.

Mild hints of another side of the self.

Loss of a loved significant one which distresses S mildly, e.g., just sad.

Debating as to course of action mild

2-moderate self division

Conflicts with another person which implies self division. The two people have different ideas, wishes, ways of life. The subject stands by his own attitudes with severe consequences to the self: e.g., loss of oral supplies, strong emotional distress.

Loss of loved significant one which distresses or upsets S intensely: this relates to the opposition of isolation and symbiosis. Do not score symbiotic stories unless the other side is also presented and then score 2 or 3 depending on intensity and elaboration.

Opposite ideas, outcomes stated though one is taken back. If equally balanced and elaborated score 3.

Debating as to course of action--moderate.

3-Strong self-division

These will depend in part (see the exception in 2) on intensity and elaboration. If moderate score 2.

The hero is divided or conflicted within his mind; in-decision over a course of action, debating whether goals are counter to own wishes. Note: If he ends up liking what he's against score 0. Moderate 2, mild 1.

The hero strongly desires to do something and can't or vice versa.

Inner conflicts over communication: wants to and doesn't want to both strong.

Hopes, wishes intensely for one thing and the opposite happens when the outcome is portrayed as out of S's control: e.g., sickness, death.

Two different sides of the personality clearly stated.

Note 1: If self-division within one character is repeated, this time as between two characters in another story score 0-3 depending on degree of self-division. This transposition must be clear or do not score.

Two opposite sides of the self on two different stories again it must be clear or don't score.

Note 2: If self division occurs according to the general definition but doesn't fit any of the specific rating guides score 0-3 according to the degree.

APPENDIX B

CROWNE-MARLOWE QUESTIONNAIRE
AND PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

Crowne-Marlowe Scale

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" (true) or "F" (false) before each statement in the space which is provided.

- ___ 1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all candidates.
- ___ 2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
- ___ 3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
- ___ 4. I have never intensely disliked anyone.
- ___ 5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.
- ___ 6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
- ___ 7. I am always careful about my manner of dress.
- ___ 8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.
- ___ 9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.
- ___ 10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
- ___ 11. I like to gossip at times.
- ___ 12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.

- ___13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
- ___14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
- ___15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
- ___16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
- ___17. I always try to practice what I preach.
- ___18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud-mouthed, obnoxious people.
- ___19. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.
- ___20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.
- ___21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
- ___22. At times I have really insisted on having my own way.
- ___23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
- ___24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.
- ___25. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
- ___26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
- ___27. I would never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.
- ___28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
- ___29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
- ___30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.

- ___31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.
- ___32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only get what they deserved.
- ___33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

Personal Data Questionnaire

Name: _____ Birth Date: _____

Place of birth _____

Both parents living? _____

Parents: Married _____ Separated _____ Divorced _____

Father's age _____ Education _____ Place of Birth _____

Type of work _____

Mother's age _____ Education _____ Place of Birth _____

Type of Work _____

Sex and age of siblings: _____

Approximate family income - Below \$5,000.00 _____

\$5,000-\$10,000 _____

\$10,000-\$15,000 _____

above \$15,000 _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Bryce, L. & Spencer, Patricia A. Personal adjustment and academic predictability among college freshmen. J. Appl. Psych., 1963, 47(2), 97-110.
- Bachhold, L.M. Personality differences among high ability underachievers. J. Ed. Research, 1969, 63, 16-18.
- Berlyne, D.E. Curiosity and exploration. Science, 1966, 153, 25-33.
- Bettelheim, Bruno. The children of the dream. N.Y.: MacMillan, 1969.
- Bettelheim, Bruno. The education of emotionally and culturally deprived children. In Eckstein, R. and Motto, R. L. From learning for love to love of learning: essays on psychoanalysis and education. N.Y.: Brunner/Mazel, 1969, 235-244.
- Bettelheim, Bruno. The empty fortress: infant autism and the birth of the self. N.Y.: Free Press, 1967.
- Boyer, L. Bryce; Boyer, Ruth M., Kawai, Hayo, & Klopfer, Bruno. Apache "learners" and "Non-Learners." J. of Projective Techniques & Personality Assessment, 1967, 31(6), 22-29.
- Bricklin, Barry & Bricklin, Patricia M. Bright child-poor grades: the psychology of underachievement. N.Y.: Dell, 1967.
- Cohen, Jacob. Multiple regression as a general data--analytic system. Psych. Bull., 1968, 70(6), 426-443.
- Corlis, R.B. Personality factors related to underachievement in college freshmen of high intellectual ability. Dissertation Abstracts, 1963, 24, 832.
- Cronbach, L.J. Studies of the group Rorschach in relation to success in the college of the U. of Chicago. J. Educ. Psych., 1950, 41, 65-82.

- Crowne, D. P. & Marlowe, D. A. A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. J. consult. Psych., 1960, 349-354.
- Crowne, D.P. & Marlowe, D. The approval motive: studies in evaluative dependence. N.Y.: Wiley, 1967.
- Daco, Pierre. Les triomphes de la psychanalyse. Belgique: Gerard & Co., 1965.
- Domino, George. Differential prediction of academic achievement in conforming and independent settings. J. Educ. Psych. 1968, 59 (4), 256-260.
- Drews, Elizabeth and Teahan, John. Parental attitude and academic achievement. J. Clini. Psych., 1957, 13, 328-332.
- Eckstein, Rudolf. The learning process: from learning for love to love of learning. In, Eckstein, R. & Motto, L. R. From Learning for love to love of learning; essays on psychoanalysis and education. N.Y.: Brunner/Mazel, 1969, 95-98.
- Erb, Everett D. Conformity and achievement in college. J. personnel and Guidance, 1961, 39, 361-366.
- Erickson, Erick H. Identity: youth and crisis. N.Y.: W. W. Norton, 1968.
- Erikson, Erik H. Childhood and society. N.Y.: W.W. Norton, 1963.
- Erikson, Erik H. Young man Luther. N.Y.: W.W. Norton, 1958.
- Folman, Rosalind D. Factors related to differential achievement among superior college students. M.A. thesis. City College of New York, 1965.
- Friedenberg, Edgar Z. Coming of age in America: growth and acquiescence. N.Y.: Vintage Books, 1965.
- Getzels, Jacob W. & Jackson, Philip W. Creativity and intelligence: explorations with gifted students. N.Y.: Wiley, 1962.

- Gough, H.G. Factors relating to academic achievement of high school students. J. Edu. Psych. 1949, 40, 65-78.
- Gruen, Arno. Autonomy and Identification: the paradox of their opposition. International J. Psychoanalysis, 1968, 49(4), 648-655.
- Gruen, A. & Hertzman, M. Autonomy and compliance. Dynamische Psychiatrie, 1973 (in Press).
- Halpern, Howard M. Psychodynamic and cultural determinants of work inhibition in children and adolescents. Psychoanal. Rev., 1964 51(2), 173-189.
- Hammer, Emmanuel F. Creativity. N.Y.: Random House, 1961.
- Henry, J. Culture against Man. N.Y.: Random House, 1963.
- Henry, William E. The Analysis of fantasy: the thematic apperception technique in the study of personality. N.Y.: Wiley, 1956.
- Hertzman, Max. Psychology, literature and the life situation. Psychoanalysis, 1955, 3(2), 46-57.
- Hirsch, I.R. & Singer, Irwin. Adolescent dependence and rebelliousness. Amer. Psych., 1961, 16, 353.
- Hollingshead, A.B. & Redlich, F.C. Social class and mental illness. N.Y.: Wiley, 1958.
- Holt, John. How children fail. New York: Dell, 1964.
- Holt, John. How children learn. N.Y.: Dell, 1967.
- Horrall, Bernice, M. Academic performance and personality adjustment of highly intelligent college students. Genetic Psychol. Monographs. 1957, 55, 3-83.
- Kavanaugh, Lee J. Behavior of captive white-footed mice. Science. 1967, Vol. 155, 3770, 1623-1639.
- Keniston, Kenneth. The uncommitted: alienated youth in American society. N.Y.: Dell, 1965.
- Kimball, Barbara. Case studies in educational failure during adolescence. Am. J. Orthopsych., 1953, 23, 406-415.

- Kimball, Barbara. The sentence completion technique in a study of scholastic achievement. J. Consulting Psych., 1952, 353-358.
- Kisch, Jeremy. A comparative study of patterns of underachievement among male college students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Michigan, 1967.
- Laing, Ronald D. The divided self. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1965.
- Laing, Ronald D. The politics of experience. N.Y.: Pantheon Books, 1967.
- Lynd, Helen M. Identification and the growth of personal identity. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 1956, 3, 1, 2-12.
- Mahler, M.S. Ego psychology applied to behavior problems. In N.D.C. Lewis & B.C. Pacella (Eds). Modern trends in child psychiatry. N.Y.: International University Press, 1945, 43-56.
- Margulies, Helen. Rorschach responses of successful and unsuccessful students. Arch. of Psych., 1942, Vol. 38, 271.
- Maslow, A.H. Defense and growth. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 1956, 3(1), 36-47.
- Morrison, E. Underachievement among pre-adolescent boys considered in relationship to passive aggression. J. Edu. Psych., 1969, 168-173.
- 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.
- Munroe, R.L. Prediction of the adjustment and academic performance of college students by a modification of the Rorschach method. Appl. Psychol. Monogr., 1945, 7, pp. 104.
- Murray, Henry A. Thematic Apperception Test. Manual, 1943.
- Oakland, James A. Measurement of personality correlates of academic achievement in high school students. J. of Counselling Psychol., 1969, 16(5), 452-457.

- Ornitz, Hilda W. Patterns of Oedipal conflicts as revealed through the Thematic Apperception Test. Unpublished M.A. thesis. City College of New York, 1963.
- Owens, W.A. & Johnson, W.C. Some measured personality traits of collegiate underachievers. J. Educ. Psych., 1949, 40, 41-46.
- Roskam, Anne H. Patterns of autonomy in high academic-achieving adolescent girls who differ in their need for approval. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. City College of New York, 1972.
- Sampson, Ronald V. The psychology of power. New York: Vintage Books, 1968.
- Steinzor, Bernard. Rorschach responses of achieving and non-achieving college students of high ability. Amer. J. Ortho., 1944, 14, 494-504.
- Stix, Daniel. Overachievement in college as a function of anxiety, repression and attitudes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Temple University, 1966.
- White, Robert W. Motivation reconsidered: the concept of competence. Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 297-333.
- Wilson, Robert M., Soderquist, Ronald, Zemke, Robert L. & Swenson, Wendell M. Underachievement in college men: evaluation of the psychodynamics. Psychiatry, 1967, 30(2), 180.
- Winterbottom, Maria R. The relation of need for achievement to learning experiences in independence and mastery. In, Atkinson, J.W. (Ed.) Motives in fantasy action and society. N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1958, 453-478.
- Witkin, H.A., Lewis, H.B., Hertzman, M., Machover, K., Meissner, P. and Wapner, S. Personality through perception. New York: Harper, 1954.